

Introduction

The mission of Seattle Public Schools is to ensure a high quality school for every student—a school where all students meet or exceed grade-level expectations and graduate from high school prepared for college, career, and life.

The District's *Excellence for All* plan—developed in partnership with the community and adopted by the School Board in June 2008—focuses on academic achievement for all students, excellent teachers in every classroom, and efficient systems and services that support success in each of our schools. One of the key strategies in the plan is to manage the District's facilities more wisely by correcting a long-standing imbalance in classroom capacity, both in terms of overall number of seats relative to student enrollment and in terms of the geographic location of classroom capacity relative to where school-aged children live in our city.

This document contains Final Recommendations on Capacity Management. The Final Recommendations stem directly from the Superintendent's Preliminary Recommendations, released on November 25, 2008. They reflect concerns and comments of the School Board raised at both regularly scheduled School Board meetings and Board Workshops on capacity management; as well as comments given during public testimony at regularly scheduled School Board meetings and site-specific hearings, as well as the hundreds of emails and comments received from staff at schools, families, students and community members since the release of the Preliminary Recommendations.

These final recommendations will strengthen the District's ability to deliver on the promise of an excellent education for every student by:

- Moving or adding certain programs to improve equity and access to educational programs within the District
- Focusing the District's resources on fewer facilities and programs in order to protect our long-term fiscal health and strengthen our ability to support student learning
- Improving the balance of classroom capacity with respect to projected enrollment and the geographic location of school-aged children in the city.

The following chart summarizes the Final Recommendations for building closures and program changes:

SUMMARY OF SEATTLE PUBLIC SCHOOLS FINAL CAPACITY MANAGEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS

BUILDING CLOSURES	RELOCATED PROGRAMS	NEW PROGRAMS	DISCONTINUED PROGRAMS
Genesee Hill Mann T.T. Minor Van Asselt Old Hay (may be temporary, depending on enrollment)	Half of Lowell APP to Thurgood Marshall Half of Washington APP to Hamilton NOVA to Meany Pathfinder K-8 to Cooper SBOC to Meany T.T. Minor Montessori to Leschi Thurgood Marshall EBOC to Dunlap and Hawthorne Van Asselt to AAA	New K-8 at Jane Addams	African American Academy Cooper Meany T. T. Minor Summit K-12

These Final Recommendations will be the subject of a public hearing on January 22, 2009, and a vote on the recommendations by the School Board is scheduled for January 29, 2009. Please visit our website at www.seattleschools.org and click on Capacity Management for more information about opportunities to continue to be involved as recommendations are reviewed and plans for implementation are prepared.

While we recognize the difficult nature of decisions to close school buildings and end or relocate programs, we also underscore that the urgency of correcting this costly imbalance in classroom capacity has only increased since the release of the Preliminary Recommendations. The district faces an immediate budget shortfall of more than \$25 million. This budget shortfall for the coming academic year, made particularly severe by the current recession, is the result of several major long-term factors:

- The state requires public school districts to offer an education to children in the community but does not cover the actual costs of providing that education
- Seattle Public Schools has for years maintained more facilities than can be justified given current and projected enrollment
- Seattle Public Schools honored a long-term commitment to steadily increase teacher pay so that we are now competitive with districts in our region as we seek to retain and recruit excellent teachers for every classroom.

While there is an immediate need to prepare a balanced budget for the coming academic year, actions must be taken to strengthen our financial condition for the years to come. With practices to improve future fiscal health at the forefront of our thinking, staff are working collaboratively to address the budget shortfall by identifying opportunities for increased revenue (including federal, state, and local funding sources) and eliminating expenditures. Expenditures will be

reduced through a variety of measures, including central office staff reductions, building closures, and improvements to transportation and other services that result in efficiencies.

We wish to acknowledge the many hundreds of hours that our families, students, community members, teachers, principals, central staff and School Board members have devoted to helping prepare these Final Recommendations. The input that the District will continue to listen to leading up to the School Board vote will add to our understanding of what it will take to successfully implement these recommendations. We are committed to learning from both the successes and the shortcomings of past building closure processes. We are equally committed to continuing to work together to make the tough academic and operational decisions that our numerous external audits urge us to confront.

Costs and Savings Expected by Closing Buildings and Moving Programs

The district expects to receive both general fund and capital savings and to incur general fund and capital costs as a result of closing buildings and discontinuing or moving programs.

General fund savings will begin in the 2009-10 year and will continue, as long as buildings are not reused for instructional purposes. Savings include staff reductions, utilities, and non-capital maintenance savings. The five-year general fund net benefit of school closures (that is, savings minus costs) is estimated to be \$16,207,061.

The majority of the general fund costs of closing schools will be incurred in the current fiscal year. These costs include all activities around planning, packing, decommissioning, moving, unpacking and set-up of moved programs at receiving locations. Costs that will extend into the 2009-10 fiscal year are the costs to shutter the closed buildings.

Capital savings include deferment of scheduled capital improvement projects and elimination of capital maintenance expense of closed buildings. The Capital Fund net benefit of school closures (again, savings minus costs) projected through 2011 is estimated to be \$33,163,648.

Capital Fund costs will be incurred in both the 2008-09 and the 2009-10 fiscal years. Capital costs include alterations and improvements to accommodate new programs or increased student and staff at receiving school sites. Capital costs also include materials and equipment for shuttering and securing closed buildings.

See Appendix A for details on general fund and capital costs and savings for each Final Recommendation.

Reduction of Excess Seats

Looking at the district in aggregate we have a planning capacity of 53,181, as compared to our October 1, 2008 enrollment of 44,393. This leaves a total planning capacity excess of 9,064.¹ In brief, “planning capacity” is a formula that multiplies the number of classrooms by an average class size, and then subtracts some spaces for elective activities.² This results in a high-level, generalized, number of students who can be accommodated in a given building. A functional capacity analysis is in process, and preliminary information indicates that there are variances between planning and functional capacity. Although this analysis is not yet complete, the data collected so far has been an additional valuable source of information.

If approved by the School Board, the closure of the five buildings included in these Final Recommendations (Genesee Hill, Van Asselt, Mann, TT Minor and Old Hay) will eliminate 2,297 seats, which will reduce our total planning capacity excess to 6,767.

As discussed later in these Final Recommendations, approximately 3,000 of these excess seats (based on planning capacity) are at the high school level and though not addressed in these recommendations, that excess will be addressed in the development of the new student assignment plan.

Developing the Final Recommendations

These Final Recommendations were developed using the same guidelines as the Preliminary Recommendations, and were additionally informed by the comments and suggestions received from the School Board, families, and community members.

