

Cordley Group Proposal

Dec. 11, 2011

Summary

Our analysis seeks to identify a workable, comprehensive plan for the District's East and Central elementary schools. To be comprehensive, we have considered newly-available data on projected growth in elementary enrollments (which are concentrated in the South and East areas of Lawrence), the Task Force's assessment of elementary school capacity, and the value of educational equity. The enrollment-growth projections are available now for the first time in any of the consolidation discussions, and we believe they have significant implications for our task. We have sought to develop a plan that would provide stability in our elementary schools for the next decade while doing no harm to at-risk students. ***Our basic proposal to the Working Group is to do no harm to at-risk students.***

In light of these considerations, our proposal builds on key elements of proposals from other groups. For the East side, we believe a consolidation is possible and have identified three possible scenarios. 1) Consolidate Cordley and Kennedy in the area southeast of 15th and Haskell; 2) consolidate New York and Kennedy at that location (we do not consider the East Heights school site to be viable for either of these consolidations), or 3) consolidate New York and Cordley at the Cordley site. ***Each of these scenarios has significant drawbacks, however, and, in order to mitigate harm to at-risk students and address other drawbacks we recommend that key equity-based conditions should be met before any of the three is recommended by the Working Group.*** For the Central area, we believe the discussions in the previous meeting identified substantial problems with each consolidation option, and we recommend no consolidation in this area of Lawrence. No Central area option leaves sufficient room for enrollment growth in the Central and West areas, and no option sufficiently meets the educational and equity elements of our charge. Finally, we recommend that any bond be used to address facility deficiencies in Lawrence elementary schools generally.

We acknowledge that our proposal does not meet the part of our charge directing us to close two to three schools. But we have found that it is not possible to fully meet this part of our charge while also following the other parts of our charge and while offering a responsible long-term plan in light of enrollment growth. We have tried to strike an appropriate balance between the various parts of our charge in light of significant elementary enrollment growth and the importance of equitable educational opportunities for at-risk student groups. We have decided that to sacrifice educational quality, equity, and long-term planning goals in the service of simply closing an additional school is unacceptable.

Various elements of our proposal are supported by our analysis in the attached addenda:

- **Addendum 1** shows that consolidation directly increases class sizes in the consolidated schools unless corrective actions are taken

- **Addendum 2** shows that financial savings may be gained from consolidation, but that a significant portion of the savings are from reductions in teaching staff due to increases in class sizes. We believe that some of these savings must be placed back into the affected schools to protect against significant class size increases for at-risk groups

- **Addendum 3** shows that the schools in the broader South and West areas of Lawrence are at their functional enrollment capacity. As a consequence, there is a need to retain school capacity in nearby areas to serve as “relief valves” so that schools in these areas do not exceed their capacity

Our proposal consists of the following parts:

--Part I: summary of our criteria

--Part II: proposal for East Side

A) Cordley/Kennedy consolidation at Southeast of 15th and Haskell

- 1) concerns about a Cordley/Kennedy consolidation
- 2) possible merits of a Cordley/Kennedy consolidation if key conditions are met
- 3) conditions for a viable Cordley/Kennedy consolidation

B) New York/Kennedy consolidation at Southeast of 15th and Haskell

- 1) concerns about a NY/Kennedy consolidation
- 2) possible merits of a NY/Kennedy consolidation if key conditions are met
- 3) conditions for a viable NY/Kennedy consolidation

C) Cordley/New York consolidation at Cordley

- 1) concerns about a Cordley/New York consolidation
- 2) possible merits of a Cordley/New York consolidation
- 3) conditions for a viable Cordley/New York consolidation

--Part III: why other East Side options are not feasible and prudent

--Part IV: proposal for Central area

I. Working Group Charge

Our charge is to Close 2 to 3 schools while adhering to the following criteria:

- 1) Schools serving at-risk populations should be limited in size, ideally to about 300 students
- 2) Classes serving at-risk populations should be limited in size, ideally “toward the lower end of the ranges set out in current District policy (13 to 17 students in kindergarten through 3rd grade; 18 to 26 students in 4th through 6th grade)”
- 3) Schools serving at-risk populations should be located so that students who are unable to obtain a ride will be able to walk to school
- 4) Educational environments in elementary schools should be “equitable”
- 5) When consolidating, school populations should be kept together to the extent possible rather than divided among several schools (this is what distinguishes “consolidation” from “closure”)
- 6) Our recommendation should include a proposal for a bond to fund needed capital improvements and the expansions necessary to eliminate portable classrooms in the remaining elementary schools

In addition to these criteria, we add two more:

- 7) *Plan comprehensively for the long term.* Our proposal seeks to ensure that enrollment in remaining elementary schools is no higher than 90% of elementary capacity so that future enrollment growth will not immediately strain existing schools’ capacity and require additional construction. Our plan is also directed at keeping elementary enrollments that are generated in Lawrence’s old core neighborhoods in the urban core (rather than shifting them toward the periphery), which would contribute to the erosion of core neighborhoods. We believe these long-term planning goals reflect the overall spirit of the Task Force Report.
- 8) *Maintain ESL Cluster Sites at some location.* The School Board has directed us to plan for maintaining cluster sites for both educational and financial reasons. Educational research demonstrates that ELL students benefit considerably from concentrated ESL instruction; anything less than concentrated instruction leads to losses in educational attainment for ELL students. Cluster Sites, along with a small number of neighborhood ESL sites, are as close as USD497 can feasibly get to the highly-concentrated ESL services recommended in the research.¹ This is because the District cannot feasibly place all of the needed ESL services in every elementary school. The District also gains additional financing for every minute that ELL students are educated by ESL-certified teachers.

¹ Wayne P. Thomas and Virginia Collier, “A National Study of School Effectiveness for Language Minority Students: Long-Term Academic Achievement,” Center for Research on Education, Diversity & Excellence (CREDE), a national research center funded by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI) of the U.S. Department of Education (2002).

The Cluster Sites maximize this time because every teacher in these sites is ESL-certified, and for this reason the Cluster Sites bring into the District considerably more money than they cost in transportation expenses. Significant numbers of teachers in other schools are not ESL-certified, and so moving away from Cluster Sites at this time is not financially feasible. While moving a Cluster Site is possible, in order to do so we must ensure that a large proportion of teachers in the new location are ESL-certified. In practice this will require displacing most of the teachers in a site receiving an ESL cluster in order to make room for incoming ESL-certified teachers from the old Cluster Site.

