

FINAL REPORT
JEFFCO FACILITIES USAGE COMMITTEE
DECEMBER 2009

To: Jefferson County School District Board of Education

From: Phillip Infelise and Bob West, Co-Chairs Jefferson County Public Schools Facilities Usage Committee

Date: December 22nd, 2009

Subject: Facilities Usage Committee - Final Report to the School Board

In March of 2009, Jefferson County Public Schools (Jeffco) convened the Jeffco Facilities Usage Committee (Committee) following a directive from the Jefferson County Board of Education (Board). The district's schools overall have excess enrollment capacity at all grade levels and the district anticipates flat enrollment in the near future after experiencing nine years of declining enrollment. These two issues are compounded by the district's projected budget cuts totaling upwards of \$15 to \$20 million per year for, at least, the next several years. In light of the district's situation, the Board charged the Committee with reviewing the usage of school district's instructional facilities. The Committee, which included district staff and community members, began meeting in March 2009 and will conclude its work in December 2009.

Building upon the Interim Report, which was submitted in August, 2009, this final report includes:

- The Executive Summary;
- A brief background for the Committee, including the Committee's mission and charge, how members were selected, main norms and an outline of the Interim Report;
- A description of the first round of public forums which focused on the six criteria identified by the Committee;
- The process for the creation of initial options by the Committee;
- A description of the second round public forums inclusive of feedback; and
- Final Committee recommendations.

A full description of the Committee's work in the six months leading up to the September forums can be found in an Interim Report which is included as "Appendix- Interim Report."

The intent of this Final Report is to relate the comprehensive process the Committee engaged in to develop its recommendations. No decisions were taken lightly. Committee members were fully aware of the gravity of their work, both in terms of the district's long term health and potential impacts on parents, students and district principals, teachers, and staff. Over the course of ten months, the Committee, therefore, delved deeply into data on every aspect of the district's school facilities, discussed and weighed available options, carefully solicited and considered community input, and ultimately made very difficult policy recommendations. Throughout its deliberations, the Committee

attempted to focus on doing what was best not just for their own students or the students at a particular school or in a specific community, but for all children in Jeffco as a whole.

The Committee's work spanned approximately ten months. During this time they held a dozen Committee meetings and eight public forums that involved thousands of community members along with thousands of comments from other sources. In addition, the Committee reviewed numerous studies, reports, and other sources designed to provide objective data with which to make key decisions. While the scope of the Committee's work was therefore significant and highly detailed, this report is designed to provide the reader with a manageable summary to understand the broad parameters of the Committee's efforts and how these efforts lead to the development of a final set of recommendations. In this way, we believe the report provides insight into the comprehensive effort undertaken to produce objective, data-driven recommendations that are offered to the Board with the intent to help the district continue to be strong and effective for years to come.

Respectfully submitted,

Phillip Infelise
Facility Usage Committee Co-Chair

Bob West
Facility Usage Committee Co-Chair

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

At the end of nearly 10 months of work the Jeffco Facilities Usage Committee (Committee) forwards twelve options and six themes to the School Board (Board) for its consideration. The Committee hopes that its recommendations can help the district accomplish its near-term facility and budget goals. It also hopes that the work can be part of a longer term guide for the district in its efforts to have the most efficient and effective use of facilities possible. The twelve recommendations include schools from around the district and at various grade levels.

