**GOVERNING BOARD MEMORANDUM**

# Phase II Design Advisory Team Information, Artifacts, and Committee Record

*Enrollment, Facility Utilization, Programmatic Considerations, Stakeholder Feedback and SWOT Analysis*

## PURPOSE

The purpose of this memorandum and report is to provide the Governing Board with a comprehensive record of the work completed by the Phase II Design Advisory Team.

This document is intended to:

- document the structure, charge, process, and activities of the Design Advisory Team;
- provide access to the information and data reviewed by committee members;
- present the models, demographic and enrollment considerations, and artifacts developed throughout the process;
- share stakeholder input and committee-generated SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats) analysis, school model scoring; and
- preserve the work of the committee for Governing Board and public review.

This memo is informational in nature; it does not present a District administrative recommendation nor attempt to replace the committee-generated record with an administrative interpretation.

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Scottsdale Unified School District continues to navigate declining enrollment, increasing costs, competition for students, and the challenge of operating schools and facilities that are not being used to their full capacity. These realities, along with the district's goal of increasing capture rate and creating full and thriving schools, led to the formation of the Phase II Design Advisory Team in spring 2026. The team was asked to examine long-range options for schools in the Desert Mountain Learning Community, including Copper Ridge School, with a focus on optimizing facilities, ensuring financial viability, and maintaining academic excellence.

The Design Advisory Team brought together parents, staff, community members, school leaders, and District representatives from across the potentially impacted school communities. The work was completed in two parts. During Part A, the committee developed a shared understanding of the district's enrollment, financial, facility, and demographic realities and considered a range of possible school models. Eight models were reviewed, with Models 1, 2, and 8 ultimately advancing for additional study. These became Options A, B, and C during Part B of the process.

Between the two phases, SUSD gathered additional feedback from families, staff, and community members through stakeholder surveys. During Part B, the committee reviewed that feedback and took a deeper look at each option, including enrollment and student impact, facility capacity, finances, staffing, transportation, boundaries, and programming. Members also completed a SWOT analysis and independently scored the three options using an evaluation rubric aligned to the committee's guiding principles.

Those guiding principles kept the work focused on five areas: student-centered decision-making; financial viability and academic success; facility optimization; strategic, future-focused sustainability; and overall community impact and implementation feasibility. The intent was not simply to determine which option closed or repurposed particular buildings, but to consider the broader impact on students, families, programs, school communities, District resources, and SUSD's long-term sustainability.

The three options represent different approaches and different tradeoffs.

**Option A** moves the Cheyenne Traditional K–8 program to Copper Ridge, moves the Copper Ridge boundary to Desert Canyon, and moves Redfield and Laguna to the current Cheyenne campus. Redfield and Laguna Prep would be repurposed. Desert Canyon Elementary and Desert Canyon Middle School would have the opportunity to merge into a K-8 campus.

This option potentially impacts more than 2,100 students. Committee members saw opportunities for stronger facility utilization and future growth of the Cheyenne Traditional program, and Option A was viewed as having the greatest potential to attract new enrollment. At the same time, members raised concerns about the number of students and communities affected, transportation changes, implementation complexity, and the potential loss of current families.

**Option B** closes Laguna Prep Elementary and re-distributes its boundaries and merges Desert Canyon Elementary and Middle School to a K-8 school and moves it to the Copper Ridge campus. In this model, both Desert Canyon campuses and Laguna are repurposed.

This option also potentially impacts more than 2,100 students. Committee feedback recognized opportunities for consolidation and facility efficiencies, while also identifying concerns about moving established school communities, transportation and boundary changes, incomplete cost information, and the long-term enrollment impact of the model.

**Option C** closes Laguna Prep and Copper Ridge while redistributing their boundaries. Copper Ridge and Laguna Prep would be repurposed. Desert Canyon Elementary and Desert Canyon Middle could merge into a K-8 campus.

Of the three options, Option C impacts the fewest students, approximately 773 to 872 based on the enrollment snapshots reviewed by the committee. Members generally viewed this option as providing greater stability, fewer transitions, and stronger potential for retaining current students and families. Concerns included the decision to repurpose Copper Ridge, a newer facility, and whether the option does enough to address longer-term enrollment growth and future capacity needs.

The committee's scoring provides another way to understand the differences among the options. Option C received the highest overall average score at 18.48 out of 25, compared with 15.65 for Option A and 13.81 for Option B. Among the 31 participants who completed comparative questions, Option C was most frequently selected for personal/community preference, long-term financial viability, and student retention. Option A was most frequently selected as having the strongest potential to recruit new students.

More important than any single score, however, is the larger theme that emerged through the committee's work. There was broad recognition that SUSD's enrollment, financial, and facility challenges are real, and that some level of change will be necessary. There was also considerable agreement that decisions should put students first and support the long-term health and stability of the district. Where perspectives differed was largely around how much disruption should occur now in exchange for the possibility of greater future growth.

