DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 452 684 EF 005 909

AUTHOR	Earthman, Glen I.
TITLE	Collaborative Planning for School Facilities and Comprehensive Land Use. Revised.
PUB DATE	2000-01-31
NOTE	51p.; Paper presented to the Stein & Schools Lecture Series: Policy, Planning, and Design for a 21st Century Public Education System (Ithaca, NY, January 31, 2000).
AVAILABLE FROM	For full text: http://www.crp.cornell.edu/steinandschools.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Cooperative Planning; *Educational Facilities Planning; Elementary Secondary Education; Guidelines; *Land Use; Public Schools; School Community Relationship; *Site Development

ABSTRACT

This paper examines the areas of local jurisdictional cooperation required for successful new school planning that is beneficial to community development. The paper reviews some of the responsibilities that local municipal governments and school districts have in developing the community. This includes an explanation of the areas of mandated responsibility for each jurisdiction and the relationship between the two major players on the local level of government. The difficulties in collaborative planning are addressed, including technical difficulties such as budget cycle differences, fiscal dependency, different planning models, and lack of coordination and planning impetus; and social and political difficulties. Also discussed are planning issues involving a new school's impact on land use within the community. Several examples of successful new school planning collaborations are described, followed by descriptions of three collaboration models, two covering collaborative planning in rapidly growing areas and one for densely settled areas. (Contains 18 references.) (GR)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 452 684

COLLABORATIVE PLANNING FOR SCHOOL FACILITIES AND COMPREHENSIVE LAND USE

Glen I. Earthman
Virginia Polytechnic Institute & State University

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Glen Earthman

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Presented: 1/31/00
Revised 10/10/00
Presented to the Stein & Schools Lecture Series:
Policy, Planning, and Design for a 21st Century Public Education System

Cornell University
Ithaca, New York

EF 005 909

Full text available at:
http://www.crp.cornell.edu/steinandschools

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

INTRODUCTION

Planning the location of a new school or relocating an existing school has a great deal to do with the successful implementation of comprehensive land use plans and policies of the local government. In many communities comprehensive land use plans and the planning for a new school building complement each other. This kind of collaboration is not easily obtained and in some communities, it is not achieved. In these localities, there are many reasons why there is not a close relationship between the two. Nevertheless, when a new school is planned, there are many opportunities for planners to work together for the betterment of the overall community.

Cooperation between agencies and levels of government has long been viewed as advantageous to the community and at the same time a good use of limited resources. In addition, governmental cooperation provides better services to the community and eventually to individual citizens. While cooperation between local governmental agencies has always presented challenges for planners, this is especially true for the development of comprehensive land use and the planning of school buildings.

Beneficial community development is a challenge for every locality in the country even in the best of circumstances. Today rational development is more difficult because of the increase in citizen demands for public service and the desire for a better environment. These pressures are relayed to planners on the local level in almost every aspect of their work and can be further exacerbated by the limitations in community resources. Surrounding these factors is an additional concern, that of how two major independent local jurisdictions operate to change, improve, and control the physical surroundings of every community. When beneficial community development is thought of, the inevitable

push and pull of normal community needs and desires quickly comes to mind. In this give and take process, solutions to problems of community development are apparently agreed upon and implemented.

The topic of beneficial community development must also include the recognition of the multi-layered local governmental structure that is prevalent in the United States. There are historical roots to this governmental arrangement that undoubtedly reaches back to the colonial period (Kaiser, Godschalk and Chapin, 1995). The present local governmental structure is made up of several jurisdictions that have rather specific responsibilities. In most localities, services to the citizens are delivered by more than one governmental agency. This is in contrast to the more centralized structure in many countries throughout the world, such as Europe and Asia. In these regions the concept of centralized planning from the federal level is commonplace. Such planning does effect a close marriage between the function of placement of various public services on the local level and development of comprehensive land use practices, for instance. This type of planning is not common in the United States where there is a multiple layered set of local jurisdictions to provide services to the citizens. The services such local jurisdictions provide range from recreation, fire and safety, water and sewer, library, to education.

At the local level, two jurisdictions provide the major human services needed by the citizens: the local municipal government and the school district (So and Getzels, 1988). To provide a setting for a further discussion of the subject, a review some of the responsibilities these two major local jurisdictions have in developing the community is in order. This will include an explication of the areas of mandated responsibility for each jurisdiction and the relationship between the two major players on the local level of

government. This will enable the reader to better understand the areas of possible challenge for planners in each jurisdiction when planning for school buildings.

COMPONENTS OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT PLANNING

Municipal Jurisdictions

All jurisdictions that are concerned in any way with land use and development operate on the local level as either part of the state system of government or as quasi-governmental corporations charged with a specific responsibility. The major jurisdiction in this scenario of planning activities has the legal responsibility for the orderly development of the community as well as for the proper legal use of land (Kaiser, Godschalk, and Chapin, 1995). The local county or city government, which is part of and a direct extension of the state governance system, is the jurisdiction that is charged with that basic accountability, among other responsibilities. The local government has the legal authority and responsibility for developing ordinances and policies to govern how land is used, all within the confines of the state constitution and existing legal codes (So and Getzels, 1988). City and county governments develop zoning ordinances and sub-development regulations, as well as fire and building codes to govern the proper use of land and the structures located thereon.

There are two ways municipalities can shape the pattern of land use within its boundary; by capital investments and zoning ordinances. Public capital investment in the infrastructure of the community is a very important way to influence land use. This is accomplished through the capital improvement program and budget of the municipality. Through such investments, the municipality can develop parks, construct libraries, hospitals, and initiate and improve traffic circulation patterns, among other infrastructure

needs. Municipalities can shape the pattern of land use in a very pervasive manner through investment of public funds for specific citizen services.

The other way to shape the pattern of land use is through legal controls such as zoning ordinances and subdivision regulations (Levy, 1997). Of the two ways to shape land use, implementation of zoning ordinances and subdivision regulations is perhaps the most stringent of these tools. Through these ordinances and regulations, municipalities have a great influence and control on the communities within their jurisdiction to develop and change. These tools also serve as a motivation to the stability of community development (Healey, 1997). Development of each community within the jurisdiction must proceed within the allowable parameters of the adopted ordinances. Exceptions to the zoning ordinances, through permitted variances, are permissible and obtainable for good reason.

Municipalities are also the custodians of the comprehensive land use map. This document is very important to the orderly growth and development of the local governmental jurisdiction. The official map serves as the document and power for both the use and possible use of land within the municipality. The authority to maintain the comprehensive land use map provides a locus of power and decision-making for centralized consideration of beneficial land use (Kaiser, Godschalk, and Chapin, 1995). Without this power, the development of the municipality would be chaotic and in some instances disadvantageous to individual citizens. Local jurisdictions other than the municipality, as well as individuals and businesses must apply for changes to the comprehensive land use map when new development is proposed. The local municipality must approve changes to the comprehensive land use map to make that request official.

Generally this occurs when development proposals are submitted for site plan or plat approval. In many states, local jurisdictions must go through the application process to obtain such changes. In a way, this application process is an act of subordination of all other jurisdictions to the authority of the governmental body of the municipality, but more importantly the local municipality serves as the central coordinating and authoritative body directing the orderly development of the community.

The land use planning function of the local municipality must take into account the needs of other jurisdictions for physical space in serving their specific clientele. The municipality must also encourage these jurisdictions to collaborate in land use planning so that they may better provide these services to the citizens. Without legal authority to mandate these services, the municipality must work with persuasion and encouragement to move the other jurisdictions that do provide such services to coordinate effective land use. The municipality, therefore, is the agency for not only governmental services and law enforcement on the local level, but also the custodian of systematic and uniform development of the community and in effect, the coordinating unit for all development.

