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Study Session Agenda

• Review Meeting Format

• Process Overview To-Date:
  • Outcomes of May 20th Study Session
  • Board Survey Responses

• Responses to Board Questions

• Review Sections and Content of Facilities Master Plan Binder

• Board Discussion

• Future Projects Rollout

• Next Steps
Review Meeting Format

Presentation

Question Opportunities

Open Discussion
Outcomes from Board Study Session – 05.20.2021

**Activities:**

- Presented Overview of Facilities Master Plan Process
- Decision Points Timeline History
- Sample Documents and Site Diagrams from Draft Facilities Master Plan
- Review Total Program Costs
- Stakeholder Groups Priorities
- Board Discussion
Outcomes from Board Study Session - 05.20.2021

Purpose & Outcomes of The 05.20.2021 Draft FMP Study Session

• To Share Knowledge of the FMP Approach, Process, and Findings To-Date

• To Present the Vision for Improvements to the School and Support Program Site and Resulting Cost of Improvements

• To Hear the Voice of the Stakeholders Engaged in the Process and Their Priorities

• To Discuss how the Stakeholder Priorities can be used by the Board as Data Points to Develop Future Implementation Strategies

• To Review Potential Next Steps for the Facilities Planning Process
Outcomes from Board Study Session – 05.20.2021

**Overarching Goals for the FMP**

*The following goals were set by the Board of Education during the initial kick-off (09.26.2019) meeting:*

- Innovation in Planning and Programs the Attract Students
- Provide Educational Options for Students within their Communities
- Retain Resident Students
- Expand Middle School Enrollment
- Increase Capture of Private School and Out-of-District Students
- Decrease Westside / Eastside Student Movement
- Efficient Use and Good Stewardship of Community Dollars
Outcomes from Board Study Session – 05.20.2021

Stakeholder Priorities Alignment

*The FMPC ranking of Overarching Goals:*

1. Retain Resident Students
2. Provide Educational Options for Students within their Communities
3. Innovation in Planning and Programs
4. Increase Capture of Private School and Out-of-District Students
5. Efficient Use and Good Stewardship of Community Dollars
6. Expand Middle School Enrollment
7. Decrease Westside/Eastside Student Movement

*The Board's ranking of Overarching Goals:*

1. Provide Educational Options for Students within their Communities
2. Innovation in Planning and Programs
3. Retain Resident Students
4. Efficient Use and Good Stewardship of Community Dollars
5. Decrease Westside/Eastside Student Movement
6. Increase Capture of Private School and Out-of-District Students
7. Expand Middle School Enrollment
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**Stakeholder Priorities Alignment**

*The FMPC ranking of Scope of Work Categories:*

- Modernize & Reconfigure Aging Classrooms
- Campus Arrival: Parking, Drop-Off & Entry Plaza
- Student Support & Counseling Services
- Existing Building Systems, Toilets, and Improved Energy Efficiency
- Assembly and Food Service
- Technology Infrastructure and Equipment
- Outdoor Learning Environments & Quads
- New Classrooms to Eliminate Portables
- Safety & Security
- Enrichment Programs & Electives
- Science Labs
- Exterior Play Spaces, Playfields & Hardcourts
- Flexible Furniture
- Administration & Staff Support
- Site Utilities
- After School Support
- Media Center
- Physical Education Improvements

*The Board's ranking of Scope of Work Categories:*

- Modernize & Reconfigure Aging Classrooms
- New Classrooms to Eliminate Portables
- Student Support & Counseling Services
- Outdoor Learning Environments & Quads
- Site Utilities
- Existing Building Systems, Toilets, and Improved Energy Efficiency
- Campus Arrival: Parking, Drop-Off & Entry Plaza
- Flexible Furniture
- Technology Infrastructure and Equipment

**Not selected:**

- Assembly and Food Service
- Safety & Security
- Enrichment Programs & Electives
- Science Labs
- Exterior Play Spaces, Playfields & Hardcourts
- Administration & Staff Support
- After School Support
- Media Center
- Physical Education Improvements
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### Stakeholder Priorities Alignment

#### ONLINE SURVEYS
- **student survey**
  1. Modernize & Reconfigure Aging Classrooms
  2. Existing Building Systems, Toilets, and Energy Efficiency
  3. Assembly & Food Service Improvements

- **teacher survey**
  1. Modernize & Reconfigure Aging Classrooms
  13. Safety & Security
  15. Outdoor Learning Environments
  7. Assembly & Food Service Improvements

- **parent and community survey**
  1. Modernize & Reconfigure Aging Classrooms
  14. Campus Arrival: Parking, Drop-Off & Entry Plaza
  2. Existing Building Systems, Toilets & Energy Efficiency

#### COMMON PRIORITIES
- 1. Modernize & Reconfigure Aging Classrooms
- 2. Existing Building Systems, Toilets & Energy Efficiency
- 3. Assembly & Food Service Improvements
- 14. Campus Arrival: Parking, Drop-Off & Entry Plaza

#### PRINCIPAL PRIORITIES
- **school site scopes of work**
  1. Modernize & Reconfigure Aging Classrooms
  7. Assembly & Food Service Improvements
  14. Campus Arrival: Parking, Drop-Off & Entry Plaza

#### SCHOOL SITE COMMITTEE
- **school site scopes of work**
  1. Modernize & Reconfigure Aging Classrooms
  14. Campus Arrival: Parking, Drop-Off & Entry Plaza
  9. Student Support / Counseling Services

#### FACILITIES MASTER PLAN COMMITTEE
- **school site scopes of work**
  1. Modernize & Reconfigure Aging Classrooms
  14. Campus Arrival: Parking, Drop-Off & Entry Plaza
  9. Student Support / Counseling Services
  2. Existing Building Systems, Toilets & Energy Efficiency

*indicates common priorities (prioritized by at least 3 groups)*
questions?
Responses to Board Questions

What is the meaning of Next Generation learning and what are we to understand are the facilities considerations they require?