For some committee members, minimizing the number of students and school communities affected and creating stability for current families was the priority. That perspective is reflected in the stronger support for Option C. Others believed there may be value in accepting greater disruption now if it creates additional opportunities for program expansion and future enrollment growth, particularly through Cheyenne Traditional. That perspective is reflected in Option A's stronger results related to new student recruitment.

The committee also identified areas where questions remain. Participants raised concerns about the completeness and timing of some financial, facility, capacity, and transportation information; the opportunity to develop or revisit alternative models; committee representation; and the amount of whole-group discussion available during the process. These perspectives are included in the record, so the Governing Board has access not only to the models and scoring results, but also to the questions, concerns, and differing viewpoints that informed the committee's work.

This memorandum is intended to provide the Governing Board with that complete record. It includes the information reviewed by the committee, stakeholder feedback, SWOT analyses, scoring results, boundary considerations, committee questions, and participant reflections. It is important to note that the results represent the work and perspectives of the Design Advisory Team and do not constitute a formal committee recommendation or an administrative recommendation.

To evaluate the three (3) models identified in Phase 2 Part A, a SWOT analysis was used. A SWOT analysis is a strategic planning tool used to evaluate the Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats related to a business, project, or organization. Strengths and weaknesses are internal factors that an organization can control, while opportunities and threats are external factors that arise from the surrounding environment. By identifying these four areas, a SWOT analysis helps decision-makers understand their current position, develop effective strategies, capitalize on advantages, address limitations, seize opportunities, and prepare for potential challenges. In this study, the SWOT analysis tool was used to evaluate the three models identified at the conclusion of the Phase 2 Part A process, providing a structured comparison to support the selection of the most suitable model for implementation.

No Governing Board action is requested with this report. It is being presented for information, review, and discussion as the district continues the public process, and the Governing Board considers potential next steps.

# SECTION I - BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE

## Why the Process Was Initiated

Scottsdale Unified School District, like many districts across the valley, continues to face challenges from rising costs, declining enrollment, increased competition and increased cost of living in Scottsdale. These realities make it increasingly difficult to sustain all of our schools in their current form while continuing to provide the world-class, future-focused education our community expects and deserves.

In an effort to address historic trends of declining enrollment, current budget constraints, and make progress towards our Wildly Important Goal (WIG) to increase our capture rate and maximize facility capacity for full and thriving schools, a superintendent committee was formed to support discussions, options and recommendations related to school consolidation, repurposing and enrollment trends in the Desert Mountain Learning community, including Copper Ridge School.

## Background and Context

The Phase II Design Advisory Team was established in the spring of 2026 to examine long-range options for schools in the Desert Mountain Learning Community, including Copper Ridge School. The team's work considered current and projected enrollment trends, the use of schools and facilities, financial sustainability, and opportunities for additional family, staff, and community input.

Initial priority considerations included:

- Optimize facility use
- Ensure financial viability
- Maintain academic excellence

## Superintendent Committee: Design Advisory Team Charge

The team was charged with designing and developing at least three long-range options for a path forward for schools in the Desert Mountain Learning Community, including Copper Ridge School, with opportunities for additional community and family input and further district and Governing Board consideration.

## Supporting Artifacts

- Phase II Design Advisory Team Application
- Phase II Design Advisory Team Selection Process
- SUSD Strategic Plan 25-26
- Phase II Committee Hub

# SECTION II - DESIGN ADVISORY TEAM STRUCTURE AND PROCESS

## Committee Membership and Representation

- Parent representatives from potentially impacted schools
- Staff representatives from potentially impacted schools
- SUSD community members at large
- Facilitators and individuals invited to provide additional experience and perspective
- District administrators
- School principals and supporting staff

Committee Membership can be found at this link: *https://www.susd.org/committee-links/phase-ii-design-advisory-team*

## Committee Norms and Decision-Making Processes

- Engage fully
- Respect and seek to understand different perspectives
- Collaborate constructively
- Remain focused on evidence, solutions, and shared goals
- Create a safe environment for candid dialogue
- Participate in consensus-based decision-making

The committee used a five-finger consensus process during Part A while narrowing the model options. During the final Part B meeting, the committee used a thumbs-up, sideways, or down process to assess consensus regarding committee products and boundary considerations.

## Process Overview

| Phase | Dates | Primary Purpose |
|---|---|---|
| Part A | March-May 2026 | Establish shared context, review information, consider models, and identify models for additional study. |
| Stakeholder Input | May-June 2026 | Gather family, staff, and community perspectives regarding advanced models. |
| Part B | June-July 2026 | Analyze survey results; evaluate capacity, finance, staffing, transportation, boundaries, programs, SWOT findings, and model scoring. |

## Part A Meeting Record

| Meeting | Date | Primary Areas of Work |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | March 26, 2026 | Orientation; committee structure; district strategic, enrollment, finance, and facility context. |
| 2 | April 2, 2026 | Budget, enrollment history, facility use, and introduction to the decision-making tool. |
| 3 | April 16, 2026 | Demographer information, early learning, facility evidence, and initial models. |
| 4 | April 30, 2026 | SPARK update, repurposing ideas, model clarifications, added model, and survey development. |
| 5 | May 7, 2026 | Model indications, consensus, survey review, and identification of Models 1, 2, and 8 for further analysis. |