II. Proposal for the East Side

Our proposal for the East Side builds on key elements of proposals from other groups. We offer three possible consolidation scenarios. Two consist of the construction of a new school immediately Southeast of 15th and Haskell. The first would consolidate Cordley and Kennedy into this location. The second would consolidate New York and Kennedy into this location. A third possible scenario is to consolidate Cordley and New York. Each of these scenarios has some benefits but also significant drawbacks. **We emphasize that we could accept any of these options only if key conditions aimed at addressing the drawbacks are met.**

We also emphasize that our support of these East Side consolidation options is only tentative and qualified because of the extensive body of research showing that small neighborhood schools (of roughly 300 or less) and small class sizes (18 or less) provide the best learning environments for “at-risk” children (those on free or reduced-cost lunch, members of racial minorities, and English-language learners). Consolidation inevitably increases both school enrollments and class sizes, as **Addendum 1** shows.

Therefore, we could accept these options only if the plan adheres to the remaining criteria (limiting class size, attention to walkability, maintaining equitable learning environments, and keeping school groups together).

A. Cordley/Kennedy consolidation immediately Southeast of 15th and Haskell

1. Concerns about a Cordley/Kennedy consolidation at 15th/Haskell

- 1) The resulting school population would be 58.3% at-risk (free & reduced lunch); while less than the proportion of at-risk children in a New York/Kennedy consolidation, this level is still a significant concern.

- 2) The resulting school enrollment would be approximately 518 (without counting the Early Childhood Program enrollment), which is nearly double the recommended range for at-risk populations (which is roughly 300 or lower).
- 3) As shown in **Addendum 1**, class sizes would increase considerably as a direct effect of consolidation (both average and median class sizes for Kennedy students would increase by about 5 students per class). Consolidation thus moves class sizes from the recommended range for at-risk populations to well above the recommended range.
- 4) Eliminating a school at the Cordley location would leave a very large area of south-central Lawrence with no elementary school. Cordley presently functions as the “neighborhood” school of three neighborhoods: Centennial (which was served by the Centennial School until it was closed several years ago), University Place, and Barker.
- 5) Cordley also may serve as a “relief valve” for enrollment growth on the South side of Lawrence (see **Addendum 3**). Broken Arrow is effectively at 100% of its capacity. If its enrollment grows as projected, students will be moved from Broken Arrow to neighboring schools. If Cordley is closed and some of its students are placed in Schwegler, then Schwegler will have little or no capacity to absorb these overflow students. Cordley is a logical “overflow” site for some of the South Lawrence enrollment growth.
- 6) The available lot immediately Southeast of 15th and Haskell may be too small for a consolidated school unless additional acreage can be obtained.
- 7) Neither the Cordley nor Kennedy site is workable for a consolidation of these two schools. The Kennedy site, at the far eastern border of the catchment area, is not acceptable for such a consolidation due to its distance from core Cordley neighborhoods. For example, Kennedy is 1.75 miles from 1801 Mississippi, 1.7 miles from 2101 Tennessee, 1.64 miles from 1601 Vermont, and 1.46 miles from 2201 Rhode Island, addresses in the heart of different Cordley neighborhoods. The Cordley site, while more central to its catchment, is also quite distant from some Kennedy neighborhoods. For example, it is 1.4 miles from 1801 Harper Street, and 1.8 miles from 1601 Lindenwood Lane, addresses in core Kennedy neighborhoods. The Kennedy site has extreme problems with drop-off and pick-up, as documented in the Task Force’s Physical Conditions Committee report, even with its present enrollment. Its drop-off/pick-up entrances cannot accommodate a doubled enrollment.
- 8) The placement of the Cordley ESL cluster site poses difficulties in this scenario. It is our understanding that for educational reasons the District has tried to avoid placing an ESL cluster site in a school with a large at-risk population, and so it may not be appropriate to place the Cluster Site in a Cordley/Kennedy consolidated school.

- 9) Moving the Cordley Cluster Site to another school (other than a Cordley/Kennedy consolidation), however, also poses difficulties. **First**, moving a Cluster Site requires that all teachers in the new location are ESL-certified. Because of the limited number of ESL-certified teachers in most other locations, this would require moving all Cordley teachers as a whole group to the new location, and this would require removing most of the existing teaching staff in the receiving school. For example, there may be few or no ESL-certified teachers in Prairie Park). Schools receiving the Cordley Cluster Site would thus experience a major loss to their school community. Moving a cluster site would also mean that the key goal of “maintaining school groups” is not met. **Second**, while Schwegler is the remaining option, placing the Cordley cluster in Schwegler would increase Schwegler’s enrollment to nearly 100% of its capacity, leaving no room for the projected enrollment growth in the South Lawrence area. **Third**, it is our understanding that the District has tried to place Cluster Sites in central locations to minimize travel costs. Placing the Cluster Site in Prairie Park would increase travel costs.
- 10) A consolidation of Kennedy and Cordley could not occur in a way that would meet the criterion of keeping school groups together if possible because in order to lower enrollments in a Cordley/Kennedy consolidation, some Kennedy students would probably be shifted to Prairie Park and some Cordley students would be moved to Schwegler.
- 11) The savings from this consolidation (\$64,094 per year) are somewhat less than the savings from a New York/Kennedy consolidation (\$128,240 per year).
- 12) Locating a Cordley/Kennedy consolidation at 15th and Haskell may appear to threaten New York school’s viability because the 15th and Haskell site is within New York’s current catchment area.

2. Possible merits of a Cordley/Kennedy consolidation at 15th & Haskell

If the above concerns are addressed, there may be merits to a Cordley-Kennedy consolidation at this location:

- 1) A Cordley/Kennedy consolidation would have a lower percentage of at-risk students (58.3%) than a New York/Kennedy consolidation (76.3%).
- 2) A new school would provide a state-of-the-art facility for the at-risk student population on the East side. Such a facility would also send the important symbolic

and practical message that the District truly is committed to these students and these neighborhoods.

- 3) Having the early childhood center on-site (but in a separate wing) as recommended by the Kennedy group would make this important benefit more accessible to Cordley families and would continue to be a benefit to Kennedy families. This location would also make the Early Childhood site relatively accessible to New York families. The early childhood center would be located in a separate wing of the school as proposed by Kennedy and thus be separate from the elementary school.
- 4) Immediate proximity to the Boys & Girls Club facilities and the East Lawrence Recreation Center offer important benefits to the 15th & Haskell location.
- 5) This option would avoid the expense of renovating the Cordley building, which has several deferred-maintenance needs (ADA compliance, etc.).

3. Conditions Necessary Before Acceptance of a Cordley/Kennedy Consolidation at 15th & Haskell

Due to our concerns outlined above, we would support the Cordley/Kennedy consolidation at 15th & Haskell *only if the following conditions are met:*

- 1) Staffing resources should be increased in keeping with the needs of the high at-risk student population. At a minimum, the consolidated school must have:
 - a full-time nurse and full-time health assistant
 - a full-time guidance counselor/school social worker
 - a full-time parent-engagement facilitator
 - an assistant principal (necessary with the early-childhood program at the same site)
- 2) Addition of all appropriate "Title" and other extra services for at-risk student groups.
- 3) Class sizes in the consolidated school should not increase above the average in the present Kennedy school. This will require using some of the operating-cost savings gained from consolidation for placing additional teachers in the consolidated school. **See Addendum 2.**
- 4) K-5 enrollment in the school should be reduced to 400 at most. Enrollments at this level may be acceptable if the above conditions are met. But as long as a large proportion of the enrollment remains at-risk, steps should be taken to ensure that enrollments do not increase much above this level.

