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INTRODUCTION / CONCLUSIONS
THE FACILITY AD HOC ADVISORY COMMITTEE (FAAC) was established by the Board of Education on May 23, 2007. The FAAC’s charge was to partner with district staff to develop a Facilities Master Plan. The Board-appointed FAAC members held over 20 public meetings and sub-committee meetings to discuss the data as it was collected and to assist in developing alternative solutions and recommendations.

**Facility Ad-Hoc Advisory Committee Members**
- Daniel Fitzpatrick, Co-Chair
- Stan Zulewski, Co-Chair
- Kay Berrien
- Joseph Herzog
- John Hutson
- Charles Manock
- Lisa Schumacher (appointed February ’09)
- Terrance Frazier (resigned November ’08)
- Hilbert Contreras (resigned January ’09)

**Staff Participation**
- Michael E. Hanson, Superintendent
- Ruth F. Quinto, Chief Financial Officer
- John Marinovich, Chief Academic Officer
- Elvia Coronado, Assistant Superintendent
- Mabel Franks, Assistant Superintendent
- Holland Locker, Assistant Superintendent
- Sue Smith, Assistant Superintendent
- Dee Persaud, Associate Superintendent
- Lisa LeBlanc, Executive Director
- Jose Alvarado, Manager
- Rick Andreasen, Project Manager
- Deana Clayton, Project Manager
- Boyd Clark, Project Manager
- Karin Temple, Analyst

The Jacobs Team was selected by the district and the FAAC to assist in the formation of the Facilities Master Plan. The Team consisted of Jacobs, MGT of America and Darden Architects. They began their work in November of 2007.

Fresno Unified School District is a large, urban district located in the San Joaquin Valley, the agricultural heartland of California.

Serving over 73,000 students, the district has rich cultural and ethnic diversity creating unique but rewarding challenges. To assist in the overall vision of the education program, the district acknowledged the strong influence that the physical environment has upon learning and teaching. Facility improvements should parallel the ever changing advancement in learning delivery.
The district has been, and continues to be, a district with declining enrollment. This is not unusual in the State of California where many of the districts are experiencing the same trend. As in most districts over the past decade, Fresno Unified experienced many years of exceptional growth, physically answered by the placement of multiple portable structures (over 1/3 of the district classrooms and over 1/2 of the elementary classrooms are in portable classrooms) on most of the district school sites, creating overcrowding and site limitations. The district acknowledged the need to develop a comprehensive Facilities Master Plan as a means of planning and anticipating potential improvements and their funding requirements. The Facilities Master Plan will assist the district to achieve a common equitable base for the district facilities and to anticipate future needs. The plan addresses current facility conditions and suitability, and identifies facility improvements to support student engagement and, most importantly, academic achievement.

The Board of Education formed a Facility Ad Hoc Advisory Committee (FAAC) to assist in the development of the Facilities Master Plan. This plan, as envisioned by the Board, FAAC and staff, joins the educational programs of the district, with the physical planning of the district facilities. The district’s “roadmap to excellence” was established as the overall direction of the district for educational goals. The Facilities Master Plan provides a visionary, “world class” guideline for improvement of district facilities.

The FAAC assisted the district staff in the selection of a planning consultant. Several tasks were outlined as a means of developing the Facilities Master Plan. They included:

1. Project Kick Off
2. Educational Program Vision, as it relates to facilities
3. Educational Facility Standards
4. Demographic Analysis and Trends
5. Site Needs Assessments, Facility Conditions and Educational Suitability
6. Community Engagement
7. Alternative Solutions and Goals
8. Financial Analysis
9. Prioritization and Implementation
10. Evaluation Process
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The electronic Final Report contains links to all detailed segments of the Facilities Master Plan to the right and throughout the document. Hard copies of all appendices are available in the District Facilities Office. The associated images denote the electronic links and are displayed on the cover and spines of the hard copy appendix reports.
Fresno Unified School District is a consolidated district comprised of the following districts:

- Wolters Colony
- Roeding
- Scandinavian Home Colony
- Teilman
- Calwa
- Easterby
- Bullard

An elaborate history, prior to the consolidation, extends back to the 1800’s. As Fresno County grew, school districts were formed. Elisha Cotton Winchell was the first Superintendent of the Fresno County Schools in 1860. When appointed superintendent he oversaw the two schools then existing in the county. They were approximately 40 miles apart. Fresno Senior High School was established in 1889, and the first principal was T.L. Heaton who also served as first Superintendent of the Fresno City Schools from 1889 to 1896.

