

SRCS School Consolidation Advisory Committee Report (DRAFT)

February 5, 2025

Background

- At the June 26, 2024 SRCS Board Meeting, the establishment of the School Consolidation Advisory Committee (SCAC) was approved
- Members of the public were given the opportunity to apply for the SCAC and on August 14, 2024 the Board approved 21 members. One member subsequently resigned from the SCAC, leaving 20 members.
- The SCAC members consist of teachers, administrators, parents, and community members.
- The SCAC was tasked to recommend a ranking of school sites for potential closure and provide potential scenarios for consideration to meet the target financial savings.

Committee Members

- Tammy Affonso (Staff, CSEA Executive Board Member)
- Janelle Black (Parent)
- Allison McLeod Budlong (Parent, SCAC Vice Chair)
- Allegra-Anne Buschman (Staff/Administrator)
- Andrea Correia (Staff/Administrator)
- Adrian Juarez Cruz (Parent)
- Ma Donna Feather Cruz (Community Member)
- Erin Geary (Staff/SRTA)
- Ross Hause (Staff/SRTA)
- Kathy Hayes (Staff/CSEA)
- Herman G. Hernandez (Community Member)
- Anna Valle Hope (Community Member/Business Owner)
- Kathryn Howell (Staff/SRTA President)
- Andrea Loveday-Brown (Parent)
- Evette Minor (Parent/Business Owner)
- Melissa Stewart (Parent)
- Carrie Taylor (Staff/CSEA)
- Nadia Berenice Villa (Parent)
- Jeanine Wilson (Staff/Administrator)
- Ben Wolf (Parent)

Process

- The SCAC held a series of 9 meetings from August 2024 - February 2025
- The meetings were facilitated by School Services of California (SSC) and in alignment with the California Department of Education (CDE) *Best Practices Guide for Potential School Closure*
- SSC developed the scoring criteria used to evaluate each school site and proposed these to the SCAC during the first meeting
- Data from each site were presented and discussed, with each site receiving a ranking for each criteria

SCAC Meetings

- August 19, 2024: Organizational Meeting to Introduce the Process and Criteria
- September 9, 2024: Demographics and Capacity
- October 7, 2024: Facilities
- October 28, 2024: Educational/Student Support Services
- November 18, 2024: Fiscal and Other Impacts
- December 16, 2024: “Parking Lot” and Alternative Scenario Discussion
- January 17, 2025: Initial Site Ranking Deliberations (Special Meeting)
- January 27, 2025: Final Site Ranking and Alternative Scenario Deliberations
- February 3, 2025: Final SCAC Meeting and Report Review

Criteria

Demographics and Capacity	
1.	School enrollment is low and projected to remain low (enrollment below 70% of capacity), including considering special day classes
2.	Demographically diverse population based on the unduplicated pupil percentage (UPP) (within the range of 40%-60%)
3.	Excess classroom capacity, excluding portables
4.	Enrollment includes positive intra-district and/or inter-district transfers
5.	Excess classroom capacity, excluding intra-district and/or inter-district transfers
6.	Proximity to schools with capacity to accommodate incoming students, excluding intra-district and/or inter-district transfers

Criteria

Facilities	
7.	Facilities are in good condition (based on cost of facility needs and proposed modernization/ construction projects)
8.	Modernization, construction, or other projects (e.g., technology upgrades) recently completed
9.	Total historical investments in facilities at the school site
10.	Unique facilities (i.e., facilities that could not be readily replicated) not found at other school sites
11.	Support spaces (e.g., cafeteria, multi-purpose room, playgrounds, etc.) have sufficient capacity to meet current and projected enrollment
12.	Environmental factors affect current or future use of property (e.g., earthquake faults, high-speed rail, etc.)
13.	Leases or other outside uses currently utilizing site/generate income

Criteria

Educational/Student Support Services	
14.*	<i>School does not meet performance (lowest two performance levels) in two or more state priorities</i>
15.*	<i>Percentage of students not meeting standard in English Language Arts (ELA) is below that of district as a whole</i>
16.*	<i>Percentage of students not meeting standard in Math is below that of the district as a whole</i>
17.	District-wide/special programs would need to be relocated
18.	District-wide/special programs can be relocated

* Data for criteria 14, 15, and 16 were presented and discussed; however, these criteria were removed by the SCAC.