Special Jurisdictions

The governmental structure of the country has permitted the states to create jurisdictions and authorities other than the municipal government with semi-governmental functions. These jurisdictions are usually termed special district governments and are mostly located within the confines of the municipality. There are, however, some locations where these jurisdictions exceed the geographical boundaries of the municipality such as water and sewer service. These special districts are usually single purpose jurisdictions with limited scope of activity. Special districts serve the needs of the citizens

for specific services (Levy, 1997). The governing boards of these special districts can serve the recreation needs of the citizens and provide library services. In some geographic areas even fire protection is available through special districts, rather than through the local municipal government. Commonly, local authorities, which are a modified form of a special district, provide water and sewer services to the community with the power of levying fees for their services independent of the municipality. In many municipalities, however, representatives of the governing body are members of the local authority board. In this manner the municipality has a limited measure of control over the functions of the authority. Thus we see there can be a myriad of jurisdictions outside of the legal purview of the local government providing what we deem today as essential human services to citizens of the locality.

Local School Districts

The local school district is one such jurisdiction that provides a specialized service to the citizens. The state gives the school district the legislative power to set its own policies and regulations to govern the educational enterprise (Alexander and Alexander, 1998). This power stems from the fact that in the constitution of every state there is a provision stipulating that the state government is responsible for providing educational opportunities to children and youth. As a result, in most states the school district is an extension of a state governmental function (Kowalski, 1999). In almost every state the school district is financially independent of the local municipality. This independence means the school district can promulgate policies and regulations for operating the school system and governing employees at the same time raising funds to operate the system. In addition this independence means school boards can levy taxes to finance the operation of

the schools without review from a different jurisdiction. Likewise, school districts have the authority to go into debt to the limit permitted by the state constitution or legislative statutes for purchase of school sites, employment of planning and design professionals, construction of buildings, payment of fees, the purchase of equipment, and debt retirement.

There is only one state in the country where all of the school systems are fiscally dependent upon local governmental control. This is because the state constitution defines the function of the local government as embodying the provision of educational services (Alexander and Alexander, 1998). In the case of Virginia, the school board is part of the local governmental structure and does not have any taxing authority. The school board can promulgate all policies and regulations to govern the school system. It does not have any taxing authority, however, and their budget must be approved and funded by the local governing body. One might think that with such an arrangement, a closer working relationship could be established than where school districts are independent. Such is not necessarily the case. Collaboration in planning and the use of land within the local jurisdiction is only as good as the planners who wish to collaborate because collaboration between the municipality and the school division is not mandated by state legal enactment or constitution requirements. On the contrary, the framers of the constitution in this state insured the separation of local school division governance and planning from the municipality in which it is located. The fiscal dependency of the school district, as stated in the constitution, resulted from the belief in the unity of government on the local level by those in government at the time of the re-writing of the constitution.

Many large city school districts throughout the country are dependent upon local governing boards for operating funds or at least are dependent upon budget approval, and

are unable to levy taxes directly upon citizens. In spite of this dependency, collaborative planning between the school districts and the local government is dependent upon the professional training, individual goodwill, beliefs, and desire for collaborative planning on the part of the planning personnel involved. No state requires or mandates the school district to cooperate with the local government in the orderly development of the community through site selection or any other process in school planning. Again, the constitution and legislative ordinances in every state guarantee the independence of the local school district in all phases of policy and governance from the local government. At the time each state constitution was written, the voters of the state believed that education was a local matter that should be governed by local people. Because of this belief, the independence of the school district was insured in almost every state. This is an important concept to keep in mind when considering cooperation between local jurisdictions.

School Board Authority. Possible challenges and problems in dealing with comprehensive land use and planning for community school sites may be better examined through a brief review of the problems school systems face in obtaining a site for a new school building. In this manner the interface between two jurisdictions can be examined and areas of concern between the school district and the local municipal governing body identified.

There are two concepts of authority that should first of all be discussed and understood because they delineate power and responsibility inherent in local school districts. These concepts have a great deal of influence upon the operating and planning processes and perhaps govern the planning efforts of the school district more than anything else does. The first concept is that of the ability of most local school districts to levy taxes for both operating expenses and for capital expenditures without external review or

approval (Kowalski, 1999). Along with the power of levying taxes is the ability of the school district to enter into debt for the purchase of sites and the construction of school buildings. The taxing authority of the school district places that jurisdiction financially on an equal plane with the local municipality. The school district independently can set the tax levy to cover operating expenses and debt without any approval of another jurisdiction, so long as the school district stays within the constitutional limits of indebtedness. The independent taxing authority of the school district sets it apart from any review process, except for securing zoning approval for a new school site and official changes in the land use map.

In those situations where the school district can set the tax levy directly upon citizens, the school board can not set the tax rate with impunity or with no thought of the consequences of the total city or county tax load upon the citizens. There is extreme competition for the local tax dollar among jurisdictions everywhere, and as a result, all jurisdictions that have taxing authority must consider the effect of their actions upon the citizens. In the absence of any formal agreement as to the total tax load, then there must be at least some sort of an informal agreement among the various governing bodies as to the tax load that the citizens can tolerate and yet provide the services needed or desired.

The second concept that greatly influences planning in the school district is the power of Eminent Domain -- the power to condemn property for school use (Earthman, 2000). Most local special districts have this power, but with this power, the school district can seize and take private property for school buildings. The right of Eminent Domain flows from the state government and as such can not be challenged in a court of jurisprudence. The procedure a school district uses to exercise Eminent Domain may be

challenged because of suspected irregularities or capriciousness in the manner of operation; however, the authority or the power to actually take private property for school use can not be challenged because that would be an attack upon the state government. This power provides the school district with a certain degree of freedom from restraint by other jurisdictions and in effect influences the thinking of school district planners. School districts rarely use the power of Eminent Domain because of the complicated process involved and the negative public relations attached to the taking of private land, but the power to condemn private property is there to be used if and when necessary.

Need for New Schools. The factors that drive the need for a new school building and subsequently a new site are growth and obsolescence (Earthman, 1994). All other reasons and justifications can be subsumed under one of these two reasons. The growth of student populations that exceed the capacity of existing school buildings is perhaps the most frequent reason given to construct a new school building. Although the number of school districts throughout the country that are growing is small compared to the total number of existing districts, nevertheless, growth generates the largest demand for new buildings.

The second factor that generates new buildings is obsolescence of existing buildings. When a building reaches a certain age, decisions need to be made whether or not to renovate it for further service. Evaluation systems are used to help school planners decide whether or not to renovate a building. The obsolescence of a building is determined more by the age and condition of the building systems than by how the structure fits the educational program (Earthman, 1994). Decisions are made based upon whether or not the various service systems of the structure can be up-graded economically. When the decision is made that the building can not be economically renovated for further service,

the solution is usually to construct a new school. Many times in such cases, the new school is re-located on a new site more convenient to the student population served, which requires the acquisition of a parcel of land. Re-location of an existing school does have some ramifications for total community development, as well as community maintenance.

The act of relocating school buildings does present an opportunity to further develop a selected community. This situation could present an advantageous set of circumstances that would lead to additional community services at the same location as the school providing there is sufficient collaborative planning. Situations like these require considerable study by planners from all jurisdictions to ascertain the needs of the specific community and how they can adequately be met. All parties can best do this through collaborative planning efforts. Unless the authorities in the school district reach out to other jurisdictions to involve them in such situations, building the new school might well become an isolated event in the development of the community.

Site Selection Problems. School districts today face many problems over which they have no control in finding an adequate site for a new school building. Over the past thirty years, the number of adequate sites available to school districts has been reduced considerably in most built-up communities. The reason being the total increase in houses, industry, and commercial enterprises, which consume considerable land. In addition, the increased educational program demands of the state, especially in the physical education offerings and interscholastic competition, have forced school districts to seek sites with increased acreage to accommodate the programs. Hand-in-hand with this is the fact that all land has increased in price faster than the resources of the school district have increased, thus pricing some of the better sites beyond the measures of the school district (Earthman,

2000). These problems have forced many school districts to seek alternative solutions to the standard school site. Among the solutions used has been the conversion of existing buildings into schools. Converting warehouses, office buildings, supermarkets, and other loft-type buildings into school buildings has been a very satisfactory solution to some difficult housing questions. Another practical solution has been the use of property already owned by the city or county government, parks department, or recreation department. These are just partial solutions to the ever-increasing problem of finding adequate sites for new schools.