## Part B Meeting Record

| Meeting | Date | Primary Areas of Work |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | June 10, 2026 | Part A review, capacity information, stakeholder survey analysis, and introduction to SWOT analysis. |
| 2 | June 16, 2026 | Survey findings, model SWOT work, HR, finance, boundaries, and programming considerations. |
| 3 | July 15, 2026 | SWOT refinement, model scoring, enrollment impact, transportation, and boundary review. |
| 4 | July 29, 2026 | Updated cost and transportation information, specialized programs, consensus, individual scoring, and reflections. |
| 5 | August 17, 2025 | Reviewing boundary options with feeder pattern clarifications. |

## Supporting Artifacts

- Part A Meeting Agendas and Slide Decks
- Part B Meeting Agendas and Slide Decks
- Public Meeting Summaries

# SECTION III - EVIDENCE REVIEWED

## Enrollment and Demographic Evidence

- Phase 2 Historical Enrollment 2016-present
- Early Learning longitudinal enrollment trends
- School- and grade-level enrollment
- Students potentially impacted by model
- Detailed Enrollment and Capacity Trends
- Enrollment Trends Slide Deck
- Phase II Program, Physical and Excess Capacity
- Demographic Studies
    - Demographic Enrollment Analysis 2025
    - Demographic Enrollment Analysis 2022
    - Demographic Enrollment Analysis 2021
    - Demographic Enrollment Analysis 2019
    - Demographic Enrollment Analysis 2018

## Facility Capacity and Utilization Evidence

- Phase II Program, Physical and Excess capacity (as of 8.13.26)
- Desert Mountain Learning Community Capital Planning Summary
- Chaparral Learning Community Capital Planning Summary (Include Copper Ridge)
- Capital replacement forecasts
- Utility cost per student
- Utility cost per square foot
- Facilities 101 Slide Deck

## Fiscal Evidence

- Budget 101 Slide Deck
- Annual Expenses per Campus
- Assumptions for Cost Savings
- Cost Savings Per Option

## Transportation Evidence

- Current transportation and bus ridership

# SECTION IV - STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK FINDINGS

## Survey Development and Distribution

Survey instruments were developed to gather stakeholder priorities, potential enrollment behavior, model-specific reactions, school and program considerations, perceived benefits and concerns, and information by stakeholder group and school community.

Three surveys were available:
- Parent/Family Survey (beginning 5/15/26) – distributed through Parent Square to the email address listed in Synergy
- Staff Survey (beginning 5/18/26) – distributed through staff email accounts
- Community Survey (beginning 5/18/26) – available on the SUSD Phase II website
- All surveys were closed on June 5, 2026

## Community Survey Findings

- Survey Results
- Executive Summary of Community Comments

## Parent/Family Survey Findings

- Survey Results
- Executive Summary of Comments

## Staff Survey Findings

- Survey Results
- Executive Summary of Comments

## School-Level Findings

- Parent Surveys by School

## Supporting Artifacts

- Survey Distribution Communications
- Staff Survey Template
- Community Survey Template
- Family Survey Template

# SECTION V - EVALUATION FRAMEWORK

## Guiding Principles

- Student-centered decision-making
- Financial viability and academic success
- Facility optimization
- Strategic, future-focused sustainability
- Overall Community Impact and Implementation Feasibility

## Evaluation Lens Considerations

| Evaluation Lens | Considerations |
|---|---|
| Student Centered Decision Making | Model considers impact on all students, families, and school communities including geographic access and program integrity (at current site or if relocated). |
| Financial Viability and Academic Success | Model considers facility costs and prioritizes financial viability and a balanced budget to ensure well-resourced, effective schools to uphold academic excellence and the reputation of the Scottsdale Unified experience. |
| Facility Optimization | Model considers facility costs and prioritizes financial viability and a balanced budget to ensure well-resourced, effective schools to uphold academic excellence and the reputation of the Scottsdale Unified experience. |
| Strategic, Future-Focused, and Sustainable | Model sets the district up to make the greatest progress towards district goals – maximizing attendance capture and retention. |
| Overall Community Impact and Implementation Feasibility | Assesses community support and the district's ability to implement the model successfully, considering stakeholder concerns, transition planning, and operational risk. |

# SECTION VI – MODELS AND OPTIONS REVIEWED

**Phase II, Part A** (descriptions based on model maps shared with committee) *CTDS is the nine-digit unique identifying code assigned to each school by the state of Arizona.