The guidelines used³ were twofold:

Programmatic Guidelines

- Do programs need to move to other areas of the district to improve equity and access to these programs?
- Do programs need to be added in areas of the district to improve equity and access to these programs?
- How will closures or program moves affect student learning and the district’s fiscal health?

Operational Guidelines

¹ Please see Appendix B for the planning capacity spreadsheet that has been used throughout this process. When the functional capacity analysis is complete we will be able to compare our enrollment against that number to identify our true excess capacity. In addition, a discussion of planning capacity can be found in the Preliminary Recommendations beginning on page 9.

² A discussion of planning capacity can be found in the Preliminary Recommendations beginning on page 9.

³ See Preliminary Recommendations, November 25, 2008, beginning on page 13, for a full discussion and definitions of the guidelines and process used.

- Geographic need— is there a shortage or excess of seats in the area?
- Building condition—based on the state-required Study & Survey analysis
- Cost per pupil—the administrative (non-instructional) costs of the school
- Proximity—are there other schools nearby?
- Academic performance—is the school in school improvement as defined by No Child Left Behind?

The academic performance guideline has raised a number of questions from community members. In brief, schools are either in “school improvement” or not in “school improvement” based on how the school does on the WASL. This identification comes from the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI). Schools that are in “school improvement” are ranked based on being in “step 0” (also known as the warning step) or steps 1-5. A school not in school improvement has met state standards (also known as meeting “adequate yearly progress” or AYP) in every area in which the school is evaluated. As school in step 0 has failed to meet state standards for one year in at least one measured area; schools in step 1-5 have failed to meet state standards in at least one area for multiple years—for example, a school in step 5 has failed to meet standards for six consecutive years.

Schools that receive Title I funding (based on their percentage of students who qualify for free/reduced price lunch) that are in step 4 of school improvement (meaning they have failed to meet standards for five consecutive years) must develop a restructuring plan; schools in step 5 must implement that plan.

The Preliminary Recommendations released on November 25, 2008 reflected initial analysis of current programs and buildings using these guidelines. These Final Recommendations are based on the same programmatic and operational guidelines, more data and further analysis, and review of the many comments we received via e-mail, at two community workshops and at hearings held at sites recommended for closure in the Preliminary Recommendations.

Comments Heard Throughout This Process

In order to gather public feedback,⁴ public testimony was taken at regularly scheduled School Board meetings and site-specific hearings for the schools recommended for closure in the Preliminary Recommendations—TT Minor, Mann, Old Hay, Pinehurst, Van Asselt, Genesee Hill. The Lowell hearing, scheduled for December 18, was postponed due to weather conditions. While Lowell is not recommended for closure in these Final Recommendations we have rescheduled the Lowell hearing for January 20, to ensure compliance with School Board policy H 01.00. Transcripts for the hearings can be found on-line at: <http://www.seattleschools.org/area/capacity/index.dxml>

⁴ Notes from the community meetings can be found at Appendix C and on-line at <http://www.seattleschools.org/area/capacity/index.dxml>

In addition, the district hosted two community workshops—one on December 4th and the second on December 6th. Approximately 300 community members participated in the workshops. Community members were provided with the same data used by the closure team to identify the Preliminary Recommendations, and asked to review the data, ask questions about the Preliminary Recommendations, and to identify alternatives or solutions.

Affected schools and programs identified in the Preliminary Recommendations also held individual meetings that were supported by their principals and instructional directors. These allowed time for conversations specific to how individual schools and programs may be affected.

Throughout this process we have received hundreds of emails about the various proposals and options. A notebook with these emails is located in the School Board office for Board Director and public review. The notebook will be available for review in the School Board office until January 29, 2009, the date the School Board is scheduled to vote on the Final Recommendations.⁵

This School Board and Superintendent felt it was critical to allow time and openness for public comment and additional analysis to inform the Final Recommendations. This was different than the 2006 closure process when discussions about options occurred privately.

The discussions about the recommendations reflected some of the options and suggestions that had been raised since the release of the Preliminary Recommendations. We recognize that this public process was unsettling for some; however, we felt it was important for everyone to hear the options, have a chance to wrestle with the data, and understand why we ended up with these Final Recommendations.

Some have suggested that one or more departments from the John Stanford Center (JSCEE) move to an underutilized building and that student programs move into the John Stanford Center. This would allow us to close buildings while also filling other buildings that have excess capacity. While the thinking is innovative, the JSCEE is in a zoned industrial area and schools are explicitly prohibited within the Seattle Municipal Code on land use.

A number of people have noted that in the last closure process (in 2006) a number of students did not choose to attend their assigned school, and some students chose to leave the district altogether. In that round of building closures approximately 50% of the students from the closed building chose to enroll in their newly assigned building; about 20% of the total students displaced (154 out of 743) chose to leave the district.⁶

We do not know why so many students chose not to attend their newly assigned school—the projection had been that 80% of students would attend the new school, based on telephone surveys conducted. We also do not know why students chose to leave the district, although 26%

⁵ After January 29, 2009 the public can still review this notebook by contacting the District's Public Record's Officer at 206-252-0117.

⁶ A final report on the 2006 process can be found on-line at <http://www.seattleschools.org/area/capacity/schoolboardfinancecommreport120407.pdf>

of those who left (41 out of 154) were non-residents—that is, students who attend a Seattle Public School but who live outside the district.

In this process we realize that not all students will choose to attend their newly assigned school. However, we hope that families will take this opportunity to visit their new schools, speak with the principal and other parents, and make an informed decision about what is an academically appropriate choice for their child.

Comments from specific public hearings are included in the discussion of those Final Recommendations.

Programmatic Design Teams

Implementing these Final Recommendations will require a number of “design teams” targeted at the various changes. The purpose of a design team is to have a dedicated team charged with identifying possible issues or concerns and finding solutions. In general, design teams will address issues such as:

- What is the best way to bring two student and staff populations together?
- How can staff and students be supported for the remainder of the 2008-09 year?
- What is the best way to transition students and staff who are moving?
- Do any renovations need to be made to the building?
- Are there supplies or materials needed for the new program?
- Are there additional professional development needs for staff?

The creation of design teams is a change from the 2006 closure process. In 2006 there was a team of central office staff and the principals from the impacted buildings. The team was charged with addressing both the logistical and programmatic issues for *every* closure and so could not focus on any one change. By having individual design teams for the various recommendations the transition of students and staff will be smoother and programs will begin the next school year ready to go.

More information about specific design teams is included in the Final Recommendations.

Logistics Design Team

In addition to the programmatic design team there is a team of central office staff who will be focused on the logistical issues, including purchases of additional curriculum, packing and moving, computer and phone moves, refurbishing computers, cleaning, and building modifications.