Municipal Review of School Sites. School systems, like all local jurisdictions, must submit a request to the local municipality for a change in the official land use map, as well as for appropriate zoning changes, when securing a site for a school building. Securing that approval in effect gives the local government an opportunity to at least comment and pass upon the selection of the particular site. Comments and recommendations can also be made regarding the appropriateness of that site for the geographic area in terms of services available to the citizens as well as the overall development of the area.

There are other times when the officials of the municipality can have review and input capability over the selection of a site for a school building. One of these points in time is at the time of adoption of the capital improvement program of the school district by the school board. Another time for review is at the adoption of the capital improvement budget, which is a time separate from the capital improvement program considerations. Approval of the capital improvement budget is an annual event and review of this document by local governmental planners occurs at this time. Both of these points in time can permit both the school district and municipal planners to examine the impact a specific

parcel of land may have upon the general surrounding area if it is used for a school building and to plan collaboratively for further site development.

At the schematic design stage, various municipal departments can require a more thorough review of the project. In most large cities, the art commission or some other appropriate agency can and does have a mandated review and approval process for every school that is constructed or renovated. This review includes only the aesthetics of design of the building and not the location of the site or the eventual use and development of the site. Nevertheless, severe review and critical examination of the projected building by such agencies or commissions can delay a project until such time as the political process can resolve any question of appropriateness of the project.

Unfortunately, not every locality observes the protocol of prior review and comment by municipal planners on the capital improvement plan and budget of the school system. These localities are for the most part in the less populated areas of the country. Yet, they are the localities probably most in need for such cooperative review and comment because of the need for other public services in the neighborhood at the school site. Efforts can be generated to multiply the services at a new school site if there is sufficient knowledge and commitment on the part of other jurisdictions. For instance, recreational services and facilities and often used governmental offices could be located near or on the school site to provide for more of a sense of community for the citizens if these agencies are informed and involved in deciding the location of a new school.

DIFFICULTIES IN COLLABORATIVE PLANNING

There are many difficulties that must be overcome in order to effectively plan in a collaborative manner. Some of these difficulties center on the organizational structure of

the various jurisdictions and are technical in nature. There are difficulties that are associated with processes in working with community members. Although there may be significant technical and social difficulties associated with collaborative land use and school planning, the most pervasive difficulty, however, lies in the political realm. The political arena governs what individuals and organizations believe and what they are willing to support or oppose. Because of what individuals and organizations believe, they act upon those beliefs in many different ways.

Technical Difficulties. Some technical difficulties center on how the jurisdictions are constituted, how they operate, and the customs and culture to which they adhere. Some of the difficulties listed below may seem rather superficial, but all are difficulties that people and organizations use to prevent, alter, or hinder collaborative planning efforts.

Budget Cycles Differ. Differences do exist between various governmental agencies in budget cycles and budget adoption schedules. As a result, appropriations for a collaborative project with another jurisdiction must be made long in advance of the annual appropriation of funds. Collaborative planning for uses of land among jurisdictions requires longer planning cycles than normal in order to have funds available when needed. This means that in most cases, governing bodies must budget funds 3-7 years in advance of actual need of funds for a project that involves other jurisdictions. The difficulties here are the provisions for carry-over funds when appropriate and for raising capital funds far in advance of need. Such efforts to raise funds could pose a severe public relations problem for some jurisdictions. Some statutory restraints also may operate here restraining the ability of cooperative funding.

Fiscal Dependency. The inability of some governmental jurisdictions to raise capital funds independently of other jurisdictions can also hinder some collaborative efforts. Some jurisdictions must rely upon another governing body to supply capital funds for every project. This is especially true for many recreation programs or districts. This dependency means decisions are made by someone else rather than the jurisdiction itself. This places an added burden on the planners to justify to another jurisdiction an intended project.

Plethora of Jurisdictions. In some states there is a plethora of jurisdictions that have taxing power and yet are answerable only to the voters. This happens to be the case in most Midwest and western states where the school district can tax independently of any other jurisdiction and the school districts are organized on a township basis. When there are several jurisdictions with the same authority in a county, there is a certain independence that militates against collaboration on the part of planners and governing bodies.

Different Planning Models. Differences in planning models as well as in types of data used in planning and in the nomenclature used for planning can also cause some confusion. In most instances, school districts have developed an indigenous planning model that involves large numbers of parents. The most obvious example of differences in data collection is the data on children and the educational program that the school district has, but does not have any data on the overall development of the community. The nomenclature for the planning process itself is an excellent example of differences in how planning is accomplished and what is planned. Even the descriptions of planning are quite different between jurisdictions.

Lack of Coordination. There is a lack of a coordinating power between jurisdictions. No governmental agency actually serves or acts as a mandated coordinating body when there are several independent jurisdictions. Even the local governing body does not, in so many cases, have the power to mandate collaboration by other jurisdictions on any project.

Multiple School Districts. In some states there is a multitude of school jurisdictions that overlap because they serve different age populations. Illinois and California are two prime examples of where one set of school districts serve upper grade students while separate school districts operate schools for younger students, all within the same geographical area. This duality of operation is very common in those two states where the union high school district covers several school jurisdictions that serve only elementary school students. Obviously, this kind of separation of educational effort causes concern for proper program articulation between units. Likewise, the planning efforts of the high school unit must to some degree coincide with the planning efforts of the various elementary units they serve, as well as the municipality. The placement of any school building regardless of which jurisdiction does it impacts the transportation efforts of other jurisdictions in many cases. More importantly, such action in some fashion impacts the comprehensive land use policies of the local government.

Lack of Planning Impetus. There is a weak impetus for collaborative planning for comprehensive consideration on land use. There are few organizational incentives for collaborative planning, except for the intrinsic worth of such planning or the desire for the beneficial overall development of the community.

Social Difficulties. Difficulties in the arena of social concerns probably have more to do with how citizens perceive and participate in the planning efforts of the jurisdictions than any major social change.

Lack of Control. Sometimes the feeling on the part of segments of the citizens that someone else is planning for them results in the perception that there is a lack of control over the destiny of their community. This is many times compounded by the limited participation of users of services or individuals in the community that are effected by the planning. In some instances there may be a feeling of distance between the citizens and the particular organization or government agency. There can also be the feeling that "we," meaning the most immediate stakeholders, can do the brainstorming and subsequent planning better than those trained to plan because "we" know what is needed. There might even be some distrust of those individuals charged with doing the planning as a result of previous negative experiences of governmental officials telling the citizens what to do.

Limited Knowledge Level. The level of knowledge of various segments of the general citizenry is often times significantly different from other groups. That fact many times hinders effective planning and participation by citizens who do not necessarily understand the process of planning. This is especially true in urban and other areas where a great number of recent immigrants are located.

Individual Inertia. The inertia of certain individuals for involvement in the community many times is a factor that prevents participation. The effort needed by a person to go to an evening meeting at the local school to discuss developments in the community is many times not sufficiently present or strong enough to actually attend the

meeting. There is also some reticence on the part of some citizens to join in planning efforts because historically they have been excluded.

Political Difficulties. Political processes seem to govern so much of what individuals and organizations will support and not support, and eventually how they will act. Political agenda exist in every area of the community, with every organization, and even with every individual. These agenda drive the decisions of the community (Cullingworth, 1993). Although there may be some overlap in the below listed political difficulties, they are put forth as a reminder of the minute nature of the agenda that some persons have regarding the development of the community and the resultant challenges for planners.