- **Model 1:**
  - Cheyenne Traditional K-8 would move to the current Copper Ridge K-8 campus
  - Laguna Prep & Redfield move to the current Cheyenne Traditional K-8 campus
  - Repurpose Redfield & Laguna -> 2 Buildings/ 2 CTDS. Merge Desert Canyon schools to K-8 -> 1 CTDS
- **Model 2**:
  - Desert Canyon Elementary and Desert Canyon K-8 would merge into a K-8 school and move to the Copper Ridge campus.
  - Laguna Prep would close.
  - Repurpose DCMS, DCES & Laguna -> 3 Buildings/ 3CTDS. Offers option to move Cheyenne Traditional Program to larger space at Desert Canyon.
- **Model 3**:
  - K-5 – Redfield to Desert Canyon, Laguna to Anasazi. 6-8 – Redfield to Desert Canyon & Laguna to Anasazi (Same as Current Middle School Configuration). Repurpose Redfield & Laguna -> 2 Buildings/ 2 CTDS. Merge Desert Canyon Schools to K-8 ->1 CTDS. No Change to Copper Ridge, Cheyenne and Desert Canyon Middle School.
- **Model 4**:
  - K-5- Redfield to Desert Canyon, Anasazi to Laguna. Repurpose Redfield & Anasazi -> 2 Buildings/ 2 CTDS. 6-8 – Redfield to Desert Canyon & Anasazi to Laguna (Same as Current Middle School Configuration). Merge Desert Canyon schools to K-8 -> 1 CTDS. No Change to Copper Ridge, Cheyenne and Desert Canyon Middle School.
- **Model 5:**
  - K-5 – Desert Canyon Elementary to Redfield, Desert Canyon MS to Mountainside, Laguna to Anasazi. 6-8 – Desert Canyon Elementary to Redfield, Desert Canyon MS to Mountainside, Laguna to Anasazi. Repurpose Laguna, Desert Canyon Elementary and Desert Canyon Middle School -> 3 Buildings/3 CTDS. No Change to Copper Ridge and Cheyenne
- **Model 6:**
  - K-5 – Redfield to Laguna, Copper Ridge to Desert Canyon. 6-8 – Redfield to Laguna, Copper Ridge to Desert Canyon. Repurpose Copper Ridge and Redfield -> 2 Buildings/ 2 CTDS. Merge Desert Canyon schools to K-8 -> 1 CTDS. No Change to Cheyenne or Anasazi
- **Model 7:**
  - K-5 – Redfield & Laguna to Cheyenne Campus, Cheyenne Traditional to Desert Canyon, Desert Canyon to CRS. 6-8 – Redfield & Laguna to Cheyenne Campus, Cheyenne Traditional to Desert Canyon, Desert Canyon to CRS. Repurpose Redfield and Laguna -> 2 Buildings/ 2 CTDS. Merge Desert Canyon schools to Copper Ridge K-8 -> 1 CTDS. No change to Anasazi
- **Model 8:**
  - Copper Ridge K-8 closes
  - Laguna Prep closes

At the conclusion of Phase II, Part A the teams arrived at consensus to move models 1, 2 and 8 forward for deeper analysis and review in Phase II, Part B. These models were renamed and identified as Options A, B and C and that naming structure is used throughout the remainder of the meetings and memo.

## Phase II, Part B

### Option A -

- Cheyenne Traditional K-8 would move to the current Copper Ridge K-8 campus
- Laguna Prep & Redfield move to the current Cheyenne Traditional K-8 campus

This will result in a reduction of two CTDS numbers. A CTDS (County code, Type Code, District Code, and Site Number) is a nine-digit code used by the Arizona Department of Education to identify a school. If Desert Canyon Elementary and Desert Canyon Middle merge to form a K-8, this would result in 1 additional reduction in CTDS.

### Potential Boundary Configurations – Option A

- Phase 2 Option A Boundary Models
- Phase 2 Option A Boundary Maps

### Enrollment and Student Impact- Option A

Potential number of students impacted:

- End of Year 25-26: 2,232
- Beginning of Year 26-27: 2,126

### Financial - Option A

Model A Cost Information

- Copper Ridge to Desert Canyon (all funds)
- Laguna and Redfield to Cheyenne (all funds)
- Model A Savings

### Transportation Considerations- Option A

- Option A Travel Impact Summaries
- Avg Bus Ridership Phase 2

### Committee SWOT Findings- Option A

- Option A SWOT Summary

### Supporting Artifacts – Option A

- Option A Current Map and Enrollment
- Phase 2 Option A Boundary Maps

## Option B Description

- Desert Canyon Elementary and Desert Canyon K-8 would merge into a K-8 school and move to the Copper Ridge campus.
- Laguna Prep would close.

This will result in a reduction of three CTDS numbers (Copper Ridge, Desert Canyon [either Elementary or Middle], and Laguna. A CTDS (County code, Type Code, District Code, and Site Number) is a nine-digit code used by the Arizona Department of Education to identify a school.

## Potential Boundary Configurations – Option B

- Phase 2 Option B Boundary Models
- Phase 2 Option B Boundary Maps

## Enrollment and Student Impact- Option B

Potential number of students impacted:

- End of Year 25-26: 2,153
- Beginning of Year 26-27: 2,132

## Financial– Option B

Option B Cost Information

- Desert Canyon to Copper Ridge (all funds)
- Laguna to Redfield (all funds)
- Option B savings

## Transportation Considerations – Option B

- Option B Travel Impact Summaries
- Avg Bus Ridership Phase 2

## Committee SWOT Findings- Option B

- Option B SWOT summary

## Supporting Artifacts- Option B

- Option B Current Map and Enrollment
- Phase 2 Option B Boundary Models
- Phase 2 Option B Boundary Maps

## Option C Description

- Copper Ridge K-8 closes
- Laguna Prep closes

This will result in a reduction of 2 CTDS numbers (Copper Ridge, and Laguna Prep). A CTDS (County code, Type Code, District Code, and Site Number) is a nine-digit code used by the Arizona Department of Education to identify a school.