FACILITIES USAGE COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED OPTIONS				
Opt. #		Articulation Area	Short Description	
1	B	Alameda	Move 7th & 8th Grade from O'Connell MS to Alameda HS. Close O'Connell	
3	A	Arvada	Move Arvada MS students to North Arvada MS. Close Arvada Middle School.	
4		Arvada West	Consolidate functions from Allendale temps & cottages into the main building.	
12		Chatfield Columbine	Move Ken Caryl MS 7-8 and GT program to Deer Creek MS. Close Ken Caryl MS.	
16	A	Golden	Move Golden 6th grade to Bell, Pleasant View P to Shelton & Pleasant View K-5 to Welchester. Close Pleasant View.	
17	A	Green Mtn.	Move Devinny 6th grade to Dunstan MS.	
21	B	Wheat Ridge	Move Wheat Ridge 6th Grade to Everitt MS & Pennington K-5 to Prosp.Valley, Stober & Vivian. Close Pennington.	
22	A	Jefferson Wheat Ridge	Move Martensen, Stevens, Molholm & Wilmore Davis 6th Grade to Wheat Ridge MS. Move Martensen K5 to Stevens, Molholm & Wilmore Davis. Close Martensen.	
24		Wheat Ridge	To align w/other MS changes in Wheat Ridge & Golden areas, expand Manning to 6-8. See Opt.16A & 21A or 21B.	
27		Pomona	Move all Pomona area 6th grade to Moore. Distribute Zerger K-5. Close Zerger.	
29		Arvada	Distribute Fitzmorris K-6 throughout articulation area. Close Fitzmorris.	
30		District Wide	Close & demolish up to 120 temps at sites where utilization is less than 92%.	

The Committee notes two key caveats regarding the recommendations:

1. With regard to option 2 (which can be viewed in Appendix E)– the moving of the Arvada West preschool to Fitzmorris elementary school and the moving of the Swanson preschool to Secrest elementary school- which could not be done in its entirety if option 29 was recommended since that option entailed the closure of Fitzmorris. The Committee would still like the Board to consider moving the Swanson preschool to the Secrest elementary school. Further, if option 29 is not implemented the Committee recommends the full option 2 be considered.
2. The Committee was closely divided between option 1B which was recommended and option 1A (which can be viewed in Appendix E) which was moving 6th grade from the Alameda articulation area to O’Connell Middle School. If option 1B is not implemented by the Board the Committee would recommend reconsidering option 1A.

In total the options represent a potential annual savings to the district of \$5,880,833. The onetime cost of implementation of the options is \$1,619,524. The options also represent a decrease of 4,196 seats in capacity and the elimination 132 temps and 6 cottages. Before implementing any of the options, the district needs to make sure to examine the impact on school programs such as special education, ELL programs and Title schools.

The Committee believes a number of themes can be used by the Board to help guide future work around the effective and efficient use of facilities. The themes may not be viable in all situations but the district should use them when appropriate.

- Reduction of temps and closing cottages, with no new temps being installed
- Moving 6th grade up to middle school
- Schools should live within their permanent capacity (Schools should not enroll more students than permanent capacity allows and over time schools should try to manage enrollment to get back within capacity)
- Cuts in facilities lessen the cuts in the classroom; they should “make tough cuts now”
- All current boundaries should be examined to measure the impact on school over/under utilization
- A permanent facilities usage committee should be established to help the district in ongoing efforts to review effective and efficient use of facilities

The Committee’s work was led by its two co-chairs, Phillip Infelise and Bob West. All of the work was guided by the Board’s mission and charge to the Committee from March 2009.

MISSION STATEMENT

“Provide options to the District for an efficient use of all district facilities where educational services are provided that align with the Board Ends Policies and the district mission of educating all students for a successful future.”

BOARD CHARGE

1. Study the current Jeffco School facilities based on capacity, enrollment, future enrollment, needs of the school district, needs of unique communities, special programs, future direction, educational specifications, and financial stewardship.
2. Recommend *options* for facility usage to the Board of Education. These options could include but are not limited to repurposing of buildings, school closures, and/or boundary/transportation changes.

A full description of the Committee’s work in the first six months can be found in the Interim Report which is included as “Appendix- Interim Report”.

Initial options were created by applying the six criteria created for analyzing all instructional facilities in the district. The six criteria are:

- 1) Building Condition – to include the safety and security of the building, along with general condition of the facility
- 2) Choice – looking at both the percentage of students who are choosing out of the school and the number choosing in
- 3) Academic Achievement – based on a body of evidence for each school
- 4) Current Enrollment and Enrollment Trends
- 5) Operating Costs – including instructional fixed, instructional variable, utilities, maintenance and custodial costs
- 6) Capacity Utilization (School Enrollment divided by Permanent School Design Capacity).