Purpose and Mission. Differences in purpose and organizational mission of the various governmental jurisdictions can be a barrier to collaboration. It is obvious that the school district is a very focused organization with a narrow mission. The school district can efficiently discharge its responsibility with little or no input into the overall development of the community. Some educators reason that the overall development of the community is not the direct responsibility of the school district and that resources are not available outside of the needs of the educational program to promote such development. The recreation district governing board can say the same thing, as can other jurisdictions with justifiable basis. Yet, the larger question is how much better would the community be if all jurisdictions collaborated effectively.

Community Power Structure. The power structure in the community must be placated in almost all decisions, especially those regarding the use of land. This is an especially sensitive area of concern for the school district. Every site the school board selects for acquisition must in some fashion, pass political muster before it can be used for

school purposes (Cullingworth, 1993). The same can be said for sites used for recreation or library services. The political muster does not imply any formal review, but rather the informal conversations between members of the community power structure. The local power structure is probably more influential on site decisions than most individuals know about or want to believe. In some instances, the power structure can so hinder the efforts of the school board and school planners to obtain a site that collaboration with the local municipality is greatly compromised.

Single Purpose Jurisdictions. Schools have a single purpose to serve the education needs of children and youth of the community. Other jurisdictions serve the same clientele, but for different purposes. For example, the Library Board promotes informal reading and learning; the Recreation Department serves the children and youth of the community in after-school and weekend play and other activities. All of these jurisdictions can work independently from other jurisdictions. This independence can be especially keen when a jurisdiction needs a site for a new building and works to obtain it without any collaboration.

Resource Competition. Competition exists for valuable community resources and the eventual allocation of funds. This item relates to the power structure of the community. There are many individuals who believe they have the correct answer for how the community should develop. This competition relates to how the power structure or individuals in the power structure believes a community could or should develop and how public funds should be utilized.

Constitutional and Legal Relationships Determine Collaboration. The constitutional and/or legal relationship between various local jurisdictions and the power

they possess often times determines the degree of collaboration in planning and whether or not comprehensive planning takes place. Although there is never any prohibition for one jurisdiction to collaborate with another, the power of some jurisdictions gives the incumbents in that organization a feeling they are independent of any process other than what their organization is involved. In other words, they may feel the planning process of other jurisdictions does not impact upon their organization.

Personal Political Motivation. The personal political motivation on the part of some officials to become elected or re-elected can present problems to planners. Sometimes the personal motivation of an individual can be such that successful collaboration is either not possible or possible only through severe compromise. In some instances personal motivation is the most important consideration in securing collaboration in planning. Regardless of the level of the public office, some politicians can look at situations only in how the result will impact upon their possible election.

COMPREHENSIVE LAND USE AND SCHOOL PLANNING INTEGRATION

Planning for a new school does impact upon the use of land in the community. Every time a school is planned and constructed, the comprehensive nature of the use of land is in some fashion impacted or influenced. To insure that the decisions made for a school building benefit the community to a maximum degree, the planning process must be structured to address the comprehensive nature of community development. The question then must certainly be raised in these instances as to how the entire community can assist and be party to the decisions that go into the planning of and locating a school building. The technical, social, and political difficulties enumerated above sometimes serves to overwhelm planning efforts of the appropriate officials in local jurisdictions.

Planning Interface. In spite of the fact that there are many actual and perceived conditions that may hinder collaboration by and between various local jurisdictions in developing the community, there are many areas where special collaborative efforts do exist. On the other hand, there are many instances where the school district either marginally collaborates with other jurisdictions, or perhaps does not even make much of an effort to collaborate. Local jurisdictions in many localities do not attempt to overcome the difficulties mentioned above simply because of the independence and single purpose nature of the school district.

Schools obviously must be placed where the students are located regardless of other circumstances. This is the prime consideration when the school board selects a site for a new school. This consideration does not necessarily run counter to appropriate land use for the betterment of the entire community. The opportunity, however, to plan in a comprehensive nature beyond the needs for a school building are very good and can result in a larger solution for community development.

The end results of integrated comprehensive land use are better, of course, but the process of achieving results is often times slower. Better use of community resources, however, result when a more comprehensive approach to land use is made. There is also less duplication of effort and more efficient use of resources when a collaborative approach to land use is effected.

Collaborative comprehensive planning simply means the planning cycle for all projects must be lengthened to accommodate the greater number of organizations and individuals so as to meet the planning deadlines such as when a school building is finished and ready for occupancy or for some externally mandated planning deadline. All jurisdictions must set realistic planning calendars to meet individual mandatory deadlines.

Devolution of Decision-making. There are some mitigating circumstances that may prolong the planning process, yet in the process produce a better product. The process of devolution of decision-making to the lowest denominator has had an impact on comprehensive planning and especially planning that involves use of land. Devolution of power is the process of moving the decision-making power from central authority into the hands of the appropriate stakeholders on the local level (Montgomery and Thornley, 1990). Devolution has been prominently associated with the educational enterprise, but not to the exclusion of other jurisdictions. Presently all local levels of government seek to move the decision-making powers to the lowest responsible level of action and to involve all interested stakeholders. Nevertheless, all governmental levels have felt the impact of decision-making devolution upon their practices and proceedings.

The public schools over the past decade have promoted the idea of moving the thrust of power to the lowest level of the school system as part of several reform programs and movements (Sarason, 1997). This level of devolution usually was defined as the local school building level. As a result, considerable interest and activity was spent in moving the decision-making power to that level of school administration. The site-based councils of the local school building so prevalent throughout the school districts of the county are a case in point, as is the textbook adoption processes schools now use.

Devolution and re-distribution of power to the lowest level of decision-making does not in any manner diminish or change the nature of the planning process, it simply elongates the process because of the large numbers of participants in the planning process (Levy, 1997). Thus, planners need to recognize the lengthening of the planning process

and allow for this time period. The work to achieve consensus of all constituents also requires more subtlety and effort under a re-distribution of power.

EXAMPLES OF POSITIVE COLLABORATIVE PLANNING

With all of the opportunities and difficulties of collaboration on land use and school facility planning evident, there are many examples of successful collaborative planning. Each locality through the individual mores, traditions, legal constraints, cultural backgrounds, political agenda, and beliefs has fashioned a method and vehicle of collaboration on the overall question of how the community will develop and use the available land. In many communities collaboration is either meager or non-existent because of the above factors. There are other cased where collaborative planning is working very effectively for the benefit of good community development. The three examples cited below are different in nature, but all possess the elements of successful collaborative planning for comprehensive land use.

Three communities have been selected for presentation because they represent different methods of collaboration, yet at the same time, there is a great deal of commonality between the three diverse communities. The school district of Clark County, Nevada has taken a leadership role in collaboration and now serves as the central agency in obtaining collaboration between five different jurisdictions. This leadership role is unique for most communities, but the pervasive nature of the service of the school district and the rapid growth of the county has required the school district to take this role.

Montgomery County, Maryland is a good example of collaboration between the county government and the school district. This collaboration also includes other jurisdictions such as recreation, library services, and local governmental services. The

county government has taken the leadership role in this collaborative effort. This effort is very comprehensive in that the entire county needs are projected and accommodated before actual need is demonstrated by population growth.

The third example is in a highly developed urban area and is an example of collaboration for re-development of the inner city. The Philadelphia Public Schools and the Redevelopment Authority of the city government are the two principal players in this effort. This locality is a good example of both jurisdictions trying to plan for comprehensive development of an area that had previously deteriorated.

Clark County School District, Nevada.

Clark County School District has a population of 216,000 students for the 1999-2000 school year. The student population is projected to grow to 347,544 students in the fall of 2008. They are housed in over 300 buildings throughout the county. The school board governs the educational program for all students for the entire county. There are five separate governmental entities (City of Las Vegas, Henderson, North Las Vegas, Boulder City, and the unincorporated areas of Clark County) with which the Clark County School District staff must interface and cooperate. In addition the school district must deal with other authorities such as: water/sewer, regional flood control, electrical power, and gas. This is in addition to the interface with the Nevada State Highway Department to furnish roads to new school sites and to several federal agencies for site locations. In this respect, the school district becomes the fulcrum for a more comprehensive planning process and perhaps a more thorough development of the county through intelligent land use. At the same time, however, each municipality maintains the comprehensive land use map for the jurisdiction and makes decisions regarding land use (Scheideman, 1999).