If Desert Canyon Elementary and Desert Canyon Middle School merge to become a K-8, that would result in one additional CTDS reduction.

## Potential Boundary Configurations – Option C

- Phase 2 Option C Boundary Models
- Phase 2 Option C Boundary Maps

## Enrollment and Student Impact- Option C

Potential number of students impacted:

- End of Year 25-26: 872
- Beginning of Year 26-27: 773

## Financial Information- Option C

Cost savings information:

- Copper Ridge to Desert Canyon (all funds)
- Laguna to Redfield (all funds)
- Option C Savings

## Transportation Considerations- Option C

- Option C Travel Impact Summaries
- Avg Bus Ridership Phase 2

## Committee SWOT Findings – Option C

- Option C SWOT Summary

## Supporting Artifacts – Option C

- Option C Current Map and Enrollment
- Phase 2 Option C Boundary Maps

## Scoring and Interpretation

At the conclusion of Part B, committee members independently evaluated the models using a rubric aligned with the guiding principles. Results are presented as a record of individual committee evaluation and should not be interpreted as a formal recommendation by the committee or administrative recommendation.

## Comparison Scores Across Models

An average score is included for each guiding principle included in the scoring rubric. Individual score information is included as well, but model scores are reflective of the average of all scores.

| Evaluation Area | Model A | Model B | Model C |
|---|---|---|---|
| Student Centered Decision Making | Avg. 2.68. Feedback frequently cited the high number of students and school communities affected, longer travel, and risk of losing families. Supporters noted preservation of programs and potential room for Cheyenne growth. | Avg. 2.65. Feedback described meaningful disruption to Desert Canyon and other communities, though some viewed it as less disruptive than A and appreciated continuity of existing programs. | Avg. 4.19 (highest score in the table). Participants consistently valued moving the fewest students, preserving larger established communities and programs, and limiting disruption to lower-enrollment campuses. |
| Financial Viability and Academic Success | Avg. 3.52. Participants saw possible savings from closing two campuses and stronger program scale, but repeatedly flagged unquantified transition, transportation, renovation, and student-retention risks. | Avg. 3.16. Participants noted potential consolidation savings and academic scale but questioned whether moving established schools would improve outcomes and cited incomplete cost information. | Avg. 3.90. Support focused on targeted closures, lower transition costs, retention stability, and preserving successful programs. Concerns included closing a newer facility and uncertainty about long-term savings. |
| Facility Optimization | Avg. 4.00 (A's strongest area). Broad agreement that this option uses larger campuses and removes two underutilized sites. Concerns focused on carrying/repurposing costs and possible underuse of specialized spaces. | Avg. 3.26 (B's strongest area). Support centered on using Copper Ridge and closing two sites. Concerns included leaving a desirable Desert Canyon facility, moving into a less central location, and mixed efficiency gains. | Avg. 3.52. Respondents saw a practical consolidation and repurposing path but were divided over closing Copper Ridge and whether retaining older/less optimal facilities maximized physical assets. |
| Strategic, Future-Focused, and Sustainable | Avg. 3.55. Positive comments emphasized a larger traditional-program footprint, north-area recruitment, and longer-term capacity. Skeptics viewed the growth assumptions as uncertain and the relocation risk as substantial. | Avg. 2.58 (B's weakest area). Many comments questioned long-term enrollment appeal, the strategic value of relocating Desert Canyon, and whether the model created a compelling future-facing program. | Avg. 3.45. Supporters called C the most stable and implementable foundation. Critics said it may be less ambitious, could defer Cheyenne growth needs, and does not by itself create new enrollment-driving programs. |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Overall Community Impact and Implementation Feasibility | Avg. 2.55 (A's weakest area). Comments emphasized the greatest disruption, transportation changes, implementation complexity, and potential attrition. A smaller group considered the change worthwhile for future growth. | Avg. 2.68. Feedback highlighted disruption to established communities, transportation and boundary complications, and implementation risk. Some respondents valued the moderate scale of change relative to A. | Avg. 3.90. Feedback strongly emphasized the smallest community impact, fewer relocations, preserved school identities, and simpler execution. Concerns centered on the communities directly losing campuses. |

| **Objective Numerical Scoring Trends** | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Metric** | **Model A** | **Model B** | **Model C** |
| Average total score (max 25) | 15.65 | 13.81 | 18.48 |
| Median total score | 16.0 | 14.0 | 19.0 |
| Highest-scoring option (including ties) | 9 | 5 | 19 |
| Top preference: family/job/neighborhood | 9 | 5 | 17 |
| Selected for long-term financial viability | 11 | 5 | 15 |
| Selected for student retention | 8 | 5 | 18 |
| Selected for new enrollment recruitment | 17 | 4 | 10 |