Meanwhile, areas adjacent to Fresno were populated by a number of “farming colonies” or agricultural developments which created their own communities and schools. As the city and the school district expanded, the schools and districts were consolidated. Wolters School is named for one of the “colonies” surrounding Fresno, Wolters Colony. It was originally established in 1892, and was annexed to the Fresno Unified School District on June 16, 1959. The Scandinavian School District was also created for a nearby development, the first large settlement of Swedes in Central California, about 1879. The school district was annexed to Fresno Unified School District in 1964. Other schools and school districts established during this period included Roeding District, which was annexed in 1898 and was merged into the Fresno Unified School District in 1951, and Kirk School which was annexed to Fresno Unified School District in 1908.

In the first decade of the 1900’s, Santa Fe interests promoted a subdivision of company property so that employees could live near their work. Calwa Elementary School is named for the town of Calwa, which was derived from the California Wine Association. C.C. Carter was the long-term principal and superintendent of the Calwa School District serving in that capacity from 1925 to 1946. The area was annexed to The City of Fresno and to Fresno Unified School District in 1947, causing the elementary and secondary districts of the Fresno City Schools to thereby become coterminal and thus allowing the unification of the Fresno schools.

Columbia School, now located at 1025 South Trinity, is one of the oldest school sites in continuous operation in the district. The school housed the first kindergarten in Fresno. The site was first purchased for school use by the Fresno City Schools Board of Education in 1889 for $2,280. Lincoln, Lowell, Jefferson and Jackson were also constructed between 1890 and 1914.

Due to the growing population in Fresno, bonds were proposed and successfully passed in 1914, 1919, and 1925. The bonds funded the construction of a considerable number of schools including the third and final location for Fresno High School, Edison High School, Roosevelt High School and Burroughs, Dailey, Fremont and Franklin Elementary Schools.

The Fig Garden area was first developed when a large tract of land was promoted by a group of capitalists in 1920, headed by J.C. Forkner. They planted nearly 12,000 acres of Calimyrma figs. As the land was developed, a school was built for grades1-8 which later became part of Fresno Unified School District.

Teilman School #2, originally part of Teilman School District, was annexed into the Fresno Unified School District in 1931, and its name was changed to Jane Addams School.

Mayfair Elementary School is named for an area of Fresno which includes homes and businesses which developers called “Mayfair.” This school was one of the first schools built after World War II with funds derived from the 1945 bond issue.

The 1950s brought more growth to the area creating the need for additional schools to be built. To mark the 100th birthday of Fresno Unified School District, the Board of Education named a school under construction Centennial Elementary School in 1956. The school opened in the 1957-58 school year. Easterby was annexed in 1955 to the Fresno Unified School District. The Bullard School District became a part of Fresno Unified in 1958-59. In the early 1920’s, the school first named Bullard Elementary and now know as Bullard “Talent,” served as a rural training school under an arrangement with the Fresno State Teachers College. As the city of Fresno grew and rural settings of the school district began to disappear, the Fresno Unified School District was further transformed into a district of eight comprehensive high schools, 14 middle schools and 65 elementary schools with a variety of specialty schools for career oriented education.
THE ISSUES

Early meetings with community groups and Fresno Unified staff identified the following major issues in the district:

1. Clear feeder patterns do not exist throughout the district
2. Available capacity and site utilization vary throughout the district and affect the learning and teaching environments of the schools.
3. Schools are overcrowded in the southeast
4. Middle school students in the southwest are transported to several different schools outside of the area
5. Schools do not meet facility condition and educational suitability standards
6. One-third (1/3) of classrooms in the district are in portables
7. Grade-level configuration should be assessed
8. Choice programs and special education should be available in every high school feeder area

RECOMMENDATION

Over the next 15 years, the district will:

1. Modify feeder patterns to give students a clear, consistent vision of the elementary, middle, and high schools that they will attend
2. Adjust school attendance areas, balance student populations, reuse some selected schools, and build new permanent classrooms throughout the district to improve capacity and utilization of facilities
3. Construct a new elementary and new high school in southeast Fresno to address overcrowding
4. Construct a new middle school in southwest Fresno to create a neighborhood school
5. Improve building and site conditions, educational suitability and technology at all schools to achieve a targeted 80 combined score (described on page 38)
6. Reduce portable classrooms by 50%-80% and build new permanent classrooms where needed
7. Implement 5th - 8th grade choice middle schools in several high school feeder areas to provide more choice opportunities for students
8. Develop functional, flexible space to accommodate specialty programs, magnet schools, career-technical education, and special education progression in high school feeder areas
PROPOSED FEEDER PATTERN

The map to the right and the feeder pattern chart above describe the proposed feeder plan, which received unanimous consensus from the FAAC on September 17, 2008.

Each high school in the feeder pattern chart and each high school attendance area in the map are identified by a color corresponding to their current or assumed school color. All schools that feed into a particular high school are similarly identified. Fresno and McLane have two comprehensive 7-8 middle schools and multiple shades are used to designate which elementary schools feed into each of these middle schools. Both Cooper and Fort Miller Middle School, designated in a purple hue, feed into the Fresno High School while Yosemite and Scandinavian Middle School, designated in a red hue, feed into McLane High School. Edison Computech, shown in white, is a district-wide choice school and is not part of a regular neighborhood feeder progression.

The solid lines connecting the schools indicate a direct feeder while the dotted lines represent a student's choice. Edison Computech is shown with a dotted line connection to Edison High School because of its impact on Edison High School's enrollment. The 6-8 and 5-8 choice middle schools, which occur in the high school feeder patterns of Bullard, Hoover, Roosevelt, Sunnyside and the New High School, are also connected to the elementary schools with a dotted line indicating their status as choice options. All elementary schools in the feeders are included in the comprehensive 7-8 middle schools' attendance boundaries. Families within those areas have the choice to pick the 5-8/6-8 option. District transfer policies already exist for students who wish to transfer to schools outside their attendance boundaries.
The long-range attendance boundary map identifies proposed high school feeder areas, including the new south high school feeder area. The draft boundaries suggested to balance student populations throughout the district and within school areas but are not considered approved until after community input board approval. The following process should occur prior to any boundary recommendation to the Board of Education:

1. Analysis of current data including, but not limited to, existing and projected student enrollment data for the school(s) affected by the boundary change, using development, transportation, growth patterns, safety concerns, feeder progression, and after school programs.

2. Establishment of a technical boundary committee consisting of parents, site personnel and district staff to review data and formulate boundary line recommenda
tions.

3. Least one community/parent meeting to gather input for Board of Education consideration

4. Board consideration of boundary adjustment

The following eight pages detail the changes in the individual high school feeder areas.
Lawless, a current K-8 school, and Tenaya Middle School are the two middle schools that currently feed Bullard High School. Figarden, Forkner, Gibson, Kratt, Malloch and Starr Elementary all feed into Tenaya. Bullard Talent is a district-wide choice program within the proposed Bullard High School attendance area from which thirty students each year go to Bullard. Baird is a district wide choice school within the Bullard area. Twenty out of neighborhood students from Baird enter Bullard each year.

Population growth in south Fresno has impacted schools within this area of the district. The new feeder pattern for the Bullard neighborhood will increase its share of the district student population. Powers-Ginsburg Elementary and Wawona Middle School will move into the Bullard feeder area from the Fresno High area.