The logistics design team creates and implements the deployment plan for the approved recommendations. The team is responsible for identifying and applying the schedule, budget,

and resources required. The team will also identify savings opportunities and methods to minimize disruption to transitioning programs throughout the project life cycle.

This team will not include principals as full time members, although principal expertise may be tapped as logistical decisions are made.

Building Names

There are two building names outstanding from prior School Board decisions—Dr. Casper W. Sharples and Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. These closure recommendations also impact three buildings named after local and national figures, Henry Van Asselt, TT Minor, and Horace Mann. We must address naming issues holistically, determining whether these names should be retained on closed buildings, or if buildings that continue to be used for instructional purposes should be renamed in honor of Drs. Sharples and King and Messrs. Van Asselt, Minor, and Mann.

Additionally, at this time, Seattle Public Schools has a number of programs with names that differ from that of their buildings, which can result in confusion. For example, Salmon Bay at Monroe—to the students and community it is Salmon Bay, but to others it is Monroe. The Superintendent and School Board need to determine if program names that differ from building names will be allowed to continue.

Reference Area Changes

Modifications to Elementary Reference Areas are needed to implement these recommendations. All areas of the district need to be identified with a school so that as students move in or start school the appropriate assignment "tiebreakers" and transportation eligibility can be determined. The changes recommended in these Final Recommendations are for the purposes of this capacity management process and may be changed as a result of the upcoming student assignment plan changes. These changes would NOT affect current student assignments. These Final Recommendations include the following reference area changes:

- The TT Minor reference area becomes the Lowell reference area
- The Van Asselt reference area becomes the Wing Luke reference area, and the Wing Luke reference area becomes the Van Asselt reference area (no current Van Asselt or Wing Luke students would be reassigned through this change)
- Cooper reference area merges with Sanislo

Final Recommendations

Comprehensive High School Changes

The Preliminary Recommendations included a recommendation to co-locate the Summit K-12 program at Rainier Beach High School.⁷ Subsequent options included moving Aki Kurose to Rainier Beach and creating a 6-12 program, or moving The Center School to Rainier Beach. The genesis of each of these options was the desire to eliminate the excess capacity that exists in our comprehensive high schools.

There is significant excess planning capacity at the high school level—3,000 seats more than enrollment requires.⁸ The functional capacity analysis is underway and will be completed by January 13, 2009; however, early indications show that while functional capacity is lower than the planning capacity, there are still more seats than our current and projected enrollment require.

Despite the excess capacity at the comprehensive high school level, the Final Recommendation is to delay the decision on the closure of a comprehensive high school. However, the excess capacity must be addressed, and any closure options should be aligned with and addressed by the development of the new Student Assignment Plan.⁹

Some of the issues that need to be discussed when addressing comprehensive high school closures include:

- Concentration of high poverty students and high numbers of students with large achievement gaps in potentially impacted schools
- Specific plans to support student safety
- Thoughtful discussion about comprehensive large schools vs. comprehensive small schools vs. alternative schools

TT Minor

The Final Recommendation is to close the TT Minor building, move the Montessori program to Leschi and reassign the remaining TT Minor students to Lowell. The reassignment of TT Minor students to Lowell in this Final Recommendation is different from the Preliminary Recommendation. The discussion of the Preliminary Recommendation, including the rationale, can be found in the Preliminary Recommendations, November 25, 2008, beginning on page 31¹⁰.

⁷ The Preliminary Recommendation can be found on-line at http://www.seattleschools.org/area/capacity/preliminary_report_and_appendices.pdf beginning on page 27

⁸ See Appendix D for a chart of high school planning capacity vs. current enrollment.

⁹ See Appendix E for a document presented to the School Board on December 9, 2008 about high school concerns.

¹⁰ The Preliminary Recommendations, including Appendices, can be found on-line at http://www.seattleschools.org/area/capacity/preliminary_report_and_appendices.pdf

We continue to recommend relocating the Montessori program to Leschi. While the program currently is a K-3 program, the Leschi building has sufficient excess space to allow the program to grow to a K-5, which is the intention of this recommendation.

In addition, with the Final Recommendation to keep the Lowell building open, there is a need to add a general education program into that building. A building with only APP and special education students is contrary to our requirements to provide special education students with access to general education curriculum and to typically developing peers. Moving some of the TT Minor students into the Lowell building will alleviate this concern.

Additionally, because more students will be moved out of Lowell than will be replaced with TT Minor students, we believe that this recommendation will alleviate the current overcrowding at Lowell, while also allowing some room for growth in either the general education or APP program.

A programmatic design team will be created to facilitate moving the Montessori program to Leschi. Among other things this team will be focused on ensuring the smooth implementation of the program at Leschi and determining the best way to continue growing the program so that it can become a full K-5 program.

A design team will also be created to facilitate the move of TT Minor students to Lowell. That team is discussed in the Lowell Final Recommendation, below.

Reassignment of TT Minor Students

Assignment of special education students will be predicated on the student's individual needs, the service delivery model and location of services. See Appendix G for specifics on the reassignment of TT Minor students.

Students who are not satisfied with their new assignment will have the opportunity to apply for another school through the regular school choice process. The Open Enrollment time period for 2009-10 has been rescheduled to March 2 – March 31, 2009. This assures that families impacted by building closures and/or repurposing will be able to participate on an equal footing in the Open Enrollment process for next fall.

Demographic & Integration Effects

See Appendix H for specifics on the Demographic & Integration Effects of this Final Recommendation.

Proposed Site Classification

The site classification of the building is recommended to be changed from “essential” to “inventory.”

Comments from Public Hearing

The TT Minor public hearing was held on December 15, 2008. A number of people commented about the community nature of the building—that there were many families in the school who could walk. In addition, a number of people commented on the value that an open school building brings to the community.

People testified about the quality of the Montessori program, and indicated that if we would allow the program to grow more students would be attracted. This Final Recommendation is to move the program to Leschi and grow to a full K-5 program.

It is clear that TT Minor families appreciate the school and the education the students are receiving. However, in the current budget environment we cannot afford to support a building with such a low condition coupled with significant under-enrollment.

The transcript from the public hearing is available on-line at http://www.seattleschools.org/area/capacity/TTMinor_Hearing_TranscriptDec15.pdf

Lowell

The Preliminary Recommendations recommended that Lowell Elementary be closed, that special education students be reassigned based on their home address and special education service delivery standards, and recommended that the APP students be reassigned to either Thurgood Marshall or Hawthorne, depending on their home address.¹¹ The Final Recommendation for Lowell is different than the Preliminary Recommendation.

Based on further analysis and information received through the public comment period, we determined that by retaining the special education programs and about half of the APP program at Lowell, while moving the general education TT Minor students into the Lowell building, that a comprehensive educational environment that would appropriately provide for all levels of learners would be created. The Final Recommendation is still to move approximately half of the APP students to Thurgood Marshall.