5) The building and site should incorporate design features that make it truly a state-of-the-art elementary school for at-risk populations. At a minimum, these features should include:

- ideal classroom sizes (as recommended by the Task Force Physical Conditions Committee)
- an ideal complement of additional rooms for “specials” classes and at-risk needs
- an ideal allocation of space on the site for diverse playground opportunities and playing fields
- an ideal complement of windows and natural daylight in the classrooms
- additional site features to be designed with community input (e.g., garden plots; water garden; green technology; other features, like a library or health clinic, that are accessible to the community)

6) A suitable solution must be developed for the problem of having no “relief valve” school on the near-South side to absorb enrollment overflows from South-side schools as their enrollments rise above their capacity. We are not sure what this solution would be in the absence of a school somewhere in the area of Cordley or Centennial schools.

7) A suitable location for the Cordley ESL Cluster Site, with the necessary number of ESL-certified teachers, must be found. If other sites do not have sufficient numbers of certified teachers, the Working Group should decide whether we are willing to recommend moving the Cluster Site in light of the fact that doing so would require displacing the receiving school’s teachers in order to receive ESL-certified teachers from Cordley.

8) The apparent risk of a consolidated Cordley/Kennedy school at this location to the viability of New York school could be mitigated by a policy commitment by the School Board to maintain two elementary schools in eastern Lawrence: one at New York school and one immediately southeast of 15th and Haskell. This is a plausible scenario because elementary enrollments in eastern Lawrence are too high for one school, and boundaries could be managed to maintain a school at New York and another immediately southeast of 15th & Haskell.

B. Kennedy/New York consolidation immediately Southeast of 15th and Haskell

1. Concerns about a New York/Kennedy consolidation

- 1) The resulting school population would be 76.3% at-risk (free & reduced lunch).
- 2) The resulting school enrollment would be approximately 409, which is higher than the recommended range for at-risk populations (which is roughly 300 or lower).
- 3) As shown in **Addendum 1**, class sizes would increase considerably as a direct effect of consolidation (for a NY/Kennedy consolidation, average class size increases by 3; median class size increases by 3-4). Consolidation thus moves class sizes from the recommended range for at-risk populations to well above the recommended range.
- 4) The available lot at 15th and Haskell, while larger than the New York lot, may be too small for a consolidated school unless additional acreage can be obtained
- 5) Neither the New York nor Kennedy site is workable for a consolidation. The New York and Kennedy sites are at the opposite ends of the neighborhood; New York children would have difficulty walking to the Kennedy site and vice versa. The New York building and site pose limitations for consolidating an elementary school of 400 plus an early childhood center because the NY building is the District's smallest elementary building and the site is the District's 2nd-smallest. Although it is possible to add space to the building, the small lot somewhat limits possibilities. Additionally, the Kennedy building, while good in many ways, has persistent drainage problems due to its placement at the bottom of a hill.

2. Possible merits of a New York/Kennedy consolidation immediately Southeast of 15th & Haskell

If the above concerns are addressed, there may be merits to a NY-Kennedy consolidation:

- 1) A new school would provide a state-of-the-art facility for the at-risk student population on the East side. Such a facility would also send the important symbolic and practical message that the District truly is committed to these students and these neighborhoods
- 2) Having the early childhood center on-site (but in a separate wing) as recommended by the Kennedy group would be a benefit to NY families and would continue to be a

benefit to Kennedy families. The early childhood center would be located in a separate wing of the school as proposed by Kennedy and thus be separate from the elementary school

- 3) Immediate proximity to the Boys & Girls Club facilities and the East Lawrence Recreation Center offer important benefits to the 15th & Haskell location
- 4) This consolidation option would keep existing school groups together rather than dividing them among several schools. Other consolidation options require dividing a school's student group among several schools
- 5) A mid-point site southeast of 15th and Haskell would be more central to the catchment area of the neighborhood than either of the current schools, both of which are near the opposite borders of their catchment areas, and thus would meet the "walkability" criterion. Neither the New York nor Kennedy sites meets the walkability criterion for students from the other school.
- 6) The savings from a New York/Kennedy consolidation (\$128,240 per year) are somewhat more than the savings from either a Cordley/Kennedy consolidation (\$64,094 per year) or a Cordley/New York consolidation (\$74,450).

3. Conditions for NY/Kennedy Consolidation

Due to our concerns outlined above, we would support the NY-Kennedy consolidation only if the following conditions are met:

- 1) Staffing resources should be increased in keeping with the needs of the high at-risk student population. At a minimum, the consolidated school must have:
 - a full-time nurse and full-time health assistant
 - a full-time guidance counselor/school social worker
 - a full-time parent-engagement facilitator
 - an assistant principal (necessary with the early-childhood program at the same site)
- 2) Addition of all appropriate "Title" and other extra services for at-risk student groups.
- 3) Class sizes in the consolidated school should not increase above the average in the present NY and Kennedy schools. This will require using some of the operating-cost savings gained from consolidation to place additional teachers in the consolidated school. **See Addendum 2.**

- 4) Enrollments of around 400 may be acceptable if the above conditions are met. But as long as a large proportion of the enrollment remains at-risk, steps should be taken to ensure that enrollments do not increase much above this level.
- 5) The building and site should incorporate design features that make it truly a state-of-the-art elementary school for at-risk populations. At a minimum, these features should include:
 - ideal classroom sizes (as recommended by the Task Force Physical Conditions Committee)
 - an ideal complement of additional rooms for “specials” classes and at-risk needs
 - an ideal allocation of space on the site for diverse playground opportunities and playing fields
 - an ideal complement of windows and natural daylight in the classrooms
 - additional site features to be designed with community input (e.g., garden plots; water garden; green technology; other features, like a library or health clinic, that are accessible to the community)

C) Cordley/New York consolidation

We believe there are some merits to a New York/Cordley consolidation, but there are also significant concerns. If this consolidation is favored by the Working Group, the key question is where the consolidated school should be placed. There is no middle site. The New York site presents significant drawbacks and we cannot support it. The Cordley site presents other drawbacks, but on balance we believe that if Cordley and New York are joined, the Cordley site is the more workable location for the reasons we outline below.

1. Concerns about a Cordley/New York consolidation

- 1) The resulting school enrollment would be approximately 479 and, according to the District’s projections, this would grow significantly in coming years, approaching double the recommended range for at-risk populations.
- 2) As shown in **Addendum 1**, class sizes would increase considerably as a direct effect of consolidation. Consolidation thus moves class sizes for New York students from the recommended range for at-risk populations to well above the recommended range.

