School consolidation criteria approved by the Governing Board on Nov. 13

Part One: A list of candidates for school closure that focuses on, but need not be limited to, middle schools, includes no more than ten schools altogether, is based on the following ten criteria, in no particular order, and includes for each candidate a written rationale that focuses on these criteria:

1. High cost savings, after accounting for likely enrollment losses, condition of the school, required renovations at receiving schools, and increased transportation costs.

2. Low academic performance, especially taking into account the demographics of the student population.

3. Lack of success in attracting families, based on enrollment trends and the attraction/flight ratio.

4. Weak prospects for turnaround in enrollment and academic performance, based on current and foreseeable assets.

5. Easy transitions for families to high-performing nearby schools. (This criterion is especially important for elementary schools.)

6. Good prospects for retaining students, based on the strength of the receiving schools and the weakness of competition from charter schools, private schools, and other districts.

7. Preservation of unique programs and activities, if there is strong demand for those programs.

8. Likelihood of reducing or at least not exacerbating ethnic imbalances within schools.

9. High likely value of the site in an alternative use.

10. Considerable distance from the sites of recently closed schools.

Part Two: For each closure candidate a report with the following information:

1. Estimated cost savings. Net annual itemized savings, assuming that all teachers are moved rather than laid off. Comparison to cost savings which could be achieved by conversion to a charter school.

2. Concurrent use of the site. Current use of the school by organizations other than TUSD. Likely prospects for future such use if the school remains open.

3. Competition. A list of nearby charter and private schools. Evaluation of the intensity of the competition provided by those schools and by any nearby school district.

4. A map showing schools in the neighborhood of the closure candidate. It should include the closure candidate and potential receiving schools, the locations of any recently closed TUSD schools within five miles, and the locations of major competing schools.

5. Plausible options for site disposition or reuse. These should take account of the site's specific characteristics.

6. Any other relevant unique or unusual features of the school.

7. Letters from the site council and principal. The school's site council should have an opportunity to review the information given to the Board and to write a letter to the Board concerning any errors or omissions. The school's principal should have a similar and separate opportunity. This can be provided after the Board initiates closure.

Part Three: For each closure candidate and potential receiving school a report with the following information:

1. Academic performance including actual average AIMS scores and ADE grades for the past two years.

2. Condition of facilities including the facilities condition index and itemization of significant bond program upgrades at that school.

3. Enrollment including total current enrollment and history for the past five years, projections of future enrollment, and notations to special factors that may have affected enrollment, e.g. boundary changes.

4. Current staffing including a breakdown of the current staffing at the school, funding source, and how many years the current principal has been assigned to the school.

5. Current attraction and flight data.

6. Demographic characteristics including ethnic composition and percentage of free and reduced lunch.

7. Special programs that distinguish this school from other TUSD schools. In the case of schools considered for closure: the movability of these programs and the potential synergies or consolidations among programs at the closed school and receiving schools.

8. Transportation time and costs including the typical distance from families enrolled at the closed school to possible receiving schools, typical bus transportation time for the same families, to possible receiving schools, and the projected increase in transportation costs, both gross and net of projected state reimbursement.

9. Capacity for each receiving school excluding portables and the nature and cost of expected necessary improvements.