These six criteria were vetted by the community during four community forums held in September 2009. Additionally, a number of general themes came out in the options:

- The potential for closure of schools with low capacity utilization in areas where other schools had open capacity
- The possibility of moving 6th grade students up to middle schools to balance capacity utilization

- The potential for moving students or programs to decrease the district's use of temporary school buildings

From this initial work, staff and committee members continued to identify possible options. This work led to a list of 51 options. Particular attention has been paid to the impact of at-risk populations or Title schools, on each school's capacity situation. Schools identified as Title 1 schools, those with very high percentages of at-risk students, had their capacity figures reduced because of program delivery. By doing this, each school's utilization figures increased. Since capacity utilization is one of the committee's criteria, it allowed for a more balanced comparison of all schools.

This pool of options was vetted by the community in November 2009 at four community forums throughout the district. Total public input included:

- 117 speakers,
- 44 recordings at the public forums,
- 190 note cards,
- 588 online feedback, and
- 1,463 emails, voice mails, phone calls, letters and petitions.

The committee has taken its work very seriously and has labored to do what is best, not just for their own children or the children at a particular school or in a specific community, but for all children in Jeffco as a whole. The Committee hopes that its recommendations can help the district accomplish its current facilities and budget goals. It also hopes that the work can be part of a longer term direction in the district's efforts to have the most efficient and effective use of facilities possible.

FINAL REPORT

In March of 2009, Jefferson County Public Schools (Jeffco) convened the Jeffco Facilities Usage Committee (Committee) following a directive from the Jefferson County Board of Education (Board) as a variety of issues began to surface. The district had identified excess capacity at all grade levels as a result of flat enrollment for several years. This was compounded by the fact that the district was facing projected budget cuts totaling upwards of \$15 to \$20 million a year for the next several years, this reflecting the state budget reductions in K-12 funding. In light of the district's situation, the Board charged the Committee with reviewing the usage of school district instructional facilities. The Committee, which included district staff and community members, began meeting in March 2009 and will conclude its work in December 2009.

This Final Report details the work of the Committee beginning with the first set of public forums held in September 2009. These four forums were disbursed geographically in the district, as well as a Saturday opportunity, attempting to give the public flexibility for participation. Input was also received on the district website as an ongoing option for the community. A full description of the Committee's work in the six months leading up to the September forums can be found in an Interim Report which is included as Appendix A. Building upon the Interim Report, this final document includes:

- A brief background of the Committee, including the mission and charge, how Committee members were selected, Committee norms; and an outline of the Interim Report;
- A description of the first round of public forums and feedback on the six criteria identified by the Committee;
- The process for the creation of initial options by the Committee;
- A description of the second round public forums inclusive of feedback; and
- Final Committee recommendations.

The intent of this report is to provide an understanding of the comprehensive process the Committee engaged in to develop its recommendations. No decisions were taken lightly and Committee members were fully aware of the gravity of their work, both in terms of the district's long term health and potential impacts on parents, children and district principals, teachers, and staff. Over the course of ten months, the Committee therefore delved deeply into data on every aspect of the district's school facilities, discussed and weighed available options, carefully solicited and considered community input, and ultimately made very difficult policy choices to forward as recommendations. Throughout its work, the Committee attempted to focus on doing what was best not just for their own children or the children at a particular school or in a specific community, but for all children in Jeffco as a whole.