- 3) There is no mid-point site between the two schools, requiring one or the other to be consolidated into the other. This may be difficult for the “losing” school community to accept.
- 4) Either building would require substantial additions to accommodate the students from both schools.
- 5) If Cordley were closed rather than expanded as a result of this consolidation, the South side of Lawrence would lose an important “relief valve” for the emerging problem of overcrowding in South Lawrence elementary schools. **See Addendum 3.**
- 6) The financial savings of this consolidation (\$74,450) are relatively low.

2. Possible merits of a Cordley/New York consolidation

- 1) The proportion of at-risk children would be 54%, the lowest of any of the East-side options.
- 2) Assuming that consolidation of these two schools would be done in an existing school, the capital costs of the consolidation would probably be lower than the cost of building a new school.
- 3) There are some affinities between the New York and Cordley neighborhood groups, which may facilitate a consolidation of the two student populations.

3. Conditions for a Cordley/New York consolidation

- 1) Staffing resources should be increased in keeping with the needs of the high at-risk student population. At a minimum, the consolidated school must have:
 - a full-time nurse and full-time health assistant
 - a full-time guidance counselor/school social worker
 - a full-time parent-engagement facilitator
- 2) All appropriate “Title” and other extra services for at-risk student groups should be assured in the consolidated school.
- 3) Class sizes in the consolidated school should not increase above the average in the present New York school. This will require using some of the operating-cost savings gained from consolidation to place additional teachers in the consolidated school. **See Addendum 2.**

- 4) Enrollments of around 400 may be acceptable if the above conditions are met. But as long as a large proportion of the enrollment remains at-risk, steps should be taken to ensure that enrollments do not increase much above this level.

- 5) The location should be at the Cordley site, for the following reasons:
 - The New York site is at the far northeast corner of the combined catchment area, limiting walkability for most Cordley-area students (for example, New York school is 1.75 miles from 1726 Illinois, and 2 miles from 2221 Tennessee, addresses in the heart of Cordley neighborhoods). The Cordley site is more near the center of its catchment area and thus is closer to the students living in the core New York neighborhood. For example, 8th and New York Street, near the far northeast edge of the New York catchment area (virtually as far away from Cordley as is possible in the New York catchment), is 1.6 miles from Cordley.

 - The New York site, at 3.01 acres, is among the smallest in the District and is probably too small to be workable for a school serving 400-479 students. Playground space would be severely limited after an expansion of the New York building. The Cordley site is a half-acre larger, offering more flexibility for expansion of the building.

 - While either school would require substantial additions in order to become a 3-section school, the New York building (at 31,842 sf, including portables) does not currently have sufficient space to be a 2-section school and thus would require more substantial additions than the Cordley building (at 44,333 sf, without portables), which is currently a full two-plus section school (some grades have 3 sections). The new construction needed at New York to accommodate Cordley's 300 students is probably much more substantial than the new construction needed at Cordley to accommodate New York's 185 students.

 - If the New York location were chosen, this would eliminate a school at the Cordley location, which would leave a very large area of south-central Lawrence with no elementary school. Cordley presently functions as the neighborhood school for three neighborhoods: Centennial (which was served by the Centennial School until it was closed several years ago), University Place, and Barker.

 - If the New York location were chosen, it is likely that some of the western-most Cordley students (in Centennial and University Place neighborhoods) would be placed in Schwegler. Closing Cordley and shifting some of its western students to Schwegler would fill Schwegler to near-capacity and would eliminate use of Cordley and Schwegler as "relief valves" for enrollment growth on the South side of Lawrence. In such a scenario, South Lawrence schools would be significantly over-crowded if the area's enrollment grows as projected (see **Addendum 3**).

III. Why other East Side consolidation options are not feasible and prudent

Other East side consolidation options (Cordley/Kennedy/NY; or Cordley/Kennedy at the current site of either Cordley or Kennedy) pose greater difficulties and we do not support them for the following reasons.

A) Cordley/Kennedy/NY (3-school) consolidation

On all key criteria, a 3-school consolidation on the East side is problematic. It would harm rather than help children's educational opportunities.

- The enrollment (703) of this 3-school consolidation would be far above recommended levels, and 62% of these 703 would be at-risk (free and reduced lunch).
- Class sizes in the consolidated school would be considerably higher than recommended levels for at-risk students.
- An adequate site for a school of this size is not available within the existing neighborhoods. The only alternative, a site on the edge of Lawrence, would be at a considerable distance from most students in the neighborhood and nearly none could walk to it. Building on a suburban site and closing the East-side neighborhood schools would draw out considerable political opposition to the needed bond proposal.
- Even if 100 students were sent to Prairie Park and 100 students were sent to Pinckney in order to reduce the overall enrollment, the remaining enrollment in the consolidated school would be considerably above recommended levels for an at-risk population.
- Dispersing 200 students to Prairie Park and Pinckney would consume nearly every available seat in these schools; any further enrollment growth in the East/Southeast area would produce over-crowding or require the District to build another elementary school on the Southeast edge of Lawrence.
- The placement of the ESL Cluster Site (currently at Cordley) poses serious difficulties for this option. **See points 8 & 9 on pages 5-6 above.**

B) Cordley/Kennedy consolidation at some location other than immediately Southeast of 15th & Haskell

A key problem with consolidating Cordley and Kennedy is finding a suitable location for a site. If 15th & Haskell is not used for this consolidation, we agree with the Kennedy group that there is no suitable mid-point location between the two schools.

- A possible mid-point site, at 19th and Haskell, is considerably less attractive for a neighborhood school than a 15th & Haskell site. While the 15th & Haskell site is in the heart of a residential neighborhood and is directly next to the East Lawrence Recreation Center and the East Heights school building, which could be used for the Boys and Girls Club), the 19th and Haskell site is immediately surrounded by a strip mall, an industrial area, and an auto-repair facility. It is within one block of an operating grain elevator.

- The Kennedy site, at the far eastern border of the catchment area, is not acceptable for such a consolidation due to its distance from core Cordley neighborhoods. For example, Kennedy is 1.75 miles from 1801 Mississippi, 1.7 miles from 2101 Tennessee, 1.64 miles from 1601 Vermont, and 1.46 miles from 2201 Rhode Island, addresses in the heart of different Cordley neighborhoods.

- The Cordley site, while more central to its catchment, is also quite distant from some Kennedy neighborhoods. For example, it is 1.4 miles from 1801 Harper Street, and 1.8 miles from 1601 Lindenwood Lane, addresses in core Kennedy neighborhoods.

- The Kennedy site has extreme problems with drop-off and pick-up, as documented in the Physical Conditions Committee report, even with its present enrollment. Its drop-off/pick-up entrances cannot accommodate a doubled enrollment.