Criteria

Fiscal and Other Impacts	
19.	Existing safety concerns regarding traffic and safe routes to school
20.	Safety concerns regarding traffic and safe routes to school if students are relocated
21.	Would require transportation for relocated students to new school sites
22.	Alternative uses identified if site is closed (e.g., use for other district functions, joint-use/joint occupancy agreements, community day school use, use for charter school [Proposition 39], shift to full-day kindergarten or universal preschool program, etc.)
23.	Proximity to non-district school that could capture district students were the school site to close
24.	District would benefit from net savings if closed
25.	Per-student operating costs, excluding staff

Removal of Criteria 14, 15, and 16

After significant discussion, these criteria were removed for the following reasons:

- Equity: Concern that these criteria may disproportionately impact schools serving a greater proportion of marginalized populations
- Data Limitations: Concern that the specific metrics do not best represent academic performance (e.g., limited multi-year data; concentration of specialized programs at sites with lower enrollment)
- Relevance: Concern that the metrics do not directly relate to factors within the control of the physical site (e.g., external support networks)

While the data was available to the SCAC during deliberations, the individual rankings were not directly considered in the summation of data

Ranking Process

- Each criteria received one or two scores: a relative score (i.e., primarily a 1 or 2 value) and/or a rank score to provide more relative comparison resolution (e.g., 1-5 for the high schools)
 - Criteria 1-24 received a yes/no score
 - Criteria 1-9, 14-16, and 24-25 received a rank score
- The yes/no scores were equally weighted when adding them, whereas the rank score provided more resolution as “tie breaker” data
- The SCAC was provided with summation data for all yes/no scores and all rank scores for each site (excluding criteria 14, 15, and 16)
- These scores were used as a starting point for the SCAC’s deliberations on final ranking recommendations

Final Ranking

The SCAC worked in four smaller teams for initial deliberations, deciding to use the following considerations:

- Sum of yes/no and rank scores
- Site location relative to other sites
- Potential local impact to communities near the sites
- Some teams gave more weight to enrollment, transfer rates, and/or financial metrics

The four team rankings were then discussed and deliberated on as a full committee over two meetings to come to consensus. These rankings are recommended as the basis for the 3-1-1 scenario.

Final School Site Ranking - High Schools

High Schools	
1.	Elsie Allen HS Montgomery HS
2.	Santa Rosa HS
3.	Maria Carrillo HS Piner HS

- Listed in three tiers in order of recommendation for potential closure
- Listed alphabetically in each tier
- The SCAC did not want to pit schools against each other and therefore did not decide on a ranking between the schools in the top tier

Final School Site Ranking - Middle Schools

Middle Schools	
1.	Santa Rosa MS
2.	Herbert Slater MS
3.	Hilliard Comstock MS
4.	Rincon Valley MS

- Listed in order of recommendation for potential closure
- Note that only SRMS and HCMS are located within the elementary school district boundary

Final School Site Ranking - Elementary Schools

Elementary Schools	
1.	Albert Biella ES Brook Hill ES Steele Lane ES
2.	Abraham Lincoln ES Cesar Chavez Language Academy Hidden Valley ES James Monroe ES

- Listed in two tiers in order of recommendation for potential closure
- Listed alphabetically in each tier
- The second tier is primarily based on the rank scores
- Consideration of the relative locations for each site is important
- The SCAC is not recommending the CCLA program be closed

Additional Considerations and Recommendations

- Avoid closing multiple neighboring elementary schools
- Avoid closing multiple elementary schools with high populations of students with disabilities or other historically marginalized populations
- If MHS is selected for closure, ensure the IB Program can be relocated in time for current students to continue the program
- If any high school is closed, the students from the affected school should be supported to ensure they stay on track to achieve their post-secondary goals
- Consider the potential future impact of out-of-district charters within SRCS boundaries
- CCLA and SRACS likely need to move within SRCS boundaries in the future

Alternative Scenarios

Based on community feedback and discussions during the SCAC meetings, the following is recommended for consideration as an alternative to the 3-1-1 scenario:

- To keep all comprehensive high schools open, consider:
 - Addition of grades 7/8 to some high school sites (e.g., Elsie Allen, Piner, Montgomery)
 - Possibility of moving Ridgway to an existing HS site (this may be needed to achieve the financial targets if a high school is not selected for closure)
 - Closure of more than one middle school
- Creation of TK-8 programs at HCMS and/or SRMS
- Mix and match grade-level configurations (i.e., not a one-size-fits-all solution)
- Consider co-location of the CCLA and SRFACS

Final Thoughts from the Committee

TBD Pending February 3rd meeting

Thank You