Wawona will continue to be a 6-8 middle school. It will also continue to house the district-wide International Baccalaureate (IB) choice program that feeds into the IB option at Fresno High School.

Lawless will change to a K-6 program. The Bullard Talent and Baird choice schools will continue as district-wide resources. Tenaya will continue to be the area’s comprehensive middle school. Bullard High School currently houses the Law and Social Justice Magnet, and no change is recommended.

During Master Plan implementation, a decision on an elementary school reuse or consolidation may be appropriate to optimize school utilization in this area of the district.

As the Facilities Master Plan is implemented, a percentage of the portables will be removed and replaced with permanent facilities and all schools will be updated to meet the established combined score for condition, technology and educational suitability.
The five middle schools currently feeding Edison High School include: Fort Miller, Tioga, Tehipite, Wawona and Scandinavian. Computech, a district-wide choice program, is geographically located in the Edison High School feeder area. Based on current information, 10% of neighborhood students attend Computech Middle School; and 70% of Computech students who come from outside the neighborhood area continue on at Edison High. A new middle school will be built in this feeder area to house neighborhood students. Addams, Columbia, King, Kirk, and Lincoln Elementary Schools will feed into the new middle school. King will be converted to a K-6 program. Sunset Elementary, which is located within the Edison feeder area, will remain a district-wide language immersion choice option offering a dual immersion language program. Carver Middle School is recommended for reuse as a specialty program site after the new middle school is constructed.

During Master Plan implementation, a decision on an elementary school reuse or consolidation may be appropriate to optimize school utilization in this area of the district.

As the Facilities Master Plan is implemented, a percentage of the portables will be removed and replaced with permanent facilities and all schools will be updated to meet the established combined score for condition, technology and educational suitability.
The five middle schools currently feeding Fresno High School are Tehipite, Fort Miller, Cooper, Wawona and the K-8 program from Hamilton. Hamilton houses the Global Studies choice program and Fort Miller Middle School has a district-wide medical magnet program in this area. The International Baccalaureate (IB) choice program is at Fresno High.

The new feeder plan designates Cooper and Fort Miller as the two middle schools to feed Fresno High School. The K-8 program at Hamilton will continue to send students to the high school and the following Elementary Schools are designated to feed the two middle schools: Fremont, Homan, Roeding, Wilson, Williams, Muir, and Del Mar. Addams Elementary School attendance area will be moved from the Fresno High School area to the Edison High School area. The Powers-Ginsburg Elementary and Wawona Middle attendance areas will be moved to the Bullard High School area.

Heaton Elementary School is recommended for reuse as a career-technical education campus in partnership with Fresno City College. Heaton attendance area will be absorbed into the other elementary school areas in the Fresno High feeder area. Dailey Elementary is recommended to reopen as an intensive program with priority attendance given to students in the surrounding neighborhood. Its program will feed into the IB option at Wawona and Fresno High.

As the Facilities Master Plan is implemented, a percentage of the portables will be removed and replaced with permanent facilities and all schools will be updated to meet the established combined score for condition, technology and educational suitability.
Hoover High School is currently being served by Ahwahnee and Tioga Middle Schools. Because of population changes in this section of the district, Ahwahnee will be converted to a 5-8 choice middle school. Tioga, which currently feeds students into Edison and McLane as well as Hoover, will be feeding only Hoover. Eaton, McCardle, Robinson, Viking, Wolters, Holland, Pyle, Thomas and Vinland elementary schools will feed students to Tioga with Ahwahnee as a choice option. Viking and Pyle have been added to the Hoover area; Lincoln, King, Centennial and Wishon Elementary have been moved to other high school areas. The Robinson Transport Area will be incorporated into Eaton’s boundaries.

During Master Plan implementation, a decision on an elementary school reuse or consolidation may be appropriate to optimize school utilization in this area of the district.