The Committee's work was led by its two co-chairs, Phillip Infelise and Bob West, and spanned approximately ten months and included a dozen Committee meetings and eight public forums that involved thousands of community members along with thousands of comments from Internet feedback

options, letters, video conferencing, etc. In addition, the Committee reviewed numerous studies, reports, and other sources designed to provide objective data with which to make key decisions. While the scope of the Committee’s work was therefore significant and highly detailed, this report is designed to provide the reader with a digestible summary to help understand the broad parameters of the Committee’s efforts and how these efforts helped lead to the development of a final set of recommendations. In this way it is hoped the report will provide insight into the comprehensive effort undertaken to produce objective, data-driven recommendations that are offered in order to help the district continue to be strong and effective for years to come.

Committee Background

Committee Mission and Charge

The Board provided the Committee with the following mission statement and charge:

MISSION STATEMENT

“Provide options to the District for an efficient use of all district facilities where educational services are provided that align with the Board Ends Policies and the district mission of educating all students for a successful future.”

The mission statement focuses on four areas of the Jeffco Strategic Plan:

- 1. Business & Finance**
 - Ensure the alignment of resources to increase student achievement and organizational effectiveness.
- 2. Instruction**
 - Ensure students have access to alternative pathways and interventions to improve achievement, close achievement gaps, and increase graduation rates.
- 3. Schools**
 - Ensure that student achievement is increasing in every school regardless of gender, race/ethnic, socioeconomic status, or special needs.
 - Ensure the alignment of resources to increase student achievement and organizational effectiveness.
- 4. Support Services**
 - Ensure facilities are planned, designed, and constructed to meet the needs of students and staff.
 - Ensure a safe learning and working environment for all school and department personnel.
 - Ensure facilities are maintained to meet the needs of students and staff.

With the mission statement spanning four areas of the district’s strategic plan, it dictates that the Committee consider both fiscal and student achievement impacts during its work.

- BOARD CHARGE**
1. Study the current Jeffco School facilities based on capacity, enrollment, future enrollment, needs of the school district, needs of unique communities, special programs, future direction, educational specifications, and financial stewardship.
 2. Recommend *options* for facility usage to the Board of Education. These options could include but are not limited to repurposing of buildings, school closures, and/or boundary/transportation changes.

The Board charge was also used to frame the Committee’s work; in fact this work began by reviewing data specifically described in the charge. Using this data and additional information, preliminary criteria were developed which were ultimately used to create a range of options to present to the Board. In September the preliminary criteria were presented to the community. In the fall, the Committee finalized and applied the criteria, to create a range of options that were then presented to the community in November, and presented to the Board of Education at the conclusion of this process.

Selection of the Committee

The Committee was initially made up of 34 members; however, since the beginning of the work, six members left the Committee, leaving the Committee with 28 final members. The members represent all areas of the Jeffco community including teachers, principals, and community members. Members were selected in one of four ways. First, each of the Jeffco employee associations appointed four participants. Second, each Board member appointed one participant. Third, three different district committees appointed participants. Fourth, members were selected from an applicant pool of individuals who applied as part of the district’s call for participants. The full list of participants can be viewed in Appendix A.

Committee Norms

The Committee agreed to work under a set of norms for their own meetings. The norms were designed to help keep the focus on the district process and on an outcome that would benefit the district as a whole. These norms, along with the Board’s written guidelines for participation at public meetings, were utilized at all public meetings and forums as well. In particular, Committee members acknowledged in the norms that the topics they would address could be controversial and difficult as they related to their own schools and communities. They were asked to look beyond the needs of the

specific group or community they represented and to consider what would be best for every student in the district. Further, Committee members agreed to be respectful towards all other members even when opinions differed. A complete list of the Committee's norms can be viewed in Appendix B.

Interim Report

In August the Committee released an Interim Report (included as "Appendix- Interim Report") that detailed the Committee's work through its first seven meetings and included:

- The Committee's mission and charge from the Board;
- A description of how the Committee was selected and current participants;
- An adoption of a set of norms for operation at meetings and public forums (see Appendix B);
- A review and summary of all data the Committee has reviewed thus far;
- A set of initial criteria being considered by the Committee in its effort to establish appropriate usage of all Jeffco schools; and
- A description of next steps.