| **Question** | **Option A** | **Option B** | **Option C** | **Leading option** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Preferred for family, job, or neighborhood | 9 (29.0%) | 5 (16.1%) | **17 (54.8%)** | **C** |
| Greatest long-term financial viability | 11 (35.5%) | 5 (16.1%) | **15 (48.4%)** | **C** |
| Strongest potential to retain SUSD students | 8 (25.8%) | 5 (16.1%) | **18 (58.1%)** | **C** |
| Strongest potential to recruit new enrollment | **17 (54.8%)** | 4 (12.9%) | 10 (32.3%) | **A** |

## Objective Trends

Among the 31 participants who answered these questions, **Option C** was preferred for personal/community impact, long-term financial viability, and student retention. **Option A** was viewed as strongest for recruiting new enrollment.

**Option C demonstrated the broadest overall support.** It received 60 of the 124 total selections across the four questions, or 48.4%. It led three of the four categories and had its strongest result on student retention, where 58.1% selected it.

**Option A's perceived strength was recruitment.** Although only 29.0% chose Option A as their personal or community preference, 54.8% believed it offered the strongest potential to recruit new students. This 25.8-point increase suggests that some participants distinguished between the model they personally preferred and the model they thought might be most effective at attracting enrollment.

**Option B had a smaller but highly consistent base of support.** It received approximately 13%–16% in every category. Four of the five participants who preferred Option B selected it for all four questions.

**Most participants were consistent in their judgments.** Twenty of 31 respondents, or 64.5%, selected the same option for all four questions:

- 9 selected Option C throughout.
- 7 selected Option A throughout.
- 4 selected Option B throughout.

Personal preference closely aligned with views on financial viability for 27 participants and with student retention for 28 participants. Alignment was lower for recruitment—23 participants—because several Option C supporters shifted to Option A for that question.

## Interpretation by Option

**Option A:** Participants were comparatively less likely to identify it as their preferred choice or as the best option for retaining current students. However, it was clearly viewed as having the greatest potential to attract new enrollment. The results indicate that participants may see Option A as a growth-oriented strategy, while also perceiving greater disruption or retention risk.

**Option B:** Option B did not lead any question, but its supporters tended to view it favorably across all measures rather than only for one specific outcome. The results reflect a stable minority preference rather than broad consensus.

**Option C:** Option C was the majority personal/community preference and received the strongest rating for retaining existing students. It also led financial viability, though by a narrower margin over Option A. The data suggests that participants generally associate Option C with lower disruption, stronger stability, and preservation of current enrollment, while being less certain about its ability to attract new students.

## Supporting Artifacts

- Decision-Making Tool
- School Model Evaluation Rubric
- Blank Scoring Instrument
- Scoring Results

# SECTION VII - COMMITTEE QUESTIONS AND REFLECTIONS

## Committee Questions and Information Requests

- Part A Questions and Answers
  - Meeting 1
    - Feedback on budget
    - Feedback on communications and marketing
    - Goals for Participation
    - Meeting facilitation and structure feedback
  - Meeting 2
  - Meeting 3
  - Meeting 4
  - Meeting 5
- Part B Questions and Answers
  - Meeting 1
  - Meeting 2
  - Meeting 3
  - Meeting 4- Participants completed scoring rubric and committee reflection

## Participant Reflections

Of the 30 reflections provided, 20 participants (66.7%) rated their experience Positive or Excellent, 7 (23.3%) rated it Neutral/Mixed, and 3 (10.0%) rated it Somewhat Negative. Even several participants who expressed significant concerns about the process distinguished those concerns from the work of the facilitators or the commitment of fellow committee members. Participants frequently described the work as difficult, educational, meaningful, and undertaken by people who genuinely cared about SUSD and its students.

Participants demonstrated broad agreement that SUSD faces difficult enrollment and financial realities that require action, and that decisions should prioritize students, long-term sustainability, and stability. Many participants reported that exposure to district data and perspectives from other school communities broadened or changed their thinking. The majority described their committee experience positively and expressed respect for the effort and seriousness of fellow participants and facilitators.

At the same time, the reflections reveal continuing concerns regarding the accuracy, completeness, and timing of data; the limited ability to develop or revisit alternative models; representation and participation; and opportunities for whole-group discussion. Participants also differed in their assessment of whether the process was genuinely open-ended or constrained by predetermined options. Substantively, the principal tension remains between minimizing disruption to current students and communities and pursuing more significant change intended to create future enrollment growth. These differing priorities help explain why Option C received broader support on stability and retention measures while Option A was viewed more favorably for recruitment potential.

## Areas of Agreement or Consensus

**Students and the long-term health of SUSD should be the primary consideration.** Across differing school affiliations and model preferences, participants repeatedly described the goal as doing what is best for students and creating a sustainable district for the future. Several explicitly described moving from a school-specific perspective toward a district-wide perspective as they learned more about enrollment, facilities, finances, transportation, and other communities.

