

CYPRESS SCHOOL DISTRICT
Cypress, California 90630

MASTER FACILITIES PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

October 14, 2009

3:30 p.m.

Education Center

A meeting regarding the Master Facilities Plan Advisory Committee convened at 3:30 p.m., October 14, 2009. Persons in attendance are listed below:

Board of Trustees:	Ellen Friedmann
District Administration:	Sheri Loewenstein, Superintendent Carrie Delgado, Chief Business Officer Robert Daley, Director, MOT
City Representative:	John Di Mario, Director Community Development, La Palma Cindy Robinson, Community Services Supervisor, La Palma June Liu, Director Recreation and Community Service, Cypress
Consultants:	Lynne Merrick, Schoolhaus Advisors, Inc. Larry Ferchaw, Dolinka Group
School Representatives:	Jodi Novy, Arnold Principal Cindy Hollingworth, Arnold Instructional Aide Dr. Galen Pickett, Arnold Parent Glenda Watkins, Arnold Teacher Jacki Teschke, Cawthon Principal Betty Baldwin, Cawthon School Administrative Secretary Allison Ferrier, Cawthon Parent Isis Ortiz, Cawthon Teacher Carol Erbe, King Principal Vickie Ohlman, King School Administrative Secretary Darrell Crosbie, King Parent Elizabeth Dunagan, King Teacher Tracy Mouren-Laurens Landell Principal Betty Ann Platt, Landell School Administrative Secretary Kim Masukawa, Landell Parent Julie Gautreau, Landell Teacher

Master Facilities Plan Minutes

Page Two

October 14, 2009

M.J. Beatty, Luther Principal
Kari Singer, Luther School Administrative Secretary
Janie Longo, Luther Parent
Jennifer Olsen, Luther Teacher

Jeannette Lohrman, Morris Principal
Sandy Dzurilla, Morris School Administrative Secretary
Della Smith, Morris Parent
Nancy Kaiser, Morris Teacher

Denine Kelly, Swain Principal
Karen Washburn, Swain School Office Assistant
Ana Martinez, Swain Parent
Tracy Cunanan, Swain Teacher

Jane Snyder, Vessels Principal
Chuck Voght, Vessels Teacher

District Employees:

Donna Wittenberg, CSEA President, Transportation
Laurie Sooter, ACT President, Teacher, Morris
Mike Baldwin, Maintenance & Operations

Superintendent Loewenstein called the meeting to order and welcomed the committee members and audience. She introduced Board member Ellen Friedmann in the audience. Ms. Loewenstein reminded committee members school closure is a very important topic that must be taken very seriously. This group will make a recommendation that will go to the Board of Trustees, where the ultimate decision will be made. The next step following the recommendation will be to plan parent meetings at the affected schools, to provide information, receive input, and answer questions. She told the committee we would be discussing the results of the activities done at the last meeting, including the informal vote by each committee member for which two schools should be closed, and the results of the vote for which criteria are most important (ranked 1, 2, and 3) when considering school closure. She then turned the meeting over to consultant Lynne Merrick.

Ms. Merrick provided committee members with a handout indicating the results of the votes for the activities the Superintendent mentioned. She reminded the committee that the original instructions for voting on closure were that the exercise could be done individually or as a school group. This was confusing and skewed the results; therefore, committee members were given an opportunity to give an individual vote, by e-mail, and it was this information that was tabulated. She said that we would have an opportunity to do this exercise again, at the end of the meeting, as we acquire additional information. The individual tally by pairs (which two schools should we close) gave Luther/Cawthon the most votes; Swain/Landell the second most; and Luther/Landell the third most. Individually, Luther received the most votes; Landell the next most; Cawthon the third most; and

Master Facilities Plan Minutes

Page Three

October 14, 2009

Swain the fourth most votes. Ms. Merrick then discussed the criteria for closure, as ranked in importance by committee members. The most important criteria was “least disruption of students” with “number of students in school of residence” second. Third most important was transportation/safety cost.” She went over the definition of the criteria as follows:

“Least disruption of students”: Disruption occurs when a student is required to change schools, so students would be considered “disrupted” if their school closed or their school’s boundaries changed requiring a change in school attendance.

“Number of students in school of residence”: This refers to students who live or reside in a school’s attendance area. However, this conflicts with the number one criteria, which is “least disruption of students” because our schools have a high volume of inter- and intra-district transfer students who have made their “home” school something other than their school of residence. This makes “least disruption of students” and “number of students in schools of residence” mutually exclusive.