First Round of Public Forums- Community Input on Criteria

The Interim Report concluded by presenting the six criteria that the Committee would potentially use in the initial evaluation of all school facilities. The six criteria were:

- 1) Building Condition – to include the safety and security of the building, along with general condition of the facility
- 2) Choice – looking at both the percentage of students who are choosing out of the school and the number choosing in
- 3) Academic Achievement – based on a body of evidence for each school
- 4) Current Enrollment and Enrollment Trends
- 5) Operating Costs – including instructional fixed, instructional variable, utilities, maintenance and custodial costs
- 6) Capacity Utilization (School Enrollment divided by Permanent School Design Capacity).

The first public forums were held to get feedback from the community on these six criteria and the Committee's work in general. Four meetings were held across the district:

- Saturday, September 12th at the Manning School Auditorium from 9:00am – 10:30am
- Monday, September 14th at the Jefferson High School Auditorium from 6:00pm – 7:30pm
- Wednesday, September 16th at the Chatfield High School Auditorium from 6:00pm – 7:30pm
- Monday, September 21st at the Arvada West High School Auditorium from 6:00pm – 7:30pm.

Around 300 people attended the four meetings across the district. Fifty-one people spoke at the public comment sessions. In addition to public comment, the public was able to submit input through note cards handed out at the meeting and through e-mail.

Overall, the feedback was supportive of the six criteria. Many individuals did have opinions on which of the criteria should be most important. Others wanted the Committee to ensure that the evaluation of facilities was not just number based and that any decisions would be made looking at the all aspects of the schools being evaluated.

Creating Initial Options

September 28th Meeting

At a meeting that followed the first round of public forums, the Committee considered the community's input and began to review and identify potential options by applying the community-vetted evaluation criteria. The first review of all facilities was undertaken by Committee staff who examined each articulation area independently. Around 25 different options were generated with this initial review. A number of general themes came out in the options:

- The potential for closure of schools with low capacity utilization in areas where other schools had open capacity
- The possibility of moving 6th grade students up to middle schools to balance capacity utilization
- The potential for moving students or programs to decrease the district's use of temporary school buildings.

The initial options, along with some basic capacity and temporary building information, can be seen in Appendix C. This was the working document presented to the Committee on September 28th, 2009. Particular attention has been paid to the impact of at-risk populations on each school's capacity situation. School identified as title 1 schools, those with very high percentages of at-risk students, had their capacity figures reduced, reflecting program delivery. By doing this, each schools utilization figures increased. Since capacity utilization is one of the Committee's criteria, it allowed for a more balanced comparison of all schools.

The Committee carefully reviewed the September 28th options, not just in an effort to examine each individual option, but also to determine if the general approach used by staff to create the options was correct. The Committee had a rich discussion about the options by articulation area and agreed that the approach used was an appropriate way to identify options. Additionally, Committee members were asked to examine all the data provided to them to create any additional options that they felt were missing from the initial list.

October 12th Meeting

Between the September 28th meeting and the Committee's meeting on October 12th, the option list was expanded to include additional options generated by staff and Committee members. The expanded list can be seen in Appendix D, which was a working document from the meeting. Further, this updated list of options included more detailed information about each option including:

- Initial estimates for potential yearly savings, one-time savings and any implementation costs

- Preliminary information on building conditions
- How the options fit with the six evaluation criteria.

The Committee was also given lists of schools sorted by certain criteria, ranking schools from high to low. Committee members requested that this be done to determine if schools that met certain criteria were included in the options. The lists examined six data points:

- Capacity Utilization
- Choice Out
- Net Choice (Difference between number of students choosing out of school and number choosing in)
- Instructional Operating Costs
- Enrollment Forecasts
- Free and Reduced Price Lunch Percentages.

Committee members spent the majority of the meeting working in small groups to further discuss the options. Small groups were used to allow each member greater opportunity to discuss the options than would be possible in a larger group setting. Each small group discussed the specific options in depth and any concerns or issues that they had with the options. Additional options were created based on their discussions and were added as well as a final review of all options was undertaken by staff.