- Focuses on and tailors the learning process for each student and their interests and capabilities.
- Key elements include personalization, flexibility, collaboration, and use of technology to increase interactivity.

What is the difference between Magnet Schools and Academies?

- Magnet schools will largely pull their students from a lottery and will attract students from throughout the district and beyond.
- Academies will largely retain their current boundaries within their High School feeder pattern.
Responses to Board Questions

**Improvement Tiers:**

Tier 1: sites with featured magnets and academies  
Magnet Campuses: draw District-Wide  
Academy Campuses: draw from within High School Community Boundary

Tier 2: sites with transformative improvements or enhancements

Tier 3: sites that are budgeted at state-matching 60/40 modernization
Responses to Board Questions

Site Tiers Categorization

Tiers DO...

• Translate OUSD innovative sites vision into proposals at the various campuses.

• Organize sites into groupings by similar scope, program and master plan approach.

• Develop a unique plan for each campus based upon program and past improvement history.

• Recognize that funding for facilities improvements is not unlimited and that the District’s culture of sharing will continue.

Tiers do NOT...

• Infer a striation of projects based on priority or level of improvement specified.

• Identify a date for potential improvements to begin once funding has been secured.

• Dictate the approach to scope or budget differently between the various Tiers.

• Create a standard improvement template but instead promote choice and variety within each feeder community.

OUSD Mission Statement:

"In partnership with our community, we will provide a safe, equitable, and innovative culture of learning for each scholar to have a competitive EDGE as a leader."
Responses to Board Questions

Why K-8’s, Magnets, and Academies? Where is the data supporting these?

• Magnets and Academies provide unique learning experiences and opportunity of choice, while supporting the district's Strategic Vision.

• The Milwaukee Study: found that students in K-8 schools had higher academic achievement, participated in more extracurricular activities, demonstrated greater leadership skills, and were less likely to be bullied than those following the elementary/middle school track.

• Spurgeon Intermediate and Romero-Cruz Elementary were combined into a PK8 grade program on the Spurgeon campus (now called Romero-Cruz Academy).

• Spurgeon had a history of declining enrollment and parents were actively looking to exit that program once students were to matriculate to middle school (discipline issues, low scores, etc.).

• The new academy has an AVID and dual immersion focus (Spanish: going from a 90:10 to a 30:70 model in 6th grade—currently highest DI cohort is 4th grade).

• Since the conversion to the PK-8 they have seen a retention of student numbers (students are no longer leaving the matriculation pattern in 7th grade) and waitlists have developed to get into the school.

• Discipline concerns have decreased since the conversion to the PK-8.

• Pre-Pandemic they were serving 1,000 PK-8th grade students.
Responses to Board Questions

Is programming driving the process or is it the need for facilities improvements? Are they inextricably linked?

• The Educational Services and Facilities departments of OUSD are working through this process together so that both needs are driving the work.

Outreach Strategies to engage broad range of stakeholders

• LPA and OUSD Facilities staff have been working with all site principals to make sure they have sent out messages and written correspondence to the entire community within the school boundaries.

• Correspondence methods include email, posts to the District website, and multiple social media platforms.

• Principals at each site coordinated multiple meetings with their community to discuss their draft plans and gathered feedback after the Town Hall.
questions?
SECTION 1
INTRODUCTION & PURPOSE

• Document Purpose
• Background
• Process
• Planning Participants
FMP Deliverable Components

SECTION 2

Planning & Considerations

• Introduction
• Planning Considerations
• Timeline of Major Decision Points
• Influencing Data
• Planning for the Future
• Tiered Approaches to Sites
FMP Deliverable Components

Program Vision & Standards

- Guidelines - District EDGE Vision
- Introduction
- Learning Spaces
- Site Considerations
- Outdoor Spaces
- Support Spaces
- Educational Vision
  - Elementary Schools
  - K-8 Schools
  - Middle Schools
FMP Deliverable Components

SECTION 4

Program Costs

- Introduction
- Scope of Work Categories
- Master Plan Cost Summary
- Stakeholder Priorities
  - Students
  - Teachers
  - Parents
  - Principals
  - School Site Committees
  - Facilities Master Plan Committee
FMP Deliverable Components

SECTION 5

Site Master Plans

- Contents - each site tab, includes:
  - Site Assessments
  - Existing Site Plan
  - Master Plan Diagram
  - School Site Cost Summary
- Canyon HS Feeder Area Sites
- El Modena HS Feeder Area Sites
- Orange HS Feeder Area Sites
- Villa Park HS Feeder Area Sites
- Other Sites
FMP Deliverable Components

Appendix

- FMP Schedule
- Demographics Report
- Total Program Detailed Cost Estimate
- FMPC Meeting Presentations
questions?
Future Projects Rollout

• Projects will be Developed Based on Board Priorities and Funding Availability.

• Based on the FMP Recommendations, Design Solutions will be Developed Through Engagement with Site Design Committees.

• Success of Projects and Program Changes Implemented will be Tracked by the District.
Next Steps

• Board Adoption of Master Plan 07.22.2021

• Post-Approval – Facilities Planning Next Steps
  • High School and Surplus Properties Update to Facilities Master Plan
  • Continuation of a Data-Driven Research Approach
  • Development of Funding Plan Strategies and Leveraging of Local Resources
  • Board Engagement for Project Priorities Scenarios
  • Implementation Planning for Rollout of Projects as Funding becomes Available

Thank You!