

To: Board of Directors
From: Robert J. O'Donnell
Date: January 28, 2013
Subject: Reflecting on Community Forum #1 (High School Project)

This past Wednesday, we hosted our first Community Forum regarding the High School Project planning. The feedback from the forum included several questions and suggestions from the participants. The forum also included feedback via the iClicker technology; our Board subcommittee for communications will be reflecting on that information tomorrow morning and compiling this for board review in the near future.

We have invited our referendum consultant, Mike Paston, 501 Group, to participate with us during a conversation about two questions that were raised during the forum.

- How will the Board make the decision to select one option that will then be reflected on the referendum?
- Will the Board consider placing the two independent 9-12 high schools back into the process for consideration?

Regarding the option that includes two independent 9-12 high schools, below is the rationale behind why our administrative team, with information from our contractors, proposed the removal of this option from the planning process:

- 1 Our demographic studies evidenced decreased enrollment, and we do not see a change in this trend in the foreseeable future.
 - a Although we are updating our demographic study data at this time, our most updated data is located on our web site: <http://www.scasd.org/page/897>.
 - b Attached is our January 2013 enrollment data for the district.
 - i Our current high school enrollment (with Delta included) is 2,358.
 - ii Our current grade 5-8 enrollment is 2,074.
 - c Also, attached is our enrollment history since 1997.
 - i During the past 11 years, we experienced a decline in district K-12 enrollment by 511 students.
 - ii During the past 11 years, grades 9-12 have experienced a decrease of enrollment by 164 students (includes Delta enrollments).
 - d The above information is simply for reference. In March 2013, we expect the updated results of our demographic study by Stewman Demographics.
- 2 We would be required to duplicate facilities.

- a For example, two independent high schools would include duplicate facilities such as athletics/physical education, art, cafeteria kitchen, career and technology center, music rooms, pool - only 1 pool qualifies for PDE reimbursement, etc).
- 3 When we consider why some community members recommend the option of two independent 9-12 schools, they mention “relationships” and “opportunity” as part of their rationale.
 - a These are reasonable areas of motivation.
 - b In our process, we will address relationships via our smaller school within a school model (e.g. - small learning communities & career cluster academies). Similar models are very successful in our large and high performing middle schools via a different type of structure known as “interdisciplinary teaming.”
 - c *Please know that we currently have a second and smaller high school located in our Fairmont Avenue School: Delta Program.*
 - d When we look at our district’s financial struggles during the next five years, we will be working to become a more efficiently staffed operation. Adding a third high school does not align with our financial demands.
- 4 Finally, we believe that splitting into two high schools has the potential of tearing apart our community. Without experiencing significant growth, we do not see the rationale to spend time and resources to developing the explicit detail for this option and slow our project calendar.

I look forward to the conversation about the above information.