- The placement of the Cordley ESL cluster site poses serious difficulties in this scenario. **See points 8 & 9 on pages 5-6 above.**

- A consolidation of Kennedy and Cordley could not occur in a way that would meet the criterion of keeping school groups together if possible. In order to lower enrollments in a Cordley/Kennedy consolidation, some Kennedy students would probably be shifted to Prairie Park and some Cordley students would be moved to Schwegler.

IV. The Central Area (Hillcrest, Pinckney, Sunset Hill)

After careful consideration of available options in light of our charge, we recommend no consolidation in the central area. Every option in the central area poses significant difficulties and would require us to depart too far from central elements of our charge. No option sufficiently meets the educational and equity elements of our charge. Additionally, as **Addendum 2** illustrates, no Central area option yields significant net financial savings if teachers are retained in order to limit growth in class sizes resulting from consolidation. Therefore we recommend renovations to the existing schools: additions to Hillcrest and Sunset Hill to allow elimination of portables, and needed repairs to all three schools.

- 1) Any of the main consolidation options in the central area (Hillcrest-SH; Hillcrest-Pinckney) would produce a school with an unacceptably high enrollment (Hillcrest-SH: 614; Hillcrest-Pinckney: 585).
- 2) The only solution to this problem would be to remove the ESL Cluster or a significant number of other students, but these options are not feasible for the following reasons:
 - a) Moving the ESL cluster as a whole to another location (other than Hillcrest/SH) presents major practical difficulties for the receiving school. Moving it to Quail Run would require replacing virtually all QR teachers with Hillcrest ESL-certified teachers, as well as certifying the remaining teachers, a disruption and expense that is not justified. No other location for the ESL cluster in central Lawrence is feasible due to the lack of available capacity in other schools. Prairie Park has capacity for some of Hillcrest's ELL students, but placing a Cluster in Prairie Park would require moving all of Hillcrest's ESL-certified teachers to Prairie Park and dispersing the Prairie Park teachers elsewhere. This poses significant managerial and educational problems.
 - b) Dividing the ESL Cluster among schools with ESL-certified teachers, like Schwegler and Cordley, would fill virtually all available seats in these schools, and this is not prudent as ELL enrollments continue to increase and the District's ESL sites would quickly be beyond capacity.
 - c) Moving the ESL cluster separately from other Hillcrest students, or dividing it in order to make the parts fit in other schools, would tear apart student groups, a step we should try to avoid.
- 3) Alternatively, non-ELL students in Hillcrest/SH might be moved to Quail Run, but this is not prudent, as shown in Addendum 3, because doing so would move students from Lawrence's older core to the periphery and would push all the schools in the Central/West area to very near their capacity. Future growth in enrollment would

require the District either to fill Central/West schools beyond their capacity (which is not wise for educational reasons) or to immediately build a new school. The most likely locations for a new elementary school would be on Lawrence's periphery. The long-term consequence would be to shift elementary populations from the old core of Lawrence to the periphery, while hollowing-out the school resources in the old core. This is not wise from the perspective of urban planning and the sustainability of Lawrence's older core neighborhoods.

- 4) Although this proposal would leave Sunset Hill and Pinckney with less than 300 in enrollment, we believe that this is preferable to reducing school capacity in the central area of Lawrence. Both Sunset Hill and Pinckney are workable 2-section schools. As the Pinckney Group reminded us in their proposal, the Finance Committee of the Task Force found that while 1-section schools are substantially less financially-efficient than 2- and 3-section schools, 2-section schools are virtually as financially-efficient as are 3-section schools. Additionally, in the context of significant enrollment growth in the District's elementary schools, a somewhat under-enrolled Sunset Hill and Pinckney should be viewed as an *asset*: they would be relief-valves for possible growth in enrollment in other near-west schools (Quail Run and Deerfield) (See **Addendum 3**). If Sunset Hill and Pinckney are closed, then enrollment growth in Quail Run and Deerfield would soon require building a new school, probably further to the west, as outlined in point 3 above. Maintaining capacity in central Lawrence is preferable to this outcome.

Addendum 1, Cordley proposal

The impact of consolidation on class size

Consolidation will significantly increase class sizes unless corrective steps are taken. Here is why. If four 19-student classes from 2 schools are put together into one school, they total 76 students. If the District splits these 76 students when class sizes rise above the 26-student threshold, which is district policy for some of these schools, there will now be 3 sections instead of the 4 previous sections. (This is where the savings are found: reducing 4 sections to 3, and eliminating one teaching line.) *The result is that the new sections now have 25, 25 and 26 students, where before they had 19 each.* That is essentially what happens in all consolidation scenarios: pulling students together into a larger pool allows class sizes to rise considerably, even if they are split at the District's current caps on class size. The source for cost-savings is this increase in class sizes. For example, as the table below illustrates, the average class size in Kennedy is currently 18.6 (which 1.6 students above the recommended class-size cap for at-risk students); consolidation with Cordley would increase the average class size in the consolidated school to 23.5, which is far above the recommended range.

Consolidation also increases the sizes of the *largest* classes in each school. For example, the largest class in Pinckney is currently 22; consolidating with Hillcrest would increase this to 31.

All data are from official USD497 9/20 enrollment reports. Calculations of the effect of the targeted consolidations are based on adding enrollments for each pair of schools, at each grade level, and splitting classes when their enrollment is above the District's current thresholds for splitting classes (these thresholds and the data used here provided on the second page).

East side, before and after consolidation:

	School size	Average class size	Median	Mode	Smallest class	Largest class
Before consolidation						
Cordley	294	22.6	23	26	18	26
Kennedy	224	18.6	17	18	16	24
New York	185	18.1	18	19	14	24
Pinckney	229	19.3	19	20	16	22
Average	233	19.9	20	18	16	24
After consolidation						
Cordley/Kennedy	518	23.5	23	24	20	28
Cordley/New York	479	21.8	20	21	19	27
Kennedy/New York	409	21.5	21	20	19	26
Average	455	22.8	22	21	19.8	27

Central area, before and after consolidation:

	School size	Average class size	Median	Mode	Smallest class	Largest class
Before consolidation						
Pinckney	229	19.3	19	20	16	22
Hillcrest	356	23.7	24	21	18	31
Sunset Hill	258	21.7	21	25	16	25
Average	307	21.7	21	20, 21, 25	17	28
After consolidation						
Hillcrest/Sunset Hill	614	24.6	26	27	24	27
Hillcrest/Pinckney	585	24.3	24	24	22	31
Average	600	24.4	24	24	23	29

Data for above tables

Enrollment threshold above which classes are divided into two

	K-3	4-5
Cordley	27	32
Kennedy	25	30
New York	26	31
Hillcrest	26	31
Pinckney	26	31
Sunset Hill	27	32

Current number of students and sections, by school and grade (in parentheses: number of sections)