“Transportation/safety cost”: Consultants examined how many students would have to be bussed based on the current Board Policy of providing transportation for primary students over one mile from school and upper grade students over 1.5 miles from school.

Ms. Merrick then introduced Larry Ferchaw, Dolinka Group, to go over some new scenarios that had been completed using the new criteria discussed. These included the following:

Scenario A: Close Cawthon and Luther and redraw boundaries for King, Landell, Swain, Vessels, and Morris. In this scenario, an estimated 971 students would change schools and 17 students would need to be bussed.

Scenario B: Close Landell and Luther and redraw boundaries for King, Cawthon, Swain, Vessels, and Morris. In this scenario, an estimated 1,109 students would change schools and 17 students would need to be bussed.

Scenario C: Close Landell and Swain and redraw boundaries for Luther, Cawthon, King, Morris, and Vessels. In this scenario, an estimated 1,304 students would change schools and 84 students would need to be bussed.

Scenario D: Close Cawthon and Swain and redraw boundaries for Luther, Landell, King, Morris, and Vessels. In this scenario, an estimated 1,085 students would change schools and 84 students would need to be bussed.

Denine Kelly asked if students would be forced to change schools when boundaries were re-drawn, or if they would be given a choice by using attrition. Ms. Merrick said that movement of students resulting from boundary change would be based on “choice stability” meaning students would be given the choice to graduate from their home school, unless it was closed. The Superintendent added

Master Facilities Plan Minutes

Page Four

September 30, 2009

that the District will continue our same open enrollment policy for inter- and intra-district transfers, approving as space is available.

Ms. Merrick added that for the scenarios above, transportation requirements were made judging distance “as the crow flies.” We did not take into consideration walking routes for this study.

Janie Longo said it seems to her we need to make a determination regarding whether or not we will continue to have a school offering a year-round calendar choice, in order to accurately make these decisions. The Superintendent stated we would be considering that issue at some point, but said for today we will assume we are keeping the year-round choice school. Without the Board being involved, we cannot make that type of decision. This is considered to be a program/schedule issue, which was fourth on the list of criteria to be considered for closure. Sheri suggested that we put this discussion off until the next meeting as part of our next steps.

Ms. Merrick went back to cover the remainder of the criteria for school closure, as weighted by the committee. Percentages are as follows, in order of importance as determined by the committee:

1.	Least disruption of students	36%
2.	Number of students in school of residence	26%
3.	Transportation/safety cost	18%
4.	Program/schedule	7%
5.	Asset management potential	5%
6.	Existing conditions of facility	3%
7.	Feeder school/jr. high attendance area	2%
8.	Potential loss of enrollment	1%
	Number of students in school of attendance	1%
9.	Geographic location within district	0%
	School test scores	0%

She provided the committee with a chart of the basic asset management criteria, number five on the list. This includes approximate site acreage, existing adjacent uses, existing adjacent zoning, main entry access road, and number of edges of property with street access. She showed that there is not a great deal of difference between the four schools that were part of the closure scenario process, as they are very similar in size, neighborhood usage, and zoning. There is more difference in access, with Cawthon and Swain having poorer access and Landell and Luther better access. All of our schools are zoned the same, and we would have to work with each city if we wanted to sell or develop a site. Ms. Merrick then turned the meeting back over to the Superintendent.

Ms. Loewenstein acknowledged that this was a lot of information. She told committee members she would ask them to use the new information and complete the same activity we did at the last meeting with the criteria charts. They were again provided with post-it notes numbered 1, 2, and 3 and asked to place them on the chart that reflected the criteria of most importance to them from first to third.

Master Facilities Plan Minutes

Page Five

October 14, 2009

She went over the criteria again and asked if anyone wanted to add anything. “Potential loss of enrollment” was added to the charts.

Following completion of this activity, Ms. Loewenstein handed out blank pages again to each committee member and asked them to individually list the two schools they would close if they had to make the decision today. Papers were collected and results will be brought back to the next meeting.

Finally, Superintendent Loewenstein gave some homework to committee members. She asked each team (school or district totaling nine teams) to provide input on two statements, **in the best interest of the future of the Cypress School District**, relating to Cawthon, Landell, Luther, and Swain, the four schools in the scenarios today:

1. Reasons the school should stay open –
2. Reasons the school should close –

Ms. Merrick will e-mail the principals at each school to get the results for the team. She needs it back within a week, so that it can be tabulated and brought back to the next meeting. Information will be due on October 21, 2009.

Superintendent Loewenstein adjourned the meeting at 5:00 p.m. The next meeting will be held on October 28, 2009, 3:30 p.m. in the Education Center.

/jb