

MINUTES

Facilities Committee Meeting *Special Meeting*



Wednesday November 5, 2008
Charles A. Jones Skills and Business Center
5451 Lemon Hill Avenue – Room 505
4:00 – 7:00 p.m.

SCUSD Board Committee Member Present
Karen Young

Staff Support:

Mellissa Truitt, Assistant Superintendent
Jim Dobson, Director II
Christopher Frappier, Project Manager

Tom Barentson, Deputy Superintendent/CFO
Dave Taxara, Project Manager
Chris Marshall, Committee Secretary

Consultants and Community Members:

Mariano Janco, City of Sacramento
Patrick Leier, IBI
Jeff Thrift, PCM3
Craig Rouse, PCM3
Olga Rodriguez, Community Member
Jeff Jones, PCM3

Bob Harris, CEO Capital Unity Council
Wayne Sjolund, PMG
Doug Henning, PCM3
Tony Woods, Beals Alliance
Alex Visaya, Community Member

I. WELCOME & INTRODUCTIONS:

1.0 Welcome & Introductions by Board Member Karen Young. Revision of agenda by Board Member Young to add additional time to Asset Development, congruent with the last meeting on October 29, 2008, limiting amount of floor discussions to 30 minutes.

II. ASSET DEVELOPMENT:

2.0 Education Programs – Update

Attachment #1: *Facility Asset Development – Continued Study*, dated November 6, 2008 and Attachment #2: *Science Lab Survey*.

- Science Labs –Science Lab Survey done by Middle and High School site staff with discussion of standards and needed improvements in compliance with Title V standards from the California Department of Education. The Operations Department staff is working on pricing this work out for the District, which was developed at the request of the Board.
- Athletic Fields: John F. Kennedy and C.K. McClatchy equity and safety issues are concerns with the athletic fields at the high schools.

Luther Burbank Sports Complex Project

- ◇ Attachment #2: Preferred Option Luther Burbank Sports Complex. Joint Use Agreement with City to develop the Luther Burbank athletic fields. The planning for this project was partially paid for by the City of Sacramento. Luther Burbank meeting tonight to discuss plans for sports complex and Florin Road Corridor Redevelopment (ongoing effort by the City of Sacramento covering from 24th Street to Hwy. 99. Includes making area bicycle friendly, adding trees and landscaping). The City is looking at how they can help finance the Luther Burbank Sports Complex Project and make

improvements to allow easier access and egress to Luther Burbank. The current Luther Burbank athletic facility does not meet ADA standards and has inadequate parking. Discussions with City Councilmember Bonnie Pannell and Director, Matthew Bryant, started two years ago in regards to improving the athletic facilities at Luther Burbank High School.

- ◇ There are three phases of construction. The first phase addresses immediate issues of track and field; football field, bleachers, lighting, concession stands, and restrooms. This phase can be done without impacting existing athletic facilities and while waiting for additional funding for Phases 2 & 3.
- ◇ All fields are planned with synthetic turf to allow for alternative uses. Overall planning includes additional softball and baseball fields to the site without the additional maintenance concerns of regular turf. Also included will be play and shade structures, a two-story 4 sided scoring area, tennis courts and additional parking. The Luther Burbank Sports Complex plan was presented to the City of Sacramento Board on Monday, November 3, 2008
- ◇ \$22 million for entire complex.
 - Phase I \$7.9m – Able to complete within the next two years by working with the City and other interested stakeholders.

2.1 Asset Development - District Property Options: Attachment #4: SCUSD Site Characteristics – Work in Progress.

Attachment #5: Study Area Critical Statistics and Distances between Schools. Tom Barentson passed out the Asset Development Matrix and supporting materials going to the Board on Thursday, November 6, 2008.

District staff is looking at District property options today due to State budget concerns with an estimated \$5.5 million to \$14 million in mid-year cuts forecasted for SCUSD. In addition, a projected shortfall for 2009-10, with no COLA projected from the State, is estimated at \$7-10 million.

The District has to look at other areas than teachers and programs to cut. SCUSD has cut \$90m in the last seven years. We are looking at District facilities and ways to raise funds or decrease costs district-wide. Selling of District facilities is not an option at this time. What we are really looking for is ways to maximize current assets and student programs in the District .

Introduction of Patrick Leier, IBI Consultant:

Opening Question: *What can we do with our assets (facilities, successful student programs) to allow flexibility and at the same time maximize revenue and minimize expenses without selling our properties.*

With destabilized budget structure, increasing expenses, decreased revenues, decreased support from the State, we know that the District will need to develop several ways to deal with a budget shortfall by making a series of strategic recommendations to use over the next three years.