Grade	Cordley	Kennedy	NY	Hillcrest	SH
KG	44 (2)	51 (2)	36 (2)	59 (3)	38 (2)
1	50 (2)	32 (2)	29 (2)	71 (3)	33 (2)
2	48 (2)	45 (2)	32 (2)	58 (3)	43 (2)
3	57 (3)	34 (2)	25 (1)	49 (2)	48 (2)
4	52 (2)	21 (1)	24 (1)	57 (2)	50 (2)
5	43 (2)	40 (2)	37 (2)	62 (2)	46 (2)

Projected number of students & sections in consolidated schools

Projections are based on summing current enrollments (in parentheses: number of sections)

Grade	Cordley/ Kennedy	Kennedy/ NY	Cordley/ NY	Hillcrest/ Sunset Hill	Hillcrest/ Pinckney	New York/ Pinckney
enrollment	518	409	479	614	587	414
% at-risk	58.3%	76.3%	54.3%	51.8%	57.6%	64.5%
KG	95 (4-5)	87 (4)	80 (4)	97 (5)	98 (4-5)	75 (3-4)
1	82 (4)	61 (3)	79 (4)	104 (4-5)	113 (5)	71 (3)
2	93 (4)	77 (4)	80 (4)	101 (4)	97 (4-5)	71 (3)
3	91 (4)	59 (3)	82 (4)	97 (4)	88 (4)	64 (3)
4	73 (3)	45 (2)	76 (3)	107 (4)	94 (4)	61 (2-3)
5	83 (3)	77 (3)	80 (3)	108 (4)	93 (3-4)	69 (3)

Addendum 2, Cordley proposal

Balancing competing criteria in our charge: Scenarios

Our charge asks us to balance *cost-cutting* and *equity*. As the scenarios below make clear, we face the following specific tradeoffs:

- 1) **Financial savings come from considerable increases in school and class sizes.** In some instances, the largest classes resulting from closing and consolidation will be the largest classes in the District (currently 31). Some of the resulting consolidated schools would be the largest elementary schools in the District (well above 600). For at-risk populations, the Task Force recommended keeping school sizes to about 300 for at-risk student populations and class sizes at the *lower* end of the District class-size goals (13-17 students in grades KG-3, and 18-26 students in grades 4-5). To mitigate harm to students, we recommend that some of the financial savings from consolidation should be reinvested in reducing class sizes (by not cutting teachers and sections).
- 2) **Consolidation results in schools with a greater number of class sections per grade than recommended by the Task Force.** The Task Force recommended capping school size at 3 sections per grade. Most consolidation scenarios result in 4 sections per grade or more. If class sizes in the consolidated schools are reduced to the sizes in the separate schools before consolidation, the number of sections per grade increases. This leads to a key question for the Working Group: How many sections per grade do we find acceptable in a consolidated school?
- 3) **Closing and consolidating schools makes it possible to have a full-time nurse, librarian, guidance counselor, etc., where schools currently have these staff only part-time, but this comes at the cost of actual reductions in FTEs (full-time equivalent positions)/student in these staffing areas.** For example, two .6 FTE guidance counselors become in a consolidated school 1.2 FTE, and the .2 may be lost to a cut. We recommend that the Working Group discuss whether 1 FTE, located full-time in a school, is preferable to two .6 FTEs located in different schools. In what staffing areas should we recommend retaining the FTE resulting from consolidation, even though this would yield less financial savings?
- 4) **If equity is our standard, consolidated schools with large at-risk student populations should have additional staffing resources.** What staffing resources should we require as a condition for closing and consolidation?
- 5) **The capital costs of construction are not considered here.** How much are we willing to recommend spending in capital costs in order to gain reductions in operating costs? Put differently, how much should the savings be in the area of operating costs in order to justify considerable capital expenditures?

Savings from consolidation: different scenarios

The following tables estimate the financial savings from consolidating different combinations of schools. Savings are gained by cutting staff. Therefore, the tables focus on how much savings can be gotten from staff cuts (measured in FTE, or full-time equivalents):

- for teachers: the savings to be gotten from cuts in the number of teachers focus on the total number of class sections that can be cut when two schools are consolidated into one
- for other staff (e.g., nurses): the savings to be gotten from cuts in the number of staff are based on a comparison of the staffing levels for each type of staff with the staffing levels in a current 3-section school with a low at-risk student population (Quail Run)
- all calculations are based on the District's report of standard staffing costs

Each of the following scenarios contains three different calculations of possible savings:

- 1) **Savings not adjusted for equity.** These calculations are based on a comparison with the staffing levels in a 3-section school, and if class sections are split at the current threshold, without any attempt to mitigate the harms arising from increased class sizes in consolidated schools
- 2) **Savings adjusted for equity.** The calculations in this column in the tables below are based on the following adjustments:
 - Class size in grades K-3 is capped at 17 (because that is the cap on class sizes recommended for at-risk students by the leading Project STAR study)
 - Class size in grades 4-5 is capped at 22 (because Project STAR found that students in the upper elementary grades are harmed somewhat less than younger students by larger class sizes, and because the Project STAR study found that harm to education became significantly greater above this level)
 - Full-time nurse
 - Full-time health assistant
 - 2 full-time guidance counselors
 - Assistant principal in schools over 550 enrollment
- 3) **A possible compromise.** The calculations in this column in the tables below are based on the following adjustments (which would reduce class sizes in consolidated schools to roughly the current level in the separate schools):
 - Class size in grades K-3 is capped at 20
 - Class size in grades 4-5 is capped at 25 (the study by Ready and Lee, 2007, demonstrated clear harms to education for at-risk students at class sizes above 25)
 - Full-time nurse
 - Full-time health assistant
 - 2 full-time guidance counselors *in schools over 550 enrollment*
 - Assistant principal in schools over 550 enrollment

Salaries per FTE (used to calculate savings in the following tables) (source: USD497)

	\$ per FTE
Principal	92,334
Teachers	53,045
Music	52,107
Art	54,263
PE	53,860
Guidance	56,118
Nurse	55,303
Health aide	22,707
Librarian	61,960
Librarian ass't	22,350
Secretary/Admin	34,594
Secretary	25,052
Custodian, head	39,870
Custodian	30,971

A) Cordley/Kennedy consolidation

Number of class sections (teachers): different class-size scenarios (source: USD497 data)

	enrollment	Number of sections in separate schools	Consolidated: Number of sections if cap is current policy ("not adjusted for equity")	Consolidated: Number of sections if capped at 17/22 ("equity")	Consolidated: Number of sections if capped at 20/25 ("compromise")
KG	95	5	4-5*	6	5
1	82	4	4	5	5
2	93	4	4	6	5
3	91	5	4	6	5
4	73	3	3	4	3
5	83	4	3	4	4
total		25	22-23	31	27
Difference (savings or loss)			2-3	-6	-2

*The addition of 6 students in Kindergarten would require the addition of 1 section.