These new elementary advanced learning programs will model and refine strategies that most successfully allow students to accelerate accomplishment of Grade Level Expectations. A major goal for the new programs will be development of acceleration strategies that can be used in any school.

One option discussed with the School Board was the closure of Montlake and reassigning Montlake students to the seats opened up by transferring about half of the Lowell APP students to Thurgood Marshall. While the central cluster has sufficient planning capacity to close one additional building, another closure would reduce excess capacity to fewer than 100 seats.

¹¹ The Preliminary Recommendation for Lowell can be found on-line at http://www.seattleschools.org/area/capacity/preliminary_report_and_appendices.pdf beginning on page 32.

Current enrollment projections indicate a continued decline in the central cluster; however, the uncertainty of the economy and the recent news reports about increased residents in the area leads us to conclude that excess capacity not be reduced to fewer than 100 seats at this time.

The decision to split APP reflects three things: (1) adherence to the guidelines around access to high quality programs—two separate locations and inclusion of students of all levels is expected to make this program more accessible to many; (2) the desire to use the specially designed spaces for special education students while also ensuring that special education students receive access to typically developing peers and general education curriculum; and (3) the data on an insufficient amount of excess capacity to close another elementary in the central cluster.

This Final Recommendation allows the special education students at Lowell to have access to general education curriculum and typically developing peers, which is in line with relevant law and best practices. Additionally, this Final Recommendation allows the general education TT Minor students to be moved together to Lowell, thus keeping this part of the TT Minor community intact.

Two programmatic design teams will be created with this recommendation—one to facilitate the TT Minor/Lowell program and one to facilitate the Thurgood Marshall/Lowell program. These design teams will work on, among other things, how to create a cohesive learning environment for students at all levels and how to facilitate a smooth transition for students coming into new buildings. These teams will be separate, to allow them to better address issues unique to their buildings, but it is expected that at times they will come together to address similar issues.

Policy Impact

Programs for highly capable students were in part governed by School Board Policy D 12.00, which can be found on-line at <http://www.seattleschools.org/area/policies/d/D12.00.pdf>. This Final Recommendation includes rescinding the portion of this policy that restricts the number of self-contained highly capable programs to the number in existence in 1993-94.¹² The need for the remainder of the policy should be reviewed in light of the findings of the recent APP review and the subsequently adopted School Board Policies on program placement, F 21.00 and C 56.00.¹³

Reassignment of Lowell Students

Assignment of special education students will be predicated on the student's individual needs, the service delivery model and location of services. See Appendix G for specifics on the reassignment of Lowell students.

¹² It should be noted that D 12.00 predates the current program placement policy and does not speak to splitting existing programs, as opposed to creating new programs.

¹³ These policies, along with other Board policies and procedures, can be found on-line at <http://www.seattleschools.org/area/policies/index.xml>

Students who are not satisfied with their new assignment will have the opportunity to apply for another school through the regular school choice process. The Open Enrollment time period for 2009-10 has been rescheduled to March 2 – March 31, 2009. This assures that families impacted by building closures and/or repurposing will be able to participate on an equal footing in the Open Enrollment process for next fall.

Demographic & Integration Effects

See Appendix H for specifics on the Demographic & Integration Effects of this Final Recommendation.

Proposed Site Classification

As the Lowell building is no longer being recommended for closure for instructional purposes; we recommend that the Lowell site remain classified as “essential”.

Comments from Public Hearing

The Lowell public hearing was originally scheduled for December 18, 2008, but was postponed due to inclement weather. The hearing has been rescheduled for Tuesday, January 20, 2009, from 6:30-8:30 in the Lowell building. It is important to note that the District is still holding a school specific hearing for Lowell even though the building is no longer slated to close, as School Board Policy H.01.00 calls for school-specific hearings for any school recommended for closure in the Preliminary Recommendations.

We also want to note that we heard reports from the Lowell community at School Board meetings, at both Community Work Shops and via many emails from the Lowell community. This input helped in formulating this Final Recommendation.

Once completed, the transcript from the public hearing will be available on-line at <http://www.seattleschools.org/area/capacity/index.dxml>

Thurgood Marshall

The Preliminary Recommendation for Thurgood Marshall was to relocate the Elementary Bilingual Orientation Center (EBOC) classrooms to Bailey Gatzert and to relocate approximately half of the elementary APP students (those in the Central, South, Southeast, West Seattle North and West Seattle South clusters) to Thurgood Marshall. This Final Recommendation is slightly different from the Preliminary Recommendation. The discussion of this recommendation, including the rationale, can be found in the Preliminary Recommendations, November 25, 2008, beginning on page 33¹⁴. Current Thurgood Marshall students will continue to be assigned to Thurgood Marshall, although students who wish to transfer from Thurgood Marshall are welcome to apply to another school through the regular school choice process.

¹⁴ The Preliminary Recommendations, including Appendices, can be found on-line at http://www.seattleschools.org/area/capacity/preliminary_report_and_appendices.pdf

The difference between the Preliminary and Final Recommendations addresses the EBOC classrooms. Rather than placing all four classrooms at Bailey Gatzert, the Final Recommendation is to place two classrooms at Dunlap, in the Southeast cluster, and the remaining two classrooms at Hawthorne Elementary, in the South cluster.

This change to the recommendation puts four classrooms for EBOC students further south, where a sizable population of EBOC students lives. This puts the students closer to their homes and enables them to attend school with children in the same area who do not need EBOC services. A reduction in transportation costs is also anticipated. The other EBOC programs are currently located at John Stanford International School and West Seattle Elementary. We note that the EBOC program is a transition program, thus it is likely that while the EBOC classrooms will be relocated, most EBOC students who are in the program now will have moved on to permanent assignments by the fall. Therefore this move will primarily impact new students who require this transition program.

Reassignment of EBOC Students and Relocation of EBOC Classrooms

Assignment of special education students will be predicated on the student's individual needs, the service delivery model and location of services. See Appendix G for specifics on the reassignment of Thurgood Marshall students.

Students who are not satisfied with their new assignment will have the opportunity to apply for another school through the regular school choice process. The Open Enrollment time period for 2009-10 has been rescheduled to March 2 – March 31, 2009. This assures that families impacted by building closures and/or repurposing will be able to participate on an equal footing in the Open Enrollment process for next fall.

Demographic & Integration Effects

See Appendix H for specifics on the Demographic & Integration Effects of this Final Recommendation.

Proposed Site Classification

There is no recommendation to close the Thurgood Marshall building for instructional purposes; therefore we recommend that the Thurgood Marshall site remain classified as "essential."