October 26th Meeting

At the October 26th meeting, a list of all possible options was presented to the Committee for approval. These options were then scheduled for release for the public forums planned for November. This list can be seen in Appendix E. Each member of the Committee was asked to individually review the options list and vote on whether each option should be taken forward for public comment. Once the votes were counted it was found that, for each option, at least 50 percent of Committee members voted in favor of moving the option forward. A discussion was then held to see if a higher standard should be used in order to put forth a more manageable list of options for public comment. The Committee, however, concluded that public input would help make better final decisions and it was therefore decided that all the options should go forward to the public.

The Committee worked in small groups during the meeting to identify any general overarching themes that they would also like to take forward to the community. The groups then shared the themes they had identified with the larger group and any similar themes were consolidated to also be put forward for public comment. The four themes identified were:

- Reduction of temps as a goal, with no new temps being installed
- Moving 6th grade up to middle school
- Schools should live within their permanent capacity (Schools should not enroll more students than permanent capacity allows)
- Cuts in facilities lessen the cuts in the classroom; they should “make tough cuts now.”

These general themes and the full list of options were put forward for public comment in November.

Second Round of Public Forums- Public Input on Possible Options

In order to facilitate a better dialogue with the community, additional work was done on all options that were moving forward to the public. This included a much fuller review of the cost impact of each option and an additional evaluation of the feasibility of each option related to space available. The additional feasibility work resulted in the elimination of two of the original options based on permanent design capacity alone. These two options were left on the documents handed out to the public but marked as “not feasible.” The more specific cost estimates were also put forth to the public.

For the second round of public comment the avenues for public input were expanded. Beyond the option of speaking at the public forums, feedback could also be made in the following ways:

- Recording comments on video at the forum sites
- Writing comments on the district’s website
- E-mailing the district
- Submitting a note card with written comments at the forum.

Once again public forums were held across the district to ensure that all community members would have access to a forum in their area and a range of possible dates to attend. These dates were as follows:

- Wednesday, November 11th at the Alameda High School Auditorium from 6:00pm – 7:30pm
- Saturday, November 14th at the Manning School Auditorium from 9:00am – 10:30am
- Monday, November 16th at the Summit Ridge Middle School Auditorium from 6:00pm – 7:30pm
- Wednesday, November 18th at the Pomona High School Auditorium from 6:00pm – 7:30pm

Turnout at the forums was very high with approximately 3,200 people in attendance across the four meetings. The input from the community varied widely and nearly every option had some support and some opposition. As might be expected, the opposition to any option that involved the closure of a school was high. Communities have strong ties to their school educationally, financially, and emotionally. At the same time, there was a broad understanding of the Committee’s need to complete its charge from the Board. There was also great understanding of the district’s current financial situation and how changes to facilities could help the district cut its budget and thus save jobs in instructional areas.

Each type of communication was treated equally and it was stressed that the quality of input versus the quantity received was most important. Committee staff compiled and reviewed every piece of feedback from the various types of input received which was then shared with the Committee. In the end there were:

- 117 speakers,
- 44 recordings at the public forums,
- 190 note cards,
- 588 online feedback, and
- 1,463 emails, voice mails, phone calls, letters and petitions.

All of the feedback from the community has been posted on the Committee’s website and can be reviewed there.

Selection of Final Recommendations

The Committee’s task after the public forums was to identify which options to take forward as final recommendations to the Board. To accomplish this, the Committee had to undertake a number of tasks:

- Review the comments put forth by the public
- Review the updated financial implications of the options
- Create a set of final guiding principles to measure each option against.