1. Best Case Scenario (Target): Consolidate/re-use/re-purpose 1-3 schools at elementary school level for next year.
2. Probable Case Scenario: Consolidate/re-use 2-4 school sites for next year.
3. Worst Case Scenario: Consolidate/re-use 3-5 school sites for next year.

With an estimated budget shortfall this year and next year, we need to develop a strategic approach to raising \$450,000-\$500,000 per site in savings by re-purposing or consolidation of our school sites. Enrollment vs. Capacities information shared with committee (see maps and attendance/capacity hand outs for SCUSD areas).

Options or Strategies:

1. Take two programs with small enrollment and consolidate K-6 or K-8.
2. Convert a MS (7-8) to a K-8.
3. Convert K-6 to K-8.
4. Convert MS (7-8) to 7-12
5. Co-location of a underutilized school site with acreage by a park, with other program that is compatible. Provide a benefit to the old program and the new program.
6. Selling the site (not an option at this time).
7. Exchange or transfer of one asset for another with District or stakeholder in community.
8. Decentralizing services and putting them in neighborhoods where they would be more effective. For Example: Multi-Lingual meetings with resource center specifically for Multi-Lingual services. DELAC and District Advisory Committee meetings.
9. Focus on replication of successful programs during consolidation.
10. Look at consolidation of schools to improve student outcomes. (*Schools in PI status – see notes below).

Site Matrix, Maps with Zones or Study Areas and Enrollment vs. Capacity Tables Reviewed:

1. Study Areas: East, North, South, West and Central – Show attendance areas for all elementary school sites. Color coded to show enrollment of sites:
 - a. Green has 350 students or more; Blue 450 students or above; Yellow less than 350 students.
 - b. Urban Design Criteria: Areas bound by light rail, major roads and freeways.
2. Statistics show student enrollment of sites vs. available capacity at the same site.
3. Matrix shows individual site information: acreage, PI status, AYP/API data, special programs, free and reduced lunch, concapped students, dollars per student (general funds divided by the number of students), future development, site size, Williams School, date of modernization, percentage attending from neighborhood, etc...

How would we address consolidating a school site or freeing up two school sites?

1. Elementary Schools – 18 schools underenrolled with 350 students
2. Middle Schools are as a whole, with the exception of Sutter M.S., underenrolled.
3. Comprehensive High Schools are very well attended.
4. Small Alternative High Schools – drawing students to SCUSD and providing student choice needs to be looked at.

School Site Utilization Options:

William Land: K-6 site. Feeder school is Sutter and C.K. McClatchy. Enrollment 288 vs.453 capacity. Future development may generate students. Not a Williams School.

- Not a PI school / ELA 47% / API over 800
- “Fatal flaws” school is what we look at in order to maximize opportunities for students.

Comparison of Sutter MS and Kit Carson MS

- Kit Carson gets more categorical funds than Sutter
- There is a \$500 difference between the same education (the students may perform different at Sutter than at Kit Carson, but it is the same cost for education: teachers, program, and facility costs).
- Whatever you can do to grow Kit Carson or to duplicate programs, can reduce some of your costs.
- If we weren't thinking about the community and kids, we could cap Sutter at 900 students, upgrade Kit Carson, and assign students to their home schools.
 - This is something we have to say to our schools and communities: “These are our 4 or 5 strategies/options to address budget deficit.”
 - A Step Further: If we look at capping Sutter at 900; what would it look like:

- Structurally
- Operations
- Instructionally
- Financially
- Create a “Mega-Sutter” with two campuses and one principal. Sutter enrollment 1200 (from area 450).
- Kit Carson as a K-8 would be a good option.
- Kit Carson’s proximity to CSUS; maybe we could use for BTSA training.
- Discussion interface between K-12 and 4-year institutions. If students did not go to Kit Carson, where would they go? Intervention Center possible. Look at Pros and Cons:

Consolidation of Washington and Theodore Judah

Washington is losing students and consequently had to cut two teachers at the beginning of year. The District wants to keep Washington for future development in area. Possible use of Washington as a performing arts center; move students to Theodore Judah and/or William Land. By increasing enrollment at other sites, you decrease cost per student to the District. Not a matter of consolidating schools and decreasing cost per student; but a matter of generating revenue in vacant facility. Examples: Performing Arts Center or child care in downtown area. Theodore Judah has room for approximately 200 students. Staff may have to re-configure the bussing strategy for these students.