Financial savings from consolidation: different Cordley/Kennedy scenarios

	Quail Run (2010, for comparison)	FTE resulting from consolidation (savings in parens)	Savings not adjusted for equity	Savings adjusted for equity	A possible compromise
Principal	1.0	1.5 (.5)*	46,117	46,117	46,117
Teachers			106,090 to 159,135	-318,270	-106,090
Music	1.5	1.422 (-.078)	-4,233	-4,233	-4,233
Art	1.0	1.37 (.37)	20,077	20,077	20,077
PE	1.0	1.39 (.39)	21,005	21,005	21,005
Guidance	1.0	1.0 (0)	0	-56,118	0
Nurse	.5	1.0 (.5)	27,652	27,652	0
Health ass't	.250	.55 (.3)	6,812	-17,030	-17,030
Librarian	1.0	1.5 (.5)	30,980	30,980	30,980
Librarian ass't	.563	.9375 (.3745)	8,370	8,370	8,370
Secretary-admin	1.0	2.0 (1.0)	34,594	34,594	34,594
Secretary	1.0	0 (-1.0)	-25,052	-25,052	-25,052
Custodian, head	1.0	2.0 (1.0)	39,870	39,870	39,870
Custodian	1.0	1.5 (.5)	15,486	15,486	15,486
Total			\$327,768 to 380,813	-\$176,552	\$64,094

*The Kennedy principal is assigned to lead the Early Childhood program at Kennedy as well as K-5. If K-5 is consolidated with another school, the Early Childhood program would still require a principal.

B) Kennedy/New York

Number of class sections (teachers): different class-size scenarios

	enrollment	Number of sections in separate schools	Consolidated: Number of sections if cap is current policy ("not adjusted for equity")	Consolidated: Number of sections if capped at 17/22 ("equity")	Consolidated: Number of sections if capped at 20/25 ("compromise")
KG	87	5	4	6	5
1	61	4	3	4	4
2	77	4	4	5	4
3	59	3	3	4	3
4	45	2	2	3	2
5	77	4	3	4	4
total		22	19	26	22
Difference (savings or loss)			3	-4	0

Financial savings from consolidation: different Kennedy/NY scenarios

	Quail Run (2010, for comparison)	FTE resulting from consolidation (savings in parens)	Savings not adjusted for equity	Savings adjusted for equity	A possible compromise
Principal	1.0	1.5 (.5)	46,117	46,117	46,117
Teachers			159,135	-212,180	0
Music	1.5	1.279 (-.221)	-11,516	-11,516	-11,516
Art	1.0	1.34 (.34)	18,449	18,449	18,449
PE	1.0	1.28 (.28)	15,081	15,081	15,081
Guidance	1.0	1.0 (0)	0	0	0
Nurse	.5	1.0 (.5)	27,652	0	0
Health ass't	.250	.5 (.25)	5,677	-17,030	-17,030
Librarian	1.0	1.0 (0)	0	0	0
Librarian ass't	.563	.625 (.062)	1,386	8,370	8,370
Secretary-admin	1.0	2.0 (1.0)	34,594	34,594	34,594
Secretary	1.0	0 (-1.0)	-25,052	-25,052	-25,052
Custodian, head	1.0	2.0 (1.0)	39,870	39,870	39,870
Custodian	1.0	1.625 (.625)	19,357	19,357	19,357
Total			\$330,750	\$-83,940	\$128,240

C) Cordley/New York

Number of class sections (teachers): different class-size scenarios

	enrollment	Number of sections in separate schools	Consolidated: Number of sections if cap is current policy ("not adjusted for equity")	Consolidated: Number of sections if capped at 17/22 ("equity")	Consolidated: Number of sections if capped at 20/25 ("compromise")
KG	80	4	4	5	4
1	79	4	4	5	4
2	80	4	4	5	4
3	82	4	4	5	5
4	76	3	3	4	4
5	80	4	3	4	4
total		23	22	28	25
Difference (savings or loss)			1	-5	-2

Financial savings from consolidation: different Cordley/NY scenarios

	Quail Run (2010, for comparison)	FTE resulting from consolidation (savings in parens)	Savings not adjusted for equity	Savings adjusted for equity	A possible compromise
Principal	1.0	2.0 (1.0)	92,234	92,234	92,234
Teachers			53,045	-265,225	-106,090
Music	1.5	1.367 (-.133)	-6,930	-6,930	-6,930
Art	1.0	1.37 (.37)	20,077	20,077	20,077
PE	1.0	1.33 (.33)	17,774	17,774	17,774
Guidance	1.0	1.0 (0)	0	0	0
Nurse	.5	.8 (.3)	16,591	-11,061	-11,061
Health ass't	.250	.55 (.3)	6,812	-10,218	-10,218
Librarian	1.0	1.5 (.5)	30,980	30,980	30,980
Librarian ass't	.563	.3125 (-.2505)	-5,599	-5,599	-5,599
Secretary-admin	1.0	2.0 (1.0)	34,594	34,594	34,594
Secretary	1.0	0 (-1.0)	-25,052	-25,052	-25,052
Custodian, head	1.0	2.0 (1.0)	39,870	39,870	39,870
Custodian	1.0	1.125 (.125)	3,871	3,871	3,871
Total			\$278,267	-84,685	74,450

D) Hillcrest/Sunset Hill

Number of class sections (teachers): different class-size scenarios

	enrollment	Number of sections in separate schools	Consolidated: Number of sections if cap is current policy ("not adjusted for equity")	Consolidated: Number of sections if capped at 17/22 ("equity")	Consolidated: Number of sections if capped at 20/25 ("compromise")
KG	97	5	5	6	5
1	104	5	4-5*	7	6
2	101	5	4	6	6
3	97	4	4	6	5
4	107	4	4	5	5
5	108	4	4	5	5
total		27	25-26	35	32
Difference (savings or loss)			1-2	-8	-5

*The addition of 1 student at this grade level would require adding another section.