As the Facilities Master Plan is implemented, a percentage of the portables will be removed and replaced with permanent facilities and all schools will be updated to meet the established combined score for condition, technology and educational suitability.
As the facilities master plan is implemented, a percentage of the portables will be removed and replaced with permanent facilities and all schools will be updated to meet the established combined score for condition, technology and educational suitability.

The new feeder plan for this high school area is designed to strengthen the neighborhood by reducing the number of middle schools to two: Yosemite and Scandinavian. A possible expansion of Duncan Polytechnical High School to a 7-12 career-technical program would enhance the choice options available to the area.

Elementary schools that are currently and will continue as part of the McLane feeder plan include Birney, Hidalgo, Mayfair, Wishon, Norseman, Ericson, and Centennial. Leavenworth will move from the Roosevelt area to McLane. Ewing, Viking, Webster, Yokomi, Pyle and Anthony will move out of McLane’s area. Anthony Elementary will be converted to a 5-8 school feeding to the Roosevelt High School area.
A new high school will be built in the south area of the district to accommodate the area's growth and to relieve overcrowding in the existing high schools. A new elementary school in the area, along with boundary changes, will relieve overcrowding at Ayernesworth, Balderas, Storey and Winchell Elementary Schools. Sequoia Middle School will be converted to a choice 5-8 program and will serve the new high school along with the comprehensive Terronez Middle School. The following elementary schools will join the new southeast elementary school in this area: Ayernesworth, Balderas, Lane, Storey, Calwa and Winchell.

As the Facilities Master Plan is implemented, a percentage of the portables will be removed and replaced with permanent facilities and all schools will be updated to meet the established combined score for condition, technology and educational suitability.
The current middle schools feeding Roosevelt High School are Tehipite, Yosemite, Sequoia, Kings Canyon and Terronez. Under the proposed plan, Tehipite will be the Roosevelt area’s single comprehensive 7-8 middle school. Anthony Elementary will move from the McLane progression and be remodeled as a 5-8 choice option middle school for Roosevelt. Elementary schools that are currently and will continue as part of the Roosevelt feeder plan include Burroughs, Jackson, Jefferson and Rowell. Webster and Yokomi will move out of McLane’s Feeder area and into Roosevelt’s feeder area. Lowell will move to Roosevelt’s feeder area from Edison.

Roosevelt High School will continue to house the choice School of the Arts program and Yokomi’s science magnet will still be offered as a district wide choice option.

As the Facilities Master Plan is implemented, a percentage of the portables will be removed and replaced with permanent facilities and all schools will be updated to meet the established combined score for condition, technology and educational suitability.
The Sunnyside High School area is served by three middle schools, Sequoia, Kings Canyon and Terronez. As part of the feeder pattern change in this area, Greenberg Elementary will be augmented and converted to a 5-8 choice program; Kings Canyon will continue to be a full comprehensive middle school. Ayer, Easterby, Olmos, Bakman, Ewing and Turner will continue as the elementary schools feeding the Sunnyside High School area. Sunnyside High School will continue to house the Doctors Academy.

As the facilities master plan is implemented, a percentage of the portables will be removed and replaced with permanent facilities and all schools will be updated to meet the established combined score for condition, technology and educational suitability.
SCHOOL REUSE CONSIDERATIONS

The implementation of the Facilities Master Plan includes assessing school facilities for reuse and/or closure. Plan recommendations include reusing Heaton Elementary in the Fresno High School feeder area and Carver Middle School in the Edison High School area. Heaton is proposed to be used as a specialty choice program similar to Design Science. The Design Science program offers high school students an opportunity to earn their high school diploma and college credit at the same time. Heaton is adjacent to Fresno City College making it an ideal site for this type of program. The proposed use for Carver Middle School will be considered after the new southwest middle school is built. Program considerations include career-technical education or an adult school.

Multiple factors are considered when determining that a school site would be used for an alternative purpose. Those factors are as follows:

**Instructional Programs**
- Educational impact on students in the school
- Consolidation or relocation