Example of Savings that Can Be Generated From Closure of One Site:

Closing one school will generate decreased costs	\$ 500,000
Generate income by leasing out Washington site 10 classrooms x \$120,000 per month for one year	\$ 120,000
At the new school, which has 400 students, you decrease the cost per student for 400 students reduction in costs*	\$ 200,000
Potential Total:	\$ 820,000

*The City is very interested in 16th and N or other downtown facility for child care.

QUESTION: What is net gain after replication of programs to benefits for both schools? PI vs. Non-PI. Will we reduce our net savings because we are improving the program at the new consolidated site? Will we have to increase funding for programs at the new site to bring the quality of education up at the new site in order to generate the same outcome?

ANSWER: The \$500,000 savings is from the cost to the general fund for a site principal, staff, etc. . . , at one site. Categorical and PI funds follow the students to the new site. What this has done, is decrease administration costs and add PI students with dollars that follow them to the new program, thereby guaranteeing that the maximum revenue is generated by the re-purposing of one school. Hopefully, this will enhance the educational program for students at both sites and address the budget needs of the District at the same time.

Downtown Area Schools with less than 250:

- Jedediah Smith
- Washington
- William Land
- Theodore Judah

Co-locate Jefferson & Bancroft: Bancroft has 35,000 square feet with PI status. Move Thomas Jefferson 206 students to Hubert Bancroft which has a total capacity of 538. Or change three school into two schools: Jefferson, Bancroft and Cohen.

T. Jefferson 206 students (161 attend from the neighborhood)	excess capacity of 143	total capacity of 350
H. Bancroft 377 students	excess capacity of 161	total capacity of 538
Isador Cohen 369 students	excess capacity of 131	total capacity of 500
O.W. Erlewine 413 students	excess capacity of 19	total capacity of 432

Re-use of Thomas Jefferson site which is close to CSUS for:

- o childcare
- o adult education
- o early childhood education
- o other

Isador Cohen and O.W. Erlewine:

- Erlewine could be used as a Community Center:
 - o sits adjacent to Larchmark Park
 - o sits on a dead end street
 - o school site currently has a problem with traffic congestion
 - o community centers provide programs to support individual community needs (the City when setting up a community center takes it to the Community to let them decide what their needs are).

The MET:

- Close school close to them and provide The Met an opportunity for a better facility
- Re-purpose 8th & V
- Make 3 schools out of 4 another option

Phoebe Hearst: Change to K-8 at Kit Carson and allow growth of a successful program. Phoebe Hearst currently 1st through 6th grade program. Site has petitioned to add Kindergarten to their program. Would assist local sites with future attendance planning for 1st grade.

- Re-purpose or lease Phoebe Hearst site which is located on Folsom Boulevard
- St. Francis H.S. behind site
- Cal Trans across the street from site

Would serve neighborhood students and students from outside area who attend magnet program. Take stress off Sutter by allowing Phoebe Hearst students to remain at home school and allow growth of a successful program.

John Sloat, John Bidwell and Mark Hopkins: John Sloat formerly a magnet program with no attendance area. John Sloat, Mark Hopkins, and John Bidwell are all bound by major streets in one area which could be divided in half and make two schools out of three or join John Sloat with John Bidwell.

Freeport: Freeport was full until John Still Elementary School opened last year. John Still is full to capacity, yet only has 321 students who live in the John Still area; a large contingency of students come from outside the John Still attendance area (some from Freeport).

As the Delta Shores housing development in south Sacramento opens, these southern schools, (Freeport, Susan B. Anthony and John Still Elementary) will fill up. A draft EIR for Delta Shores is out at this time and staff is working with the developer to plan for the school needs of the area. Capacity vs. growth trends need to be taken into account for the area.

John Cabrillo and Sam Brannon: Sites next door to each other and could be made K-8.

Fern Bacon MS: Possible K-8 by adding Maple students which is underenrolled.

Alice Birney and John Cabrillo: Consolidate students at Alice Birney and allow Sam Brannon to grow to 7-12.

Alice Birney and John Morse: Consolidate. Alice Birney is a large site and under enrolled. John Morse is smallest site in the District with a special program that needs room to grow. John Morse has no attendance area; parents transport students to school.

Genevieve Didion: Excess capacity offered up through open enrollment process. Cap student enrollment and keep out of open enrollment.