Old Hay & Mann

The Final Recommendation is to close the Old Hay and Mann buildings and relocate the Secondary Bilingual Orientation Center (SBOC) and Nova high school to the Meany building. This recommendation is the same as in the Preliminary Recommendation. The discussion of the Old Hay recommendation can be found in the Preliminary Recommendations, November 25,

2008, beginning on page 18 and the discussion of the Mann building recommendation begins on page 30¹⁵.

As discussed in the Preliminary Recommendations, the School Board approved an action in May 2006 that, among other things, set forth seven items to be considered in the possible relocation of the SBOC. The recommendation to co-locate the SBOC with the Nova program meets a number of the terms, but does not meet the term of having the program in a stand-alone facility. However, Meany is very centrally located, has appropriately-sized facilities for secondary students, and the co-location of these two programs will allow each program to grow if that is appropriate.

We do not believe that having the SBOC by itself in a building is academically appropriate for the students. Being co-located is responsive to the recommendations in the recent bilingual review, will ensure that we are compliant with federal law requiring that non-English speaking students have access to typical language peers, will give SBOC guidance in becoming an alternative learning experience program, will benefit both student groups and may allow both groups of students to participate in shared learning experiences.

At this point we recommend keeping the Bilingual Family Center (BFC) at the Aki Kurose site. This will allow the SBOC and Nova to move into the Meany building and organize their spaces while we review whether it is appropriate to bring the BFC to Meany or keep it at Aki Kurose.

Pursuant to the May 2006 Board action, sufficient capital funds will be used for the SBOC program at Meany to enable that program's relocation and to meet its operational needs. After the SBOC moves into Meany, district staff will work with the SBOC leaders and families to determine the best use of those dollars.

A programmatic design team will be created with representatives from both the SBOC and Nova. This team will work on issues such as arranging student schedules, building safety and governance issues. It should be noted that this recommendation is to co-locate these programs—as such it is expected that each program will have a leader and a separate budget. That being said, there will be opportunities for both programs to be enhanced by working together—perhaps sharing a librarian or a nurse. The design team will be charged with working through those issues.

The SBOC portion of the design team will also work with the bilingual department to clarify the program's role in furthering the department's vision of *a system-wide instructional program of quality services addressing the needs of all English Language Learner students*. And the Nova portion of the design team will work to ensure that the art and other things that have been developed at Mann can be relocated to the Meany facility, including working with district staff on green building techniques at Meany.

¹⁵ The Preliminary Recommendations, including Appendices, can be found on-line at http://www.seattleschools.org/area/capacity/preliminary_report_and_appendices.pdf

Policy Impact

This Final Recommendation includes a recommendation that the School Board rescind the elements of the May 2006 Board Action that are not compatible with this academic direction—specifically elements (b), (e) and (g) of section 4 of the Board Action¹⁶. This does not include rescinding the commitment outlined in section 6 of the same Board Action to “secure revenues” to fund renovations of a new site for the SBOC.

Reassignment of SBOC and Nova Students

All SBOC students who continue to qualify for the program will be reassigned to SBOC @ Meany. All Nova students will be reassigned to Nova @ Meany. Students in the IDP program @ Summit will be reassigned to the Nova @ Meany program.

Students who are not satisfied with their new assignment will have the opportunity to apply for another school through the regular school choice process. The Open Enrollment time period for 2009-10 has been rescheduled to March 2 – March 31, 2009. This assures that families impacted by building closures and/or repurposing will be able to participate on an equal footing in the Open Enrollment process for next fall.

Demographic & Integration Effects

See Appendix H for specifics on the Demographic & Integration Effects of this Final Recommendation.

Proposed Site Classification

The site classification of both the Old Hay and Mann buildings is recommended to be changed from “essential” to “inventory.” If Old Hay is reopened for instructional purposes as a result of increased enrollment then the recommendation would be to change the classification back to “essential.”

Comments from Public Hearing—Old Hay

Some people testified about historical commitments made to the SBOC, while others testified about both the need for additional seats at the elementary level in the Queen Anne/Magnolia cluster.

In terms of capacity in the cluster, this Final Recommendation does not preclude reopening the Old Hay building as an elementary school for fall 2010; that decision will be made this spring after enrollment numbers for fall 2009 are available

¹⁶ The Board Action Report is included as Appendix 9 of the Preliminary Recommendations, and can be found online at http://www.seattleschools.org/area/capacity/preliminary_report_and_appendices.pdf

Comments from Public Hearing—Mann

A number of people testified about the unique spirit of Nova that pervades the Mann building, and about the knowledge and skills that students have gained in the program. Other spoke about the need for a central location because of the relationship with Garfield High School and Seattle Central Community College.

The majority of the people testifying were students, and their commitment to the ideals of Nova and to making a smooth transition was evident—even in those who do not want to leave the Mann building. Given Nova’s governance system the district encourages students to participate in the programmatic design team to ensure that Nova retains its central character.

Assignment of Meany Students/Splitting Middle School Accelerated Progress Program

With the Final Recommendation to co-locate the SBOC and Nova together in the Meany building, Meany Middle School students must be reassigned. A number of students at Meany live in the Central region, and Washington Middle School would be the logical choice for their new assignment. However, Washington is now at capacity and cannot accommodate additional students.

Therefore we recommend dividing the middle school Accelerated Progress Program (APP) students between Hamilton and Washington Middle Schools, based on their home addresses. By moving middle school APP students to Hamilton sufficient space is created for the Meany Middle School students who live in the Central cluster to attend Washington. As with the recommendation to split the elementary APP program, it is expected that this will result in increased access for students. This Final Recommendation is different than the Preliminary Recommendation.

If this Final Recommendation is approved, two APP pathways will be created. Students who live in the Queen Anne/Magnolia, Northwest, North and Northeast clusters will attend Lowell for elementary school, Hamilton for middle school, and Garfield for high school. Students who live in the Central, South, Southeast, West Seattle North and West Seattle South clusters will attend Thurgood Marshall, Washington, and Garfield. As with the elementary APP recommendation, the two middle school programs will model and refine strategies that most successfully allow students to accelerate accomplishment of Grade Level Expectations, and will develop acceleration strategies that can be used in any school.

New elementary and middle school advanced learning programs will model and refine strategies that most successfully allow students to accelerate accomplishment of Grade Level Expectations.

Programmatic design teams will be created for both Hamilton and Washington; as with the Lowell recommendation, these will be separate teams, but it is expected they may come together at times for planning purposes. The Hamilton design team will address issues related to curriculum, including the development of a high-quality music program to mirror that of

Washington. The Washington team will address issues including student transition both of the APP students leaving and the Meany students entering.