November 30th Meeting

At the first Committee meeting after the public forums, the Committee took time to discuss their impressions of the public forums as every Committee member had attended at least one. They then discussed as a group the summaries of all forms of public comment and what options had received the strongest response, either positive or negative. The Committee stressed the need to consider all opinions equally and not just the loudest, reaffirming their position that it was their job to do what is best for all children in Jeffco. The Committee then broke into small groups to again discuss each option individually in light of the community’s feedback. Each of three groups created their own method for going through the options and then deciding if an option should stay on the list or be eliminated for consideration. After each small group went through the options, they then reported back to the full Committee. Each group reflected on how they approached their review of the options and on which ones they voted to put forward for further consideration. By combining the results from all three small groups, four sets of options were created:

- 1) Group 1 – Options that all groups voted to keep
- 2) Group 2 – Options that two of the three groups voted to keep
- 3) Group 3 – Options that one of the three groups voted to keep
- 4) Group 4 – Options that no group voted to keep

It was determined that all options from Group 4, those with support from no small group, be eliminated immediately from consideration. The list of these options can be seen in Appendix F. Additional discussion then focused on those options in Groups 1-3. These options would all be discussed at the

next Committee meeting with a particular focus on Group 2 options. Committee members would also be able at that time to bring up any Group 3 options they felt needed more discussion.

December 14th Meeting

The Committee held its last meeting on December 14th to finalize the set of options it would bring forward to the Board for consideration. General themes to bring forward were also finalized. The meeting was conducted as a full Committee discussion. At the beginning of the meeting, it was agreed upon by the Committee to forward between 10 and 15 options to the Board. It was also agreed that options would be treated as mutually exclusive; in other words, if an option was recommended, then any other option in conflict with it would be removed from consideration.

At this meeting, the Committee was also presented with: 1) feedback from a separate review of the options undertaken by district principals; and 2) additional options suggested by community members. There was discussion about how to include these items into the Committee's recommendations, but ultimately it was decided that they should remain separate since they had not been vetted by both the Committee and the community. However, the Committee found these items were valuable and worth being reviewed by the Board so it was determined that they would instead be included in the final report as appendices. Please refer to Appendix G for the principals' feedback and Appendix H for additional options suggested by the community.

The Committee's options were then considered in groups using the previous meeting's categorization of Group 1, Group 2, and Group 3 based upon the number of groups that had voted in favor of keeping them. Again, options that fell into Group 4 (options that no group voted to keep) were eliminated. The discussion began with the Group 1 options (which had the most support to be put forward to the Board during the previous meeting). Committee members voted on all nine of these options together and agreed to bring all nine options forward to the Board. The Group 1 options can be seen on the top of the next page.

The recommendation to put forward the nine options described above meant a number of Group 2 and 3 recommendations needed to be removed since they were in conflict with one of the Group 1 options. These conflicts were:

- Option 3A – Conflicts with option 3B in Group 3, which was removed.
- Option 12 – Conflicts with options 7B3 and 7D in Group 2, which were removed.
- Option 17A – Conflicts with option 17B in Group 3 which was removed.
- Option 22A – Conflicts with option 22B from Group 2 which was removed.

GROUP 1 RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE BOARD				
Opt. #		Articulation Area		Short Description
3	A	Arvada		Move Arvada MS students to North Arvada MS. Close Arvada Middle School.
4		Arvada West		Consolidate functions from Allendale temps & cottages into the main building.
12		Chatfield Columbine		Move Ken Caryl MS 7-8 and GT program to Deer Creek MS. Close Ken Caryl MS.
16	A	Golden		Move Golden 6th grade to Bell, Pleasant View P to Shelton & Pleasant View K-5 to Welchester. Close Pleasant View.
17	A	Green Mtn.		Move Devinny 6th grade to Dunstan MS.
21	B	Wheat Ridge		Move Wheat Ridge 6th Grade to Everitt MS & Pennington K-5 to Prosp.Valley, Stober & Vivian. Close Pennington.
22	A	Jefferson Wheat Ridge		Move Martensen, Stevens, Molholm & Wilmore Davis 6th Grade to Wheat Ridge MS. Move Martensen K5 to Stevens, Molholm & Wilmore Davis. Close Martensen.
27		Pomona		Move all Pomona area 6th grade to Moore. Distribute Zerger K-5. Close Zerger.
30		District Wide		Close & demolish up to 120 temps at sites where utilization is less than 92%.