**There was broad recognition that difficult change is necessary, and that no option is without consequences.** Participants generally acknowledge declining enrollment, financial pressures, and underutilized facilities as real challenges that cannot simply be avoided. Several comments indicated that, even where people disagreed about which schools should be affected, there was an increasing acceptance that consolidation or closure would likely be required.

**Minimizing unnecessary disruption and creating long-term stability emerged as an important, shared value.** A number of participants described changing their thinking toward affecting fewer students, reducing moves, avoiding repeated disruption, and selecting a solution that could remain viable for many years. This theme appears particularly connected to support for Option C, although it was not universally interpreted as the most important criterion.

**Data and exposure to different perspectives were highly influential.** Many participants said enrollment trends, facilities information, operating costs, demographic information, transportation, and conversations with parents, educators, and representatives from other schools changed or broadened their thinking. Participants frequently valued hearing perspectives they otherwise would not have encountered.

**There was substantial respect for the effort of committee members and facilitators.** Even comments critical of the structure often acknowledged that participants worked hard, cared deeply, and tried to make responsible decisions. Several respondents specifically praised the organization, facilitation, meeting management, and willingness of district staff to answer questions.

## Areas of Continuing Concern or Genuine Disagreement

**Accuracy, completeness, and timing of information were the most persistent procedural concerns.** Multiple participants raised concerns about “incorrect” capacity data, financial information that was incomplete or presented late, information changing during the process, and insufficient time to digest new material before making decisions. Some participants specifically wanted final comparative financial savings, more complete underlying data, or information distributed earlier.

**There was concern that the committee had too little opportunity to develop or substantially revise options.** Several participants expected a more open-ended design process and later concluded that they were primarily evaluating models that had already been constructed. Some wanted previously eliminated models reconsidered after data changed, while others wanted additional alternatives or more strategic discussion about innovation, programming, enrollment growth, and the district's 10- to 20-year vision.

**Representation and participation were questioned by some participants.** Concerns included equal representation by school rather than representation proportional to student enrollment, uneven representation at tables, changing attendance over time, and whether the final group represented exactly the same participants involved throughout the process. These respondents cautioned against portraying the outcome as more unanimous or representative than it was.

**Participants wanted more opportunities for whole-group dialogue.** Several people appreciated their individual table conversations but felt the structure limited exposure to perspectives elsewhere in the room. Suggested improvements included more cross-table discussion, greater access to principals and subject-matter experts, and more opportunities to collectively examine school impacts before scoring.

**Areas of genuine disagreement**

**Participants held differing views on the openness and fairness of the process**. The clearest disagreement concerned whether the process was genuinely open and consensus-driven or whether outcomes/options were predetermined or favored. Some participants emphatically stated that they never felt pressured and viewed the process as genuinely collaborative and data-driven. Others believed their voices had limited influence, felt certain options received more favorable treatment, or concluded that the committee was evaluating predetermined choices rather than designing solutions.

**Participants differed in how they balanced stability versus future growth.** There was also substantive disagreement over how much disruption should be accepted in exchange for potential future growth. One group increasingly prioritized the option affecting the fewest current students and providing near-term stability. Another group saw strategic value in making a larger change now—particularly to create room for Cheyenne to grow and potentially attract additional enrollment—rather than potentially revisiting the issue later. One reflection framed the decision very clearly: if the long-term goal is substantial Cheyenne growth, Option A offers a stronger pathway; if the goal is preserving its current success while minimizing disruption, Option C is stronger.

**These differing priorities are reflected in the quantitative results.** That disagreement closely mirrors the numerical scoring of the different options. Option C was favored for personal/community impact, financial viability, and retaining current students, while Option A was favored for attracting new enrollment. The qualitative comments help explain why. Participants were not necessarily disagreeing about the underlying challenges; rather, they differed in how they weighed current stability and minimizing disruption versus future growth and strategic opportunity.

## Committee-Generated Deliverables

Stakeholder survey findings
Final SWOT synthesis documents
Committee questions and information requests
Proposed boundary considerations
Boundary consensus records
Model scoring results
Participant Reflections
Meeting Exit Tickets and FAQs

## SECTION IX - PUBLIC INFORMATION & COMMUNICATION

Information regarding the committee's work was shared through meeting summaries, slide decks, survey opportunities, and the SUSD School Repurposing and Enrollment Review webpage.