Hamilton is currently located at the Lincoln building while the Hamilton building is renovated. The students will move for fall 2009 to Hamilton @ Lincoln, and will return to the Hamilton building for fall 2010 with their Hamilton classmates.

Policy Impact

This recommendation also impacts Policy D 12.00. The recommendation for addressing that policy is discussed above in the Final Recommendation for Lowell.

Reassignment of Meany Students

Assignment of special education students will be predicated on the student's individual needs, the service delivery model and location of services. See Appendix G for specifics on the reassignment of Meany students.

Students who are not satisfied with their new assignment will have the opportunity to apply for another school through the regular school choice process. The Open Enrollment time period for 2009-10 has been rescheduled to March 2 – March 31, 2009. This assures that families impacted by building closures and/or repurposing will be able to participate on an equal footing in the Open Enrollment process for next fall.

Reassignment of Washington APP Students

Assignment of special education students will be predicated on the student's individual needs, the service delivery model and location of services. See Appendix G for specifics on the reassignment of Washington APP students.

Students who are not satisfied with their new assignment will have the opportunity to apply for another school through the regular school choice process. The Open Enrollment time period for 2009-10 has been rescheduled to March 2 – March 31, 2009. This assures that families impacted by building closures and/or repurposing will be able to participate on an equal footing in the Open Enrollment process for next fall.

Demographic & Integration Effects

See Appendix H for specifics on the Demographic & Integration Effects of this Final Recommendation.

Proposed Site Classification

Because no building is being closed for instructional purposes, there is no need to change the site classifications for these buildings. The Meany, Washington and Hamilton buildings will continue to be classified as “essential.”

Van Asselt

The Final Recommendation is to close the Van Asselt building, move the Van Asselt program to the African American Academy building, with current African American Academy students who reside in the South East cluster remaining in the building with the Van Asselt program and those who reside outside of the South East cluster and current 6 and 7 grade African American Academy students being reassigned to schools in their home clusters or regions. The building would become a K-5 program, rather than K-8. This recommendation is the same as in the Preliminary Recommendation. The discussion of this recommendation, including the rationale, can be found in the Preliminary Recommendations, November 25, 2008, beginning on page 37¹⁷.

There will be a programmatic design team created for this recommendation. The team will address programmatic issues, such as looping classrooms. As discussed above, the School Board will need to address the issue of the building name as part of a holistic review of school building and program names.

Reassignment of Students

Assignment of special education students will be predicated on the student’s individual needs, the service delivery model and location of services. See Appendix G for specifics on the reassignment of African American Academy students.

Students who are not satisfied with their new assignment will have the opportunity to apply for another school through the regular school choice process. The Open Enrollment time period for 2009-10 has been rescheduled to March 2 – March 31, 2009. This assures that families impacted by building closures and/or repurposing will be able to participate on an equal footing in the Open Enrollment process for next fall.

Demographic & Integration Effects

See Appendix H for specifics on the Demographic & Integration Effects of this Final Recommendation.

Proposed Site Classification

¹⁷ The Preliminary Recommendations, including Appendices, can be found on-line at http://www.seattleschools.org/area/capacity/preliminary_report_and_appendices.pdf

As we are recommending the closure of the Van Asselt building for instructional purposes, the site classification of the Van Asselt building is recommended to be changed from “essential” to “inventory.”

Comments from Public Hearing

The public hearing for the Preliminary Recommendation to close the Van Asselt building was held on Monday, December 14 from 6:30-8:30 pm. The transcript of the hearing can be found on-line at <http://www.seattleschools.org/area/capacity/index.dxml>. There were speakers from both Van Asselt and African American Academy present at the hearing.

The majority of the speakers from Van Asselt spoke about the questions they had about the proposal. These questions included wondering about whether staff, including the principal and custodian would transfer from Van Asselt to the African American Academy building. A number of people asked about transportation, class size, and the name of the building. These questions will be answered through the implementation process and with assistance from the design team.

The speakers from the African American Academy spoke about history of the Academy, how it was created, and the importance of the name and concept. Representatives from the Academy will be a part of the design team and will be able to work together towards resolution of these issues.

Genesee Hill

The Final Recommendation to close the Genesee Hill building has not changed, but the recommendation about where to relocate the Pathfinder K-8 program has changed. The discussion of the Preliminary Recommendation can be found beginning on page 39 of the Preliminary Recommendations.¹⁸

In the Preliminary Recommendations, two options—Arbor Heights and Cooper—for a new location for Pathfinder K-8, were analyzed. The Pathfinder program is unique, as it is the only alternative and the only K-8 in West Seattle, which made the program a likely candidate for moving. However the Genesee Hill building has a very low building condition, thus making it an appropriate candidate for closure.

The Preliminary Recommendation identified Arbor Heights as the appropriate new location for the Pathfinder program because moving to Cooper would mean either becoming a K-5 (in order to accommodate all current Cooper students) or (1) that either West Seattle Elementary would need to absorb 140 students or (2) that Cooper students be assigned to West Seattle South cluster schools, contrary to the tenets of the current student assignment plan.

¹⁸ The Preliminary Recommendations, including Appendices, can be found on-line at http://www.seattleschools.org/area/capacity/preliminary_report_and_appendices.pdf

At the School Board work shop on November 25, 2008, when this Preliminary Recommendation was presented, School Board Directors indicated that staff should analyze the possibility of moving Pathfinder to Cooper despite the restrictions of the current student assignment plan. With this direction, staff began analyzing moving the Pathfinder program to Cooper.

In general, the Cooper building is a more logical choice for the relocation of the Pathfinder program. The building is nearly 30,000 square feet larger than Arbor Heights, and the building layout is more suitable for a K-8. Typically, K-8 programs prefer to physically separate the elementary and middle school students and the Cooper building allows for this. Cooper also has a full size field suitable for middle school PE. Cooper is also located on a large site that has a natural area that can be used by the Pathfinder program in support of their environmental education focus.

In addition, the location of the Cooper building—not in the heart of a neighborhood—is more appropriate for a regional draw. There are 309 students who live in the Cooper reference area, 92 of whom attend Cooper. Of the 309 who live in the reference area, only 36 live within the walk boundary. There are 8 students who can walk to Cooper who attend Cooper. Conversely, there are 225 students who live in the Arbor Heights reference area. Of these, 150 attend Arbor Heights. There are 215 students in the reference area who can walk to Arbor Heights, and there are 149 in the reference area who can walk to Arbor Heights and who go to Arbor Heights.¹⁹

This is an important data point. As we move to a student assignment plan where students are assigned to a school near home, it is important to maximize the number of students who can walk to school. A building where most students will require transportation is therefore less appropriate for a reference area school and is more appropriate for a regional draw, because in a regional draw most students are transported anyway.