After the conflicting options were removed, the Committee continued its work by examining the Group 2 options individually. For a number of the remaining Group 2 options, choices had to be made between one option or another since the two options conflicted with one another. In these cases, both options were put to vote at the same time and the option with the higher number of votes in favor was forwarded to the Board. Three options from Group 2 were forwarded to the Board:

GROUP 2 RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE BOARD				
Opt. #		Articulation Area		Short Description
1	B		Alameda	Move 7th & 8th Grade from O'Connell MS to Alameda HS. Close O'Connell.
24			Wheat Ridge	To align w/other MS changes in Wheat Ridge & Golden areas, expand Manning to 6-8. See Opt.16A & 21A or 21B.
29			Arvada	Distribute Fitzmorris K-6 throughout articulation area. Close Fitzmorris.

The Committee notes two key caveats regarding the Group 2 recommendations:

1. With regard to option 2 – the moving of the Arvada West preschool to Fitzmorris elementary school and the moving of the Swanson preschool to Secrest elementary school- which could not be done in its entirety if option 29 was recommended since that option entailed the closure of Fitzmorris. The Committee would still like the Board to consider moving the Swanson preschool to the Secrest elementary school. Further, if option 29 is not implemented, the Committee recommends the full option 2 be considered.
2. The Committee was closely divided between option 1B which was recommended and option 1A which was moving 6th grade from the Alameda articulation area to O'Connell Middle School. If option 1B is not implemented by the Board, the Committee would recommend reconsidering option 1A.

After reviewing the Group2 options, the Committee turned to the Group 3 options. The Committee discussed the remaining Group 3 options and decided against forwarding any of the options to the Board.

During the final meeting, the Committee talked frequently about focusing back on the criteria during its evaluation of which options to forward to the Board. In the end, the twelve forwarded options are based on the full body of work of the Committee. Specifically, each option meets a number of the criteria set by the Committee when evaluating schools. If all these options were implemented, they would represent a potential annual savings to the district of \$5,880,833. The onetime cost of implementing all options together is \$1,619,524. The options also represent a decrease of 4,196 seats in capacity and the elimination 132 temps and 6 cottages.

It is important to note that any revenues from selling a closed building were not included in the cost estimates. This was partially due to the uncertainty inherent with estimating any possible sales price, especially in the current economic climate. A summary and description of each of the twelve forwarded options can be seen in Appendix I. The descriptions include a map of the option, facility data, enrollment data, program data and an option overview. Before implementing any of the options, the Committee recommends that the district examine the impact on school programs such as special education and ELL programs.

The Committee also forwarded a number of themes to the Board for its consideration. These themes can be used by the Board to help guide future work around the effective and efficient use of facilities in the district. They include the four themes reviewed by the community in November plus two additional ideas. A number of the options that the Committee reviewed over the course of its work can be linked back to these themes. The themes may not be viable in all situations but the district should use them when appropriate.

- Reduction of temporary buildings and closing cottages, with no new temps being installed in the future
- Moving 6th grade up to middle school
- Schools should “live” within their permanent capacity (meaning schools should not enroll more students than their permanent building capacity allows and that, over time, schools should try to manage enrollment to get back within capacity)
- Cuts in facilities now can lessen classroom cuts later on. Making tough decisions now can therefore be in the long term best interests of both the district and its students
- All current school boundaries should be examined to measure the impact on school over/under utilization
- A permanent facilities usage committee should be established to help the district in ongoing efforts to review effective and efficient use of facilities.

The Committee hopes that its recommendations can help the district accomplish its current facility usage and budget goals. It also hopes that the work can be part of a longer term direction in the district’s efforts to have the most efficient and effective use of facilities possible.