Sub-development Plan Review. When a land developer presents a sub-division plan for housing to any of the five governmental entities, the plans are first of all sent to the school district for review. The school district assesses the needs of the projected sub-development in terms of the number and types of school buildings that will be needed by this area based upon their estimate of the number of students that will eventually be there. The school district then informs the specific governmental unit what they need to adequately plan for a new school. This request could be in the form of a school site donation, imposition of impact fees paid by the developer, or any other stipulation that would help the school district to adequately house a new student population. The local government then sets that requirement as a condition for approval of the plan. This type of cooperation is essential to provide the school buildings needed for a successful sub-division development. Without this kind of cooperation, the school district would be disadvantaged in providing school buildings. Of equal importance is the inconvenience the developer would have if school buildings were not available within or nearby the development. Of course the specific municipal governing board would also feel the wrath of parents if sufficient educational opportunities were not afforded their children in like manner as the rest of the county.

Even though this kind of cooperative review is not mandated by any legal provision in Clark County, the officials and planners of each jurisdiction deem it necessary for the smooth development of the county. Along with this kind of preliminary review of school needs and the appropriate remedy, the school district reviews all possible sites for new schools with the various jurisdiction planners. This review is not a request for permission to acquire the site, but rather a review that will permit new data from the municipality to be

incorporated into the decision-making process of the school district. The municipality might supply data such as the availability of utilities, public transportation, and any possible restrictions of surrounding areas. This review must take place with the planners of the particular jurisdiction in which the school will be located, but a review must also take place with state agencies such as the highway department to determine road needs. In addition, a review takes place with the United States Bureau of Land Management (BLM) to determine possible sites under their control (Scheideman, 1999).

For some sites the school district has access to BLM lands. If conditions are such that the land is not needed by the BLM for specific purposes, the school district is able to procure sites for schools from this federal agency. The assistance of BLM planners has enabled the school district to have access to sites at a very reasonable cost.

All of these reviews must take place with every school site that will be acquired by the county school board. These reviews are in addition to the internal reviews of the school site planners of the school district. As a result, the time frame for identifying, selecting, and acquiring a site is elongated to include external reviews.

Student Population Projections. The school district also needs to have a good sense of where students will be located in the future because they must bring utilities to sites two years in advance of the developers. It also makes the review of housing developments by the school district staff of vital importance. This permits the school district to stay abreast of school building needs and prevents a situation where there are students, but no school building to house them.

In the past, the school district has been successful in predicting the student populations far out for schools in spite of the fact of the very rapid growth of the county.

The success can be attributed to the use of an indigenous system of predicting school enrollments. The school district uses a modified cohort survival ratio. The cohort survival methodology is tied closely into an indigenous geo-referenced system of tracking the housing of the various communities (Scheideman, 1999). The geo-reference system is based upon the countywide United States Government Information System that provides data on housing location. The school district has student data on all of the residences that are presently in existence. School officials use these data to project the number of students for new housing development plans.

Zoning plays an important part in the planning for new schools. Each of the five governmental units in Clark County has a similar zoning code. This makes it easier for the school district to work with the municipalities in selecting and approving sites.

The school district has a real estate office whose responsibility is to procure sites, process zoning changes, and secure other permits. This office is staffed with sufficient personnel to maintain an active site acquisition program to accommodate the rapid growth of the school population in the county.

The school district has many inter-local governmental agreements for joint site use so those school sites can be used as parks or part of the state university system. Collaboration with local jurisdictions, as well as the state, has paid handsomely in that several community services are usually available on one site in a specific geographical area. It also has reduced the duplicative cost of multiple sites for these separate services.

Clark County is an example of where the school district has taken the lead to effect collaborative planning across five different jurisdictions. The pervasive need for schools to be placed equitably throughout the county regardless of jurisdictional boundary makes

the school district the major player in this area. The school district, rather than the local government, has provided the leadership for comprehensive planning. This is a different relationship than that existing in most localities. At the same time the school district staff must interface with the comprehensive planning effort of each jurisdiction to assist in its implementation.

Montgomery County School District, Maryland. Montgomery County is a suburb community to Washington, DC and yet has a population almost equal to that of the City. The current school enrollment is approximately 127,000 students. The county student population is expected to grow to approximately 136,315 students in 2004. Approximately 23.5 percent of the total student population participate in the free and reduced lunch program, whereas in 1990, approximately 15.2 percent of the student population participated in that program (Crispell, 1999).

The county experienced very rapid growth in the 1970's and beginning 1980's with a subsequent drop in population from the mid-decade to the beginning of 1990. In the latter part of the 1970-decade, the school population of the county exceeded 120,000 students. That figure dropped to 90,000 students during the late 1980's. As a result, the school district has been faced with trying to keep up with growth of the school population at one time followed by a precipitous decline in students. Administrators were faced with the prospect of closing school buildings to properly house the students. After this excruciating exercise, the school district is now faced with another growth spurt. Most of these changes have resulted from influences outside the county, especially the growth of the federal government and related industries. Over the past thirty years, the county has

experienced a period of rapid growth, followed by severe decline in students, followed by another rapid increase (Montgomery County Public Schools, 1999).

Cooperative Planning. The school district and local government has had a long history of cooperation for beneficial county development. This arrangement has served the county very well in managing severe growth and decline of the county population. The relationship between the school board and the Board of Commissioners is a little different than in most states. Although the school board has the authority to set the tax rate for their budget, the Board of Commissioners does have review privileges. This does place the school board in somewhat of a subordinate role to the Board of Commissioners and at the same time fosters a cooperative atmosphere. There is also encouragement for collaboration with all jurisdictions on the part of the state government through legislation. Through one of its agencies, the State of Maryland provides a great deal of encouragement for master planning on a county-wide basis. The Public School Construction Program of the State of Maryland does much to encourage local school districts to work collaboratively with the Board of County Commissioners to plan for the future. The Public School Construction Program, as its name implies, funds school building projects on a local level. Through the review process, authorities in the PSCP are able to influence the process by which decisions are made on a county basis. As one of the criteria for funding projects, the PSCP requires some evidence of collaborative planning with the local government and other jurisdictions for community development. The possibility of funding school projects is a good incentive for collaboration between all local jurisdictions.

Sub-development Control. Montgomery County, like many local jurisdictions, has enacted ordinances that require housing developers to either dedicate land or funds for

schools, as well as other municipal services, in every plan submitted for approval (Crispell, 1999). This form of land banking helps the school district and local government secure sites for schools and other services and at the same time helps the developer sell houses because public services such as schools are available to the residents of the development.

An additional approach to controlling sub-development growth is taken through the Adequate Public Facilities Ordinances of the local government (Strein, 2000). Local governmental jurisdictions in Maryland may pass ordinances designed to control growth when public facilities are reaching a point of overcrowding. This is done by the school district notifying the local government when certain school buildings either are overcrowded or becoming so. Overcrowding is determined through the Annual Growth Policy completed by the school staff, which is an enumeration of the capacity of each school building compared to the projected student population for the present and future. This comparison permits the school district staff to highlight the geographical areas where there is growth and possible overcrowding of schools. Following review of this comparison, the school district certifies that the buildings in an area under consideration by developers can not accommodate any more students and that all available space in the building is being properly used. Based upon this certification, the Board of Commissioners notifies potential developers that their submitted plans will be either not approved or if approved each building permit will be passed upon individually as it comes forward. In other words, the development plan may be approved, but the developer will have to submit each building permit for approval. This process in essence controls all substantive planning and construction by the developer until the school district can

accommodate more students in this specific area by either building new structures or redistricting for more space (Strein, 2000).