Moving Pathfinder K-8 to the Cooper building will require that most of the Cooper students be reassigned. We recommend that the three self-contained special education classrooms along with the existing therapy space remain at the Cooper building and become part of the Pathfinder K-8 program. This offers a number of benefits, including the possibility of a K-8 continuum of autism services for students who live in West Seattle.

Remaining Cooper students will need to be reassigned based on their residence addresses and transportation standards. Cooper students will be reassigned throughout West Seattle, not only in the West Seattle North cluster. This may incur additional transportation costs for a few years, until either current students age out of their new buildings or until the new student assignment plan and transportation are fully implemented.

This Final Recommendation also includes a recommendation to adjust the student assignment plan to ensure that students who must be transported across cluster boundaries qualify for transportation.

¹⁹ See Appendix I for a map showing this information.

The Final Recommendation is to move Pathfinder K-8 to Cooper. This recommendation is congruent with the direction of the new student assignment plan and, long term, is a better location for a regional draw program.

A programmatic design team will be created with this recommendation and will include representatives from both Pathfinder and Cooper, especially representatives from the Cooper autism program. The team will address issues including student transition, inclusion of the autism programs, appropriate professional development of the Pathfinder staff, and how to best promote expeditionary learning on the Cooper site.

Policy Impact

This Final Recommendation also includes a recommendation that the current student assignment plan provision offering elementary students transportation only within their cluster be lifted to allow Cooper students who live in the West Seattle North cluster to receive transportation to schools in the West Seattle South cluster, within the current transportation distance standards. This will ensure that Cooper students who are assigned to out-of-cluster elementary schools (albeit still in West Seattle) to receive transportation.

Reassignment of Cooper Students

Assignment of special education students will be predicated on the student's individual needs, the service delivery model and location of services. See Appendix G for specifics on the reassignment of Cooper students.

Students who are not satisfied with their new assignment will have the opportunity to apply for another school through the regular school choice process. The Open Enrollment time period for 2009-10 has been rescheduled to March 2 – March 31, 2009. This assures that families impacted by building closures and/or repurposing will be able to participate on an equal footing in the Open Enrollment process for next fall.

Reassignment of Pathfinder Students

Pathfinder students will be reassigned to Pathfinder @ Cooper. Assignment of special education students will be predicated on the student's individual needs, the service delivery model and location of services. See Appendix G for specifics on the reassignment of Pathfinder students.

Students who are not satisfied with their new assignment will have the opportunity to apply for another school through the regular school choice process. The Open Enrollment time period for 2009-10 has been rescheduled to March 2 – March 31, 2009. This assures that families impacted by building closures and/or repurposing will be able to participate on an equal footing in the Open Enrollment process for next fall.

Demographic & Integration Effects

See Appendix H for specifics on the Demographic & Integration Effects of this recommendation.

Proposed Site Classification

As we are recommending the closure of the Genesee Hill building for instructional purposes, the site classification of the Genesee Hill building is recommended to be changed from “essential” to “inventory.”

Comments from Public Hearing

The public hearing for the closure of Genesee Hill was held on Tuesday, December 16, 2008. Both the Pathfinder and Cooper communities were represented, although the focus of the hearing was on the proposal in the Preliminary Recommendations to close the Genesee Hill building. The transcript of the hearing can be found on line at <http://www.seattleschools.org/area/capacity/index.dxml>.

A number of the Genesee Hill/Pathfinder community members spoke about the unique nature of the program and the number of activities that students complete through the expeditionary learning focus that Pathfinder has. A number of people also spoke about the fact that the Pathfinder community is based on people, not about the building. That being said, people also talked about the fact that the middle school portion of Pathfinder is not in an adequate facility.

Many people also spoke to the desire that should the Genesee Hill building be closed, that the Pathfinder program move as an intact K-8. It is the intention of this Final Recommendation to move the Pathfinder K-8 program intact to the Cooper building.

A number of Cooper community members also spoke, many of whom questioned why the Preliminary Recommendation of moving Pathfinder to Arbor Heights should not be the path taken in the Final Recommendations. In brief, as discussed above, the Cooper building is not ideally situated for a reference area school. With the move towards reference area schools in the new assignment plan, a building that is difficult to reach and which does not have many people living nearby is better suited for an alternative school with a draw from multiple areas.

While we believe that the Cooper building is better for an alternative K-8 school, we recognize the Cooper community’s comments about the value the school has had for their children, and their concerns about moving elsewhere. A few people talked about the autism program; this Final Recommendation is to retain the autism program and incorporate it into the Pathfinder program. We will also be assigning the Cooper students who can walk to Cooper to the Pathfinder program, so that they will be able to stay in the building, if desired.

Jane Addams

In the Preliminary Recommendation we recommended moving the Thornton Creek program from the Decatur building to the Jane Addams building and growing it to a K-8. In this Final Recommendation we recommend leaving Thornton Creek as a K-5 in the Decatur building and developing a new K-8 in the Jane Addams building. This new K-8 would have an assignment and transportation draw for the Northeast Cluster

This Final Recommendation has changed based upon community input. We heard from a number of people that the Thornton Creek program could not be expanded rapidly without changing the nature of the program, because it would be difficult to get all new staff fully trained in the experiential learning pedagogy in time for fall 2009.

In addition, the ongoing review of the capacity in the Northeast indicated that a traditional K-8 would offer additional flexibility to assign students to the new program and to expand either the elementary or middle school grades as necessary to accommodate enrollment.

The programmatic design team for this recommendation will focus on developing a new, traditional K-8 in the Jane Addams building. We expect that the team will include interested members of the Northeast Cluster Coalition as well as Northeast cluster families from the Summit community to come together to help develop the program. This team will be led by the principal (when named) under the guidance of the Instructional Director and Chief Academic Officer.

Assignment of Students to the new Jane Addams K-8

A small number of K-5 and 6-8 grade students impacted by building closures and/or repurposing who live in the Northeast cluster will be assigned to the Jane Addams building initially. In addition, students with autism currently attending Summit at the Jane Addams building will remain in the building and become part of the new Jane Addams school. This also provides a future opportunity for creating a continuum of services for students with autism in this part of the district.

Additional students will be assigned to Jane Addams through the normal student enrollment process, which will begin on March 2, 2009. The program will be a K-8 Northeast cluster draw.

Demographic & Integration Effects

There are no demographic or integration effects to report at this time. Enrollment and demographic information will be available after the Open Enrollment period and processing of applications.

Proposed Site Classification

Because the building is not being closed for instructional purposes we recommend that the site classification of the Jane Addams building remain as “essential.”