John Cabrillo and Sam Brannon: Make K-8

Rosa Parks and Mark Hopkins: Make K-8

8th & V: Move The MET to a closed school and allow use of the 8th and V facility by a program currently housed at the Serna Center. For Example: Greg Purcell would like to move out of the Serna Center into the community, freeing up space at the Serna Center for rental. Multi-Lingual Services could also be moved into the community to make it more accessible to the public.

Camellia: Has a separate area for Kindergarten and separate 1st through 6th grades. Could move students to Genesis to allow room for growth (¼ mile from Genesis).

Pony Express and Alice Birney: Consolidate.

Genesis: Make a K-8 or Middle School. Use as a “demonstration school” for BTSA Training, DELAC, DAC, Multi-Lingual resource center, Parent University for parent training.

Possible 7-12 Options:

- LDV and Hollywood Park
- Health Professions and Jedediah Smith. School of Engineering and Science – 7-12 rigorous curriculum demands – do the same.
- PS-7 combine with Sacramento Charter.
- Large Comprehensive High Schools: Reduce the population of larger high schools and create 7-12 grades.

Challenges:

- Short timeline
- Community input through outreach
- New School Board
- Transportation
- Community resistance to change

***Program Improvement (PI) Status:** How do you address PI status of schools, (year 6 and 7) as you move forward? A key strategy could be to use an alternative governance structure, by changing from K-6 to K-8 configuration.

- When re-purposing or consolidating sites when one site is in PI status, you re-set the clock on the PI status of the one site by consolidating or creating a new school.
- Re-setting clock on PI status – those students bring categorical dollars with them to enhance programs for the new consolidated site.
- If we move lower testing students to higher performing programs, the hosting school's scores go down. How do you mitigate issues associated with lower test scores for the new site?

Next Steps:

1. Board Workshop - Review of five step decision making process developed by the District to help the Board determine where we need to go and what we need to do.
2. Determine timeline.
3. Determine what our options are - Review options to bring before community.
 - a. Looking at what the best development values are.
 - b. Look at what school consolidations best meet the program and fiscal needs of the District students, and the communities it serves.
 - c. List Pros and Cons for each option
4. Community Meetings for stakeholder input. Mariano Janco, from Robbie Water's office, offered to assist with community outreach; contact emails, phone numbers and neighborhood contacts for community meetings. Mr. Martin suggested District give Community three options and let them choose best options for their community.
5. Apply dollar amounts to "low hanging fruit". E.g.: Serna Center - Renting space to City or re: community service space at our sites. \$1.00 to \$3.00 per square foot.
6. Average classroom is 960 square feet at \$1.00 to \$3.00 per square foot; 1 classroom rental equals approximately \$12,000 in annual net revenue.

III. OPEN DISCUSSION:

QUESTION: Looking at timeline; we are talking about November through January meeting with community stakeholders. Will all options be presented to the community or when discussing what we bring forward?

ANSWER: Per Mariano Janco, with Councilmember Robbie Water's office: Give each group the criteria, survey area map and let them come up with options. The City has found this to be very effective process when getting community input and buy-in.

QUESTION: Are there any options that the Board would take off the table?

ANSWER: With new Board, no one knows. How do you figure this into the timeline? The District will need a mega-Board retreat to go over process and needs.

QUESTION: On District properties, is there a way to put hard dollars to low hanging fruit items?

ANSWER: We know right now that 4th R is ready to take on additional space in the Serna Center. We know current lease agreement and cost per square.

QUESTION: What is the possibility of UCD leasing of Marian Anderson?

ANSWER: This is something staff is considering once permanent home for two small programs established. (Success Academy and Therapeutic Center).

QUESTION: Is there a way to put a dollar figure on gains by consolidation? Re-frame by dollars needed re: this is how many school consolidations we should be doing based on funding deficits?

ANSWER: That is doable. Example: Costs per student would decrease by growing Kit Carson MS and duplicating Sutter MS program at Kit Carson.

CONCERN: K-8 programs do not offer same programs for 7th and 8th grade students due to small enrollment at 7/8 in K-8 schools.

ANSWER: K-8 programs tend to be located in more affluent neighborhoods; when actually, lower socio-economic groups are more successful with K-8 programs vs. regular 7th/8th grade middle school.

QUESTION: What does it save cutting 20:1 vs. closing a school site?

ANSWER: This is something we need to look into.

This will be a good test for the new Board to see how well they join together to address these issues.

Next Facilities Committee Meeting: December 10, 2008 @ 5:00 p.m. / Location: TBD
Next Board Meeting: November 6, 2008 @ 6:30 p.m.

Meeting adjourned at 6:52 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Chris Marshall