Although this state Act does control rapid growth and enables the school district sufficient time to plan and construct a new building, there are some obvious points of challenge to it. The County Board of Commissioners obviously is reluctant to take the developer's rights of using land in an appropriate manner away, but at the same time is reluctant to be party to a situation where the schools may easily become overcrowd. Since this situation prevents developers from proceeding with planning and construction, this delay undoubtedly causes them considerable financial damage. The only recourse is to turn to political solutions in an attempt to move the appropriate governmental unit to provide funds for construction of new schools. There also can be in certain circumstances some unwanted political pressure brought to bear upon the situation, if the developer has sufficient political power.

Staff Liaison. The school district maintains close staff liaison with the county government. This takes considerable time and effort on the part of the school district staff to attend meetings of the local government and other jurisdictions. The benefits to this liaison, however, are very obvious in that Montgomery County does have an excellent school system whose students are housed in safe, modern school buildings.

For the past three decades growth of the county has developed along the main north/south arterial highway, Interstate 270. This highway extends from the highly populated Washington, DC boundary northward to the rural areas of the county above Gaithersburg and Damascus. Both commercial and industrial firms located within easy

reach of this transportation artery. Major housing developments of all sorts followed suit and the population of the county spread to the north, often in leapfrog fashion.

With this type of growth, the county government had to look within to address this phenomenon forthrightly by staking out claims for land for public services. This action meant a large outlay of public funds to purchase sites for schools, firehouses, libraries, hospitals, and other infrastructure systems. Through a large bond referendum, the county and school district raised the funds to purchase the needed sites long before development reached the area. In addition, these landbanked sites spurred growth in population because of the possibilities that public services might be available when the housing was available.

This far-reaching effort paid large dividends in the long run because the county could afford to purchase the land that was needed and at the right location. When housing development started in this area, developers were required to pay fees in lieu of donating land within the development. Although the fees did not cover entirely the cost of all sites, nevertheless, the fees did pay down much of the initial costs. The long-term benefit to all of the jurisdictions in the county was that services could be concentrated in an effective and complementary manner. In addition, the services could be offered in well-designed facilities and not in makeshift buildings.

Today the cooperative planning for the county still exists, but the land-banking efforts of the past are not in place mainly because of the diffuse development of commercial enterprises and subsequent housing sub-divisions. There are still pockets of strong housing development scattered throughout the county. These are not contiguous enough to form a set pattern of growth. The economic growth of the county in the form of new or relocated businesses has dispersed because of satisfactory alternative routes of

transportation besides Interstate Highway 270. The growth of the county still reflects the outward growth of previous decades, but not in a contiguous fashion as before. The scare of rapid growth in the county several decades previous and the intelligent reaction of the officials of both the local government and the school district has provided Montgomery County with an effective and efficient model of cooperative planning on a comprehensive scale.

Montgomery County is a good example of a close planning relationship between the county government and the school district to develop the county in an orderly manner. The planners in these two jurisdictions identified the infrastructure needs for the future in a growth area long before the actual need was there. Of equal importance, both jurisdictions took the steps to implement a rational plan to preserve adequate sites at propitious locations for needed governmental purposes.

Philadelphia School District, Pennsylvania. The School District has a student population of approximately 215,000 students situated in almost 300 buildings. In the early 1970's the school district enrolled over 245,000 students. The drop in enrollments has stabilized over the past decade. During the height of the enrollment peak, the school district had a capital improvement program of some 140 projects of all sorts from new buildings to additions and renovations. The program consisted of 10 new high schools, 20 new middle schools, and 40 new elementary schools. The enrollments started to drop off in 1972 to such an extent that most of the projects were eliminated from the program. There were several major projects completed under the capital program. On the secondary level, three new high schools for 3000 students each and four new middle schools for 1500 students were constructed on new sites (School District of Philadelphia, 1973).

All of the problems of selecting a site mentioned earlier in this chapter also exist in Philadelphia. Because of the highly dense population, the problems are more acute and seem almost monumental. The number of parcels of land available for school buildings have long since the end of World War II become extinct. Only in the far northeastern part of the city was any land available, even though the price was many times out of reach for the school district.

School Building Alternatives. The school district has been successful in converting existing structures to use as school buildings. The Ludlow Middle School is housed in a former six-story warehouse in North Philadelphia. The conversion of this structure was done in a relatively shorter period of time than construction of a new building, even if a site had been available. This was just one example of using alternatives to house students in modern school facilities rather than constructing new buildings. One of the most unique alternatives for housing students came from a municipal planner not connected to the school district. The planner suggested the school district use available space in various governmental, cultural, and commercial buildings to house approximately 500 high school students rather than try to build a new high school in the core area of the city (Gauchet, 2000). This suggestion resulted in the famous Philadelphia Parkway School, where the high school had only a headquarters building for administrative purposes and the instructional program was carried on in a host of locations in the Center City. Buildings like the Franklin Institute, Philadelphia Art Museum, district court, Free Library, and even the Insurance Company of North America building all contained space in which classes were held. The present organization of the Parkway School continues to use some of these

resources for instruction, but to a considerable lesser degree than at the beginning of the program.

Redevelopment Authority. The City established a Redevelopment Authority shortly after the war and it continues to operate effectively in the present. In establishing the authority, the geographical boundaries of its jurisdiction were set. The core area of the city was the responsibility of the Authority, but this entailed the major part of the city. Many new schools were placed on sites within the geographic purview of the Authority.

Because of its charter, the Redevelopment Authority became a partner with the School District in locating and developing sites for new school buildings. The school district provided a full-time staff liaison with the Authority staff. In this manner, there was constant communication between the school district and the Authority. In addition, the Authority staff was briefed before any changes in the capital improvement program were put forward. As a result, the school district had input from the Authority before any legal approval was made. The Authority staff could many times suggest alternatives for locating a school building based upon their knowledge of the needs of the school district. In this manner there was a give and take between the planners of these two jurisdictions to arrive at plausible solutions to land use issues.

Land Acquisition. In its usual operation, the Redevelopment Authority through various means and from different sources acquires land throughout the city. When such acquisitions occurred the Authority reviewed possible uses for the parcel. In these circumstances, Authority staff would often times alert school district staff of available land. The school district would then have first option for acquiring the land. In such instances, placing a school on some of these sites helped in the overall redevelopment of

the community and assisted the city planners in restoring development to that part of the municipality (Gauchet, 2000).

The Redevelopment Authority had to approve the use of every parcel of land for school purposes and even the services to be placed upon the site. Nevertheless, the input of the Authority before hand and during the planning stage of the site assured approval at the appropriate time. At the same time, the school district benefited from the discussions of alternatives for housing students. This symbiosis was beneficial to both parties.

Collaborative Interface. The kind of collaborative planning exhibited in Philadelphia was as even-handed as possible given the legal constraints of both parties and the legal mandate of the Redevelopment Authority. By that is meant that the Redevelopment Authority had the power to approve or not approve use of land under its authority and could deny use for a school building on these lands. At the same time, the school district had to get approval of the use of any land under the purview of the Authority. Even with these parameters, both the Authority staff and the School District staff had a common purpose and that was the beneficial development of the area under consideration and the provision of modern physical facilities for the students living there.

The weekly conferences between the staff members of the Authority and School District did much to solidify relationships and routinized the work of the members. The interface between the two staffs was not an occasional happening, but a common occurrence. This kind of frequent interface does much to create knowledge, trust, concern, and common purpose, which are the bases of an effective organization.

COLLABORATION MODELS

Three models of collaboration have been presented in this chapter each serving in a particular geographic area; two are found in rapidly growing areas and one in a densely settled area. The models have been judged as being effective by various individuals working in the school districts because they believe there has been beneficial development of the community and proper placement of needed schools and other municipal services. Some models may be more comprehensive than others may, but the effectiveness with all models is the same. In the Clark County model, the school district staff has taken the lead and serves as the main coordinating force for five other jurisdictions. This is because the school district is the largest geographic jurisdiction and has interests in serving students in all of the other jurisdictions. In the Montgomery County model, the local governmental agency was the driving force and the lead jurisdiction. In this county, the municipal planners saw the need for aggressive location and purchase of sites for necessary governmental and educational services for areas in advance of actual development. By taking this stance, the jurisdictions were able to secure propitious and strategic sites at a cost the county and school district could afford.