Pinehurst

The Final Recommendation is to retain both the Pinehurst building and the AS #1 program in that building. This Final Recommendation is different than the Preliminary Recommendation. The discussion of the Preliminary Recommendation can be found in the Preliminary Recommendations, November 25, 2008, beginning on page 23²⁰.

We make the Final Recommendation to retain the AS #1 program based primarily on the need for additional capacity throughout the North, Northeast and Northwest clusters. In addition, the Final Recommendation to create a traditional K-8 in the Jane Addams building [see Jane Addams recommendation, above] created a need for additional alternative seats in the north, especially alternative middle school seats.

However, AS #1 is a Title I school in Step 4 of School Improvement and must create a restructuring plan. As a part of this restructuring plan we will reduce the assignment priority and transportation draws to the North and Northeast clusters.²¹ This will also result in significant transportation savings by not transporting students from throughout the city. The restructuring plan will also include metrics for increasing enrollment. Additional restructuring elements will be developed this spring. The team to design those metrics will include the Instructional Director, the Director of School Improvement, the Manager of Title I and the AS #1 principal.

If AS #1 does not meet the metrics outlined in the restructuring plan we will evaluate discontinuing the program for fall 2010.

Reassignment of AS #1 Students

AS #1 students are not being reassigned as a result of this recommendation.

Demographic & Integration Effects

See Appendix H for specifics on the Demographic & Integration Effects of this recommendation.

Proposed Site Classification

²⁰ The Preliminary Recommendations, including Appendices, can be found on-line at http://www.seattleschools.org/area/capacity/preliminary_report_and_appendices.pdf

²¹ Elementary students from other parts of the district may still apply to attend AS #1, but transportation will not be provided. Middle school students who attend any school in the district for which they are not eligible for school bus transportation, but do live more than two miles from the school, receive a Metro bus pass; this will continue to be available for middle school students attending AS #1.

Because the Pinehurst building is not recommended for closure for instructional purposes, we recommend that the site classification of the Pinehurst building remain as “essential.”

Comments from Public Hearing

The Pinehurst public hearing was held on December 15, 2008. A transcript of the hearing can be found on-line at http://www.seattleschools.org/area/capacity/pinehurst_hearing_121508.pdf. Many of the people testifying at the hearing made suggestions to allow the program to continue, including reducing the assignment and transportation draws and increasing the number of neighborhood children attending school in the building.

The community members’ interest in restructuring is encouraging, given our recommendation to retain the program if it can meet the restructuring criteria. We look forward to working with the school on this restructuring plan.

Summit K-12

The Preliminary Recommendation for Summit K-12 was to co-locate the program with Rainier Beach.²² The Final Recommendation is to discontinue the Summit K-12 program.

This Final Recommendation is the result of further analysis of other recommendations, along with the costs of maintaining the Summit K-12 program as it currently exists in another location. One option discussed was to make Summit a K-8 and co-locate it at Meany with Nova High School. While both programs could have been accommodated in the building, that option would have eliminated the ability to co-locate the SBOC and Nova at Meany.

As discussed in the Old Hay & Mann recommendation, we believe that the most academically appropriate recommendation is to co-locate the SBOC and Nova; therefore that is the Final Recommendation.

Additionally, co-locating Summit and Nova would have meant identifying another location for the SBOC program. One option was to relocate the program to Hawthorne Elementary and reassign all Hawthorne students to other elementary schools. Relocation of the SBOC to the Hawthorne building would comply with the May 2006 Board action to house the SBOC by itself (or with the Bilingual Family Center), but would not comply with other elements of that same action, including that the building be large enough for 400 secondary students, or that the students have a facility appropriate for secondary students. Further, as has been discussed, the isolation of SBOC students from English speaking peers is contrary to both federal law and best practices for educating bilingual students.

Looking at current planning capacity we show 232 excess elementary seats in the South cluster—fewer than necessary to accommodate all 240 current Hawthorne students. In addition we are proposing to move two elementary bilingual orientation center classrooms from Thurgood

²² The Preliminary Recommendation can be found on-line at http://www.seattleschools.org/area/capacity/preliminary_report_and_appendices.pdf beginning on page 27.

Marshall to Hawthorne. We believe that eliminating the Hawthorne building from our elementary capacity will result in an inability to educate all elementary aged students in the area in the future.

As we continued our analysis we found that the program, which shares transportation with AS #1, currently costs approximately \$1100 per student transported, for a total of nearly \$500,000. Locating the program at Meany actually *increased* transportation costs to approximately \$1400 per student because of the additional number of students being transported.²³

Because of the high transportation costs of the Summit K-12 program and the belief that SBOC and Nova co-located at Meany is an appropriate recommendation, the Final Recommendation is to discontinue the Summit K-12 program.

This is the discontinuation of a program, rather than closing of a building for instructional purposes, no building specific public hearing was held. However, the Summit community was well-represented at the Community Work Shops and through public testimony at School Board meetings. We recognize the commitment of the Summit community to their program, and do not make this recommendation lightly. However, the solutions posed by the community members—namely, co-locating the program (either as a K-8 or a K-12) with Nova at the Meany building would, as discussed above, prohibit us from making the recommendation that we believe is academically appropriate—co-locating the SBOC and Nova programs at Meany. Given the cost of providing transportation to Meany, is not a wise fiscal choice either.

And while the Preliminary Recommendation was to co-locate the program at Rainier Beach, we heard from community members that this was a non-viable alternative. That, coupled with the decision to not make recommendations at this point about comprehensive high schools, resulted in no feasible location being available for the Summit program.

Reassignment of Summit K-12 Students

Assignment of special education students will be predicated on the student's individual needs, the service delivery model and location of services. See Appendix G for specifics on the reassignment of Summit K-12 students.

Students who are not satisfied with their new assignment will have the opportunity to apply for another school through the regular school choice process. The Open Enrollment time period for 2009-10 has been rescheduled to March 2 – March 31, 2009. This assures that families impacted by building closures and/or repurposing will be able to participate on an equal footing in the Open Enrollment process for next fall.

²³ See Appendix F for the transportation costs.

Demographic & Integration Effects

See Appendix H for specifics on the Demographic & Integration Effects of this Final Recommendation.

Conclusion

We appreciate the countless hours spent by School Board members, schools, students and community members to evaluate the Preliminary Recommendations and make suggestions. Those suggestions and ideas resulted in stronger Final Recommendations.

We have heard from many people who have argued that we will not save enough dollars by closing schools to eliminate our budget shortfall; they are correct and that is why the district is already taking additional steps to eliminate the remaining shortfall. We have heard from many more who have argued that with more time and more resources their building could be a full, strong program: unfortunately we no longer have that time. We have received a number of reviews calling on us to become more efficient by reducing excess capacity, and the magnitude of our budget shortfall requires that we take this action today to eliminate these ongoing operational costs.