### Supporting Artifacts

- Phase II Public Webpage
- Phase II Design Advisory Committee Hub
- Boundary Public Meeting Postcard

# SECTION X - PROCESS TIMELINE

| Date | Activity | Supporting Artifacts |
|---|---|---|
| March 26, 2026 | Part A Meeting 1 | Meeting A.1 Folder |
| April 2, 2026 | Part A Meeting 2 | Meeting A.2 Folder |
| April 16, 2026 | Part A Meeting 3 | Meeting A.3 Folder |
| April 30, 2026 | Part A Meeting 4 | Meeting A.4 Folder |
| May 7, 2026 | Part A Meeting 5 | Meeting A.5 Folder |
| May-June 2026 | Stakeholder Surveys | Survey Folder |
| June 10, 2026 | Part B Meeting 1 | Meeting B.1 Folder |
| June 16, 2026 | Part B Meeting 2 | Meeting B.2 Folder |
| July 15, 2026 | Part B Meeting 3 | Meeting B.3 Folder |
| July 29, 2026 | Part B Meeting 4 | Meeting B.4 Folder |
| Aug. 17, 2026 | Part B Meeting 5 | Meeting B.5 Folder |
| August 2026 | Delivery of Committee Record to Governing Board | Memo Link |
| September 8, 2026 | Governing Board Information Discussion/Public Hearing | |
| October 2026 | Potential Governing Board Action | |

The timeline presented to the committee anticipated delivery of a board memorandum and supporting documents in August, a public hearing on September 22, and potential Governing Board action on October 6, 2026.

# SECTION XI - COMPLETE ARTIFACT INDEX

## Folder 1 - Governance and Committee Structure

- Committee charge and application
- Selection Process and Scoring Details
- Membership roster
- Guiding principles
- Evaluation rubric

## Folder 2 - Part A Meeting Materials

- Meeting A.1 Folder
- Meeting A.2 Folder
- Meeting A.3 Folder
- Meeting A.4 Folder
- Meeting A.5 Folder

## Folder 3 - Survey Materials

- Survey instruments
  - Parent Survey Template
  - Staff Survey Template
  - Community Survey Template
- Distribution communications
- Response data
  - Parent Survey Responses
  - Staff Survey Responses
  - Community Survey Responses
- School-level results
  - Parent Survey by School
  - Staff Survey by School
- Survey analysis
  - Parent Comments Executive Summary
  - Staff Comments Executive Summary
  - Community Comments Executive Summary

## Folder 4 - Part B Meeting Materials

- Meeting B.1 Folder
- Meeting B.2 Folder
- Meeting B.3 Folder
- Meeting B.4 Folder
- Meeting B.5 Folder

## Folder 5 – Models & Options

- Part A- Models 1-7
- Part A- Model 8
- Part B- Options A-C
  - Option A
  - Option B
  - Option C

## Folder 6 - Enrollment and Demographics

- Phase 2 Historical Enrollment 2016-present
- Detailed Enrollment and Capacity Trends
- Historical Grade Level Enrollment
- Enrollment Trends Slide Deck
- Student-impact data
- Demographic Studies
  - Demographic Enrollment Analysis 2025
  - Demographic Enrollment Analysis 2022
  - Demographic Enrollment Analysis 2021
  - Demographic Enrollment Analysis 2019
  - Demographic Enrollment Analysis 2018

## Folder 7 - Facilities and Finance

- Facilities 101 Slide Deck
- Budget 101 Slide Deck
- Phase II Program, Physical and Excess Capacity
- Annual Expenses per Campus
- Desert Mountain Learning Community Capital Planning Summary
- Chaparral Learning Community Capital Planning Summary (Include Copper Ridge)
- Utility cost per student
- Utility cost per square foot
- Facilities 101 Slide Deck
- Capital Planning Replacement Report
- Assumptions for Cost Savings
- Cost Savings Per Option

## Folder 8 - Boundaries and Transportation

- Option A Current Map and Enrollment
- Phase 2 Option A Boundary Models & Phase 2 Option A Boundary Maps

- Option B Current Map and Enrollment
- Phase 2 Option B Boundary Models & Phase 2 Option B Boundary Maps

- Option C Current Map and Enrollment
- Phase 2 Option C Boundary Models & Phase 2 Option C Boundary Maps

- Avg Bus Ridership Phase 2

## Folder 9 – School Model Scoring and Results

- Decision-Making Tool
- School Model Evaluation Rubric
- Blank Scoring Instrument
- Scoring Results

## Folder 10 - Committee Products & Questions

- Part A Questions and Answers
  - Meeting 1

        - Feedback on budget
        - Feedback on communications and marketing
        - Goals for Participation
        - Meeting facilitation and structure feedback
    - Meeting 2
    - Meeting 3
    - Meeting 4
    - Meeting 5
- Part B Questions and Answers
    Meeting 1
    Meeting 2
    Meeting 3
  Participant reflections

## Folder 11 - Public Communications

- Design Advisory Committee Hub
- Repurposing Website
- Survey invitations
- Boundary Hearing Postcard

## ADMINISTRATIVE NOTE

The documents linked in this report represent information provided to, reviewed by, or developed through the Phase II Design Advisory Team process. Some materials may reflect information available at a specific point in time. Enrollment, staffing, financial, transportation, facility, and program information may continue to change. Where updated information is provided, the date and source of the update should be clearly identified.

Committee-generated materials are included to accurately preserve the work and perspectives of the Design Advisory Team. Their inclusion does not indicate endorsement by individual committee members, district administration, or the Governing Board.

## GOVERNING BOARD ACTION

No action is requested as part of this memorandum and report. This item is provided for Governing Board information, review, and discussion.