In the case of a highly populated jurisdiction, the City of Philadelphia and the School District collaborated through the Redevelopment Authority of Philadelphia, which was a legal creation of the city. Although the collaboration was legally determined and defined, through the constant and varied interaction of the members of both staffs, an

almost equal and beneficial collaboration was achieved. The lead organization in this collaboration was the Redevelopment Authority.

What might be learned from these three examples is that collaboration can take a variety of structures and forms, but the common thread that runs through each is the work and attitude of the staff members involved in collaboration. In the absence of any legal mandate and structure to collaborate, such as Clark County, collaboration will occur only if the planners or those in authority will take steps to begin the process of finding out how collaboration can take place. In Montgomery County and more so in Philadelphia, the municipal government took the initiative to formalize collaboration and insured its continuation.

Collaboration is best initiated and maintained on a local level. Mandating collaboration on a statewide level could be legally done, but the consequences of this could well be that of applying another level of approvals on the school district. The keeper of the zoning power is lodged in the municipal government where review and approvals are made. It would be logical for that jurisdiction to think that legislation from the state governmental level requiring collaboration with other local jurisdictions might give them the power to force the school district and other local jurisdictions to come to them for review and approval of any and all projects. If this did happen, the collaboration might be perceived as more coercion than cooperation by the school district and other jurisdictions.

In the models cited above the actors in the collaborative effort were for the most part planners from each participating jurisdiction. The participants of a collaborative effort must be the persons who can and do represent the legal governing bodies of the jurisdictions. This has to be the first level of continual participation in order to formalize

the work of the collaborative vehicle. At the same time, there may be individuals other than the planners involved in the deliberations of the collaborative vehicle.

Lay Participation. There is always the question of participation by the ultimate stakeholders in the deliberations of the collaborative. The models cited above did not include parents and community members not associated with any of the governmental functions of the jurisdictions. Whether parents and community members are included in the deliberations of the collaboration is a matter for the local authorities to decide. The devolution of decision-making has brought about the inclusion of laypersons of all sorts in the planning process as stakeholders of all jurisdictions.

Laypersons are normally involved in the review process of each jurisdiction through public forums concerning the capital improvement program and the capital improvement budget approval sessions, as well as site selection and architectural design reviews meetings. These review sessions permit the community to have input into the programs, budgets, site plans, and design work through the planners and architects. In addition, these sessions provide the community with knowledge they can use to affect the political process leading to any and all document approvals. These are the time proven methods of participation by laypersons. The question arises, however, whether community members could or should be involved in the work of the planners in developing a plan. Much depends upon the method of collaboration that is developed in the locality. If there are no legal constraints imbedded in the collaborative effort, lay participation can be effected very easily. The number of participants, however, need to be limited to representatives of the particular neighborhood or community effected because large numbers of individuals involved in a planning session changes the nature of the effort from

a work session to a public meeting and the dynamics of the work are changed. If the number of participating lay representatives is limited, then the question emerges of how many will be involved and who will be the representatives. If lay participants are involved in the work sessions of the planners, the authorities must decide the possible benefit that will be derived from such participation given the potential concerns inherent in the scheme (Earthman, 1976).

Effective participation can result just as well from open meetings of interested individuals to review the proposed plans that resulted from collaborative work sessions of planners. Through such measures, a larger number of individuals can be reached and at the same time individual input can be received and incorporated into a revision of the plan. In this manner, all individuals who are concerned with the project can see and hear what has developed and can provide their thoughts and feelings about the final outcome. While in-depth involvement is sacrificed, the spread of information to the community and a larger number of participants can result.

Collaborative Consortium. The interface needed for collaborative efforts can be accomplished easily enough in the present legal relationship between the local government unit and other jurisdictions by forming an informal consortium of planners dedicated to a systematic approach to comprehensive community development. There might be some impediment to voluntary collaboration because of past feelings on the part of some officials of the various governing bodies, but this can be overcome through successive efforts of the part of the planners themselves. A consortium can take many forms and include a variety of individuals and governmental representatives to affect the necessary collaboration for comprehensive land use. Planners and representatives from all local

jurisdictions should be involved in the deliberations of the consortium. The main work of the consortium would be to review the capital needs and initiatives of all jurisdictions to identify locations for and methods of collaboration for these needs and initiatives. Thus, consortium members would review the capital improvement program for the municipal government, the school district, recreation district, and any other jurisdiction with the idea of finding ways to collaborate on a project. Developing collaborative initiatives might at first be difficult, but working together continuously for the greater development of the area would lend itself to some substantial ideas and programs. The continuous nature of the consortium is of great importance for the growth of the collaborative vehicle. Collaboration then becomes continuous interaction and not a happenstance. Collaboration becomes important to the orderly development of the community and not a rare occurrence to initiate when someone thinks it necessary.

All of the collaborative examples cited in this chapter meet the test of a consortium even though each is different. There is no one form or structure for a consortium, each locality must formulate, organize, and administer it to suite local needs. This is the manner in which collaboration can work effectively in as much as collaboration can not be imposed or forced from above.

SUMMARY

Collaboration by local governmental agencies in comprehensive land use development presents many challenges. These challenges can be interpreted as both problems and opportunities. This double interpretation is enacted every day in almost every locality. When collaboration is desired because an opportunity that will benefit the

community through land use presents itself, then the local planners must deal with the difficulties inherent in the process.

The difficulties these agencies experience in bringing about collaboration are very real to local planners. There are some rather specific technical difficulties around which planers must maneuver and work to achieve collaboration. These difficulties center around either the manner in which the agencies are constituted, the limitation of authority the agency has, or the practices incumbents in the agencies have established.

In addition to technical difficulties and perhaps overlying the technical difficulties is the political agenda of various power sources. Political difficulties and problems stem from the beliefs various individuals or groups hold about how the community should develop and land should be used. These beliefs extend along the range from the most conservative to the most liberal philosophical bases. Often times these beliefs stem from the very personal base of either profit or tenure in office. Nevertheless, planners must deal with political beliefs promulgated by individuals and groups in every jurisdiction. Local planners are usually not involved in the power structure of the community and as a result they can very seldom bring political pressure to bear upon a decision. Local planners, in presenting a project, must rely upon the logic of their position and the beneficial nature of the collaborative effort they are supporting.

Local planners also must work to overcome social difficulties such as lack of participation in decision-making, community inertia regarding planning efforts, and in some cases lack of trust of the planners. Planners have done an excellent job of involving community persons in any number of collaborative planning activities. The devolution of decision-making in the public schools has assisted school authorities in bringing the

decision-making activity to the stakeholders of the community. Likewise, other local planners have been active in promoting local decision-making, which helps overcome participation reticence by individuals in the community.

All difficulties and barriers can be overcome in some fashion to effect collaborative planning for comprehensive land use and school planning. Local planners must use the strategies and devices at their disposal to bring it about. Because there is no legal or constitutional mandate to require collaboration, effective collaboration must come as a result of the actions of individual planners or groups of planners. This state of affairs may be discouraging to those individuals who desire collaboration on all matters, but there are some sound reasons that mandated collaboration is not the answer to a planner's dream. Legal or constitutional mandates to require collaboration can in effect result in perfunctory collaboration and in some cases a matter of one agency serving as the regulatory agency to bring about approval. The present balance between the roles and authority of the various local jurisdictions need to be kept in tact for efficient government.

On the other hand, the opportunities for collaboration for comprehensive land use on the local level are innumerable. These opportunities present themselves at very unique times and places. For example, the Philadelphia School District needed a new high school in Center City, but could not find a site nor could they have afforded one in a highly congested area if one were available. Collaborative planning with the Redevelopment Authority of the city government resulted in a new idea for a school and the beneficial use of community resources to house the students. The Parkway School was an idea that came out of collaborative planning and saved the school district millions of dollars in capital funds and provided students with an innovative approach to learning. The collaborative

approach to planning for the comprehensive use of land within the city executed by planners from the city and school district resulted in one of the most innovative school projects in the country. This was not accomplished by a single meeting of these groups, but was the result of many years of cooperation and collaboration that paid off in results.

Likewise, planners from a school district and the local government can work together to secure land for human service agencies throughout the county before development actually takes place and in doing so conserve limited capital resources and place needed human service agencies in strategic locations. This is what took place in Montgomery County, Maryland during a period of rapid growth. Again, that effort was the result of many years of prior collaborative planning by two major jurisdictions. In this situation the planners of both the school district and county government saw the need for such services and seized the opportunity to implement a far-reaching program of land use and site acquisition.

Although these two examples are large school districts, collaboration on land use and school planning can and do result in every sized school system. The type of collaboration that is suggested here goes on at innumerable locations throughout the country. When a school is constructed next to or on a municipal owned park, collaboration has been the vehicle for that to happen and the community benefits from those actions. Even the smallest municipality can benefit from collaborative efforts. Sometimes collaboration in smaller communities is easier to obtain because of the level of acquaintance by the actors. People have a better knowledge of the constituents in a smaller community and the trust level is usually very high.

The chance to enhance a community by the proper placement of various human services for the benefit of citizens is a wonderful opportunity and challenge for all planners. In many instances the local planner needs to look beyond the immediate requirements of the job and see the possibilities of beneficial land planning and use. The key element to collaborative planning for land use and school buildings is the technical know-how of the local planner. Most localities do not have mandated collaboration for land planning and therefore, whatever collaboration might take place will result from the knowledge, training, professionalism, and most important of all, the vision of the planner that will suggest collaboration on the part of significant other jurisdictions.

REFERENCES

Alexander, Kern and M. David Alexander. (1998). American public school law. 4th Edition, Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishers, pp 1-859.

Crispell, Bruce. (September 15, 1999). Senior Planner, Department of Planning and Capital Programming, Montgomery County Public Schools, Rockville, Maryland. Interview.

Cullingworth, J. Barry. (1993). The political culture of planning: American land use planning in comparative perspective. NY: Routledge Press, Inc., pp 1-350.

Earthman, Glen I. (2000). Planning educational facilities for the next century. 2nd Edition, Reston,VA: Association of School Business Officials, pp 1-299.

Earthman, Glen I. (1994). School renovation handbook: Investing in education. Lancaster, PA: Technomics Publishers, Inc, pp 1-179.

Earthman, Glen I. (1976). "The politics of school site selection." CEFPI Journal. October/November. (14), p. 5.

Gauchet, Steven. (July 24, 2000). School District Architect, Department of Design and Construction, School District of Philadelphia, Phone Interview.

Healey, Patsy. (1997). Collaborative planning: Shaping places in fragmented societies. Vancouver, BC: UBC Press, pp 1-388.

Kaiser, Edward, David R. Godschalk, and F. Stuart Chapin, Jr. (1995). Urban land use planning, 4th Edition. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, pp 1-493.

Kowalski, Theodore J. (1999). The school superintendent: Theory, practice, and cases. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc., PP 1-443.

Levy, John. (1997). Comprehensive urban planning, 4th edition, Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall, pp 1-347.

Montgomery County Public Schools. (1999). FY 2000Educational facilities Master Plan. Rockville, MD: Department of Planning and Capital Programming.

Montgomery, John and Andy Thornley. (1990). Radical planning initiatives: New directions for urban planning in the 1990's. Brookfield, VT: Grower Publishing Company, pp 1-325.

Sarason, Seymour B. (1997). How schools might be governed and why. New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University. pp 1-175.

Scheideman, Elton Dale. (August 20, 1999). Director, Planning Department, Clark County School District, Las Vegas, Nevada. Interview.

School District of Philadelphia. (1973). Capital Improvement Program, 1973-1978. Philadelphia, PA: School Facilities Department.

So, Frank and Judith Getzels. (Ed), (1988). The practice of local governmental planning. 2nd Edition, Washington, DC: International City Management Association, pp 1-554.

Strein, Barbara. July 24, 2000). Assistant Director, Public School Construction Program, Baltimore, Maryland, Phone Interview.

SUGGESTED READINGS

The suggested readings cover two major planning spheres that deal with the total community and with the schools in particular. Because the audience is drawn from two disciplines, the readings reflect this fact. Some of the readings will already be familiar to some participants in one discipline while new to others.

Beatley, Timothy and Kristy Manning. (1997). The ecology of place: Planning for environment, economy, and community. Washington, D.C.: Island Press, pp 1-263.

The authors promote the idea of sustainability of communities that can be achieved through a host of incremental, individual efforts that are coordinated and advanced through their connection to a broader vision. A synthesis of ideas, concepts, and case examples that have been implemented elsewhere are provided.

Brubaker, C. William. (1998). Planning and designing schools. New York: McGraw-Hill. pp 1-203.

This text contains a discussion of the school planning process as viewed by an architect who has designed over 200 buildings. Discussions are not in depth, but have a unique perspective. Many good illustrations and photographs of new buildings are contained in the book. Author discusses trends in building design that are important today.

Castaldi, Basil. (1994). Educational facilities: Planning, modernization, and management. 4th edition, Boston: Allyn and Bacon, pp. 1-435.

This is one of the classics in the field of school facility planning. Included in the text are discussions of all the processes involved in planning, financing, designing, and constructing school buildings. In spite of the fact the author does not directly discuss site selection and acquisition, he does discuss community use of schools and some of the trends in the buildings themselves. This text contains a good overview of the planning process.

Kilbert, Charles J. (Ed). (1999). Reshaping the built environment: Ecology, ethics, and economics. Washington, D.C.: Island Press, pp.1-361.

This book is a series of essays devoted to discussions on the impact buildings and the process of building has upon the environment. Changes are needed in the way we create buildings, landscapes, and communities. This book shows ways that real estate development and the process of building can not only be less damaging to the environment, but can actually be the vehicle to improve our collective environment.

Krumholz, Norman and John Forester. (1990). Making Equity Planning Work. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, pp 1-271.

This is an older text that addresses the problem of equity, which is vitally important today. The main thesis of the text is that planners can work to serve those most in need. The case study is about the planning efforts in Cleveland during the Carl B. Stokes administration, but relates the issues to the larger field of city planning. The political environment of a city in which the planners work is described. The conclusion is that planners may diminish, but not completely abolish inequity.

Herman, Jerry. (1995). Effective school facilities: A developmental guidebook. Lancaster, PA: Technomic Publishing Company, pp 1-195.

A text devoted to a discussion of the processes of planning school facilities. The author provides a discussion of a community based cooperative model for planning facilities. There is a short chapter on site selection that presents the main points under this process. A good discussion on historical trends in school design in contained in the text.

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Collaborative Planning for School Facilities and Comprehensive Land Use	
Author(s): Earthman, Glen, Ph.D.	
Corporate Source:	Publication Date: 2000

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1

☒

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) *and* paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A

☐

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B

☐

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, please

Signature: Glen I. Earthman	Printed Name/Position/Title: Glen I. Earthman, Prof Emeritus
Organization/Address: Room 201 E Eggleston, Virginia Tech Blacksburg, VA 24061-0302	Telephone: 540/231-9715 FAX: 540/231-7845
	E-Mail Address: earthman@vt.edu Date: 4/9/01

(over)

EF005 909

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

National Clearinghouse for Educational Facilities
National Institute of Building Sciences
1090 Vermont Ave., N.W., Suite 700
Washington, DC 20005-4905

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
4483-A Forbes Boulevard
Lanham, Maryland 20706

Telephone: 301-552-4200
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-552-4700
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com

EFF-088 (Rev. 2/2000)