Financial savings from consolidation: different Hillcrest/Sunset Hill scenarios

	Quail Run (2010, for comparison)	FTE resulting from consolidation (savings in parens)	Savings not adjusted for equity	Savings adjusted for equity	A possible compromise (hold harmless)
Principal	1.0	2.0 (1.0)	92,234	0	0
Teachers		(3)	53,045 to 106,090	-424,360	-265,225
Music	1.5	1.8 (.3)	15,632	15,632	15,632
Art	1.0	1.43 (.43)	23,333	23,333	23,333
PE	1.0	1.5 (.5)	26,930	26,930	26,930
Guidance	1.0	1.2 (.2)	11,224	-44,894	-44,894
Nurse	.5	1.0 (.5)	27,652	0	0
Health ass't	.250	.65 (.4)	9,083	-17,030	-17,030
Librarian	1.0	2.0 (1.0)	61,960	0	0
Librarian ass't	.563	.6875 (.1245)	2,783	8,370	8,370
Secretary-admin	1.0	2.0 (1.0)	34,594	34,594	34,594
Secretary	1.0	.5 (-.5)	-12,526	-25,052	-25,052
Custodian, head	1.0	2.0 (1.0)	39,870	39,870	39,870
Custodian	1.0	1.625 (.625)	19,357	19,357	19,357
Total			405,171 to 458,216*	-343,250	-184,115

E) Hillcrest/Pinckney

Number of class sections (teachers): different class-size scenarios

	enrollment	Number of sections in separate schools	Consolidated: Number of sections if cap is current policy ("not adjusted for equity")	Consolidated: Number of sections if capped at 17/22 ("equity")	Consolidated: Number of sections if capped at 20/25 ("compromise")
KG	98	5	4-5*	6	5
1	113	5	5	7	6
2	97	5	4-5**	6	5
3	88	4	4	6	5
4	94	4	4	5	4
5	93	4	3-4***	5	4
total		27	24-27	35	29
Difference (savings or loss)			0-3	-8	-2

*The addition of 6 students in this grade would require adding another section, which would yield no reduction in sections at this grade level.

**The addition of 7 students in this grade would require adding another section.

***The addition of 1 student at this grade level would require adding another section.

Financial savings from consolidation: different Hillcrest/Pinckney scenarios

	Quail Run (2010, for comparison)	FTE resulting from consolidation (savings in parens)	Savings not adjusted for equity	Savings adjusted for equity	A possible compromise (hold harmless)
Principal	1.0	2.0 (1.0)	92,234	0	0
Teachers		(0 to 3)	0 to 159,135	-424,360	-106,090
Music	1.5	1.8 (.3)	15,632	15,632	15,632
Art	1.0	1.53 (.53)	28,759	28,759	28,759
PE	1.0	1.5 (.5)	26,930	26,930	26,930
Guidance	1.0	1.2 (.2)	11,224	-44,894	-44,894
Nurse	.5	1.0 (.5)	27,652	0	0
Health ass't	.250	.65 (.4)	9,083	-7,947	-7,947
Librarian	1.0	1.5 (.5)	30,980	30,984	30,984
Librarian ass't	.563	.625 (.062)	1,386	1,386	1,386
Secretary-admin	1.0	2.0 (1.0)	34,594	34,594	34,594
Secretary	1.0	.5 (-.5)	-12,526	-12,526	-12,526
Custodian, head	1.0	2.0 (1.0)	39,870	39,870	39,870
Custodian	1.0	2.0 (1.0)	30,971	30,971	30,971
Total			336,789 to 495,924*	-280,601	37,669

Addendum 3, Cordley proposal

The need for “relief valves” in school capacity in the South and Central areas of Lawrence

Enrollment is straining the functional capacity of elementary schools in the South and Central-West areas of Lawrence. The Physical Conditions Committee of the Task Force recommended using 90% utilization of available capacity as the measure of when an elementary school is functionally “full.” When elementary school enrollment is above 90% capacity, flexibility becomes increasingly limited. For example, above this level it may be necessary to add one or more sections for some grade levels, but there may be no available rooms for the extra sections, requiring the addition of portable classrooms. Sunflower Elementary, which is at 103% of its capacity, requires the use of a portable classroom.

The 90% capacity standard has implications for consolidation in two areas of Lawrence: South Lawrence and Central/West Lawrence, as we describe below.

The South Area

Schools in the near-south area Lawrence (Broken Arrow, Cordley, and Schwegler) are currently at 89.2% of capacity. By year 2016, enrollment in these three schools is projected to grow by 89 students, reaching 97.3% of their total capacity. The schools in the broader south area of Lawrence as a whole (the above schools plus Sunflower and Prairie Park) are at 87.1% of capacity. By 2016, enrollment in these five schools is projected to grow by 162 students, to 94.9% of their capacity.

If Cordley is closed and other capacity is not added in the area to compensate for this loss of capacity, the remaining schools will immediately be above 90% of capacity, as shown in the tables below. If we look at the near-South schools, closing Cordley would add enrollments to neighboring schools (probably Schwegler), which would fill the remaining schools to their functional capacity. Any natural growth in enrollments would exceed these schools’ capacity. Even if we include all South-area schools (including Prairie Park and Sunflower), closing Cordley would push the overall area far above 90% of capacity.

If Sunflower’s overcrowding is alleviated by shifting some of its students into other West-area schools (Langston Hughes and Quail Run), the first table below shows that enrollment in the near-South schools will still be pushing up against these schools’ functional capacity.

--Tables of enrollment and projections follow on next page--

Near-South Schools: enrollment and capacity

	Enrollment	Capacity	% of Capacity
Broken Arrow	305	312	97.8%
Cordley	294	308	95.5%
Schwegler	382	480	79.6%
Total (current)	981	1100	89.2%
Total (projected 2016)	1070	1100	97.3%
Total if Cordley closed and 100 of its students moved to Schwegler	787	792	99.4%
Total if Cordley closed and 100 of its students moved to Schwegler and South schools grow as projected	876	792	110.6%

All South Schools: enrollment and capacity

	Enrollment	Capacity	% of Capacity
Broken Arrow	305	312	97.8%
Cordley	294	308	95.5%
Prairie Park	344	504	68.3%
Schwegler	382	480	79.6%
Sunflower	485	475	102.1%
Total (current)	1810	2079	87.1%
Total (projected 2016)	1972	2079	94.9%
Total if Cordley closed and 100 of its students moved to Schwegler	1616	1771	91.2%
Total if Cordley closed and 100 of its students moved to Schwegler and South schools grow as projected	1778	1771	100.4%

--continued on next page--

The Central and West Area

West Lawrence schools are at their functional capacity, as illustrated by the table below. Given the crowding in the South area schools, the appropriate solution to the overcrowding and projected growth at Sunflower is to shift some enrollments from Sunflower into other West side schools.

If a Central area school is closed and some enrollments are shifted from Central area schools into West Lawrence schools, two undesirable consequences are immediately likely. First, these receiving schools will be above 90% capacity and portables may be needed to address overcrowding. Second, if, contrary to projections, there is any enrollment growth in the West area, this growth may immediately require construction of a new elementary school. In effect, the District would have traded school capacity in the Central, or core area, of Lawrence for capacity on the periphery. This would contribute to erosion of the urban core, and is contrary to good planning principles.

For these reasons, we recommend making no enrollment shifts from Central area schools to West area schools.

West area schools: enrollment and capacity

	Enrollment	Capacity	% of Capacity
Deerfield	471	544	87%
Langston Hughes	463	512	90%
Quail Run	417	525	79%
Sunflower	491	475	103%
Total (current)	1842	2056	89.6%
Total (projected)	1840	2056	89.5%
Total if 100 students added from Central area	1942	2056	94.5%
Total if 200 students added from Central area	2042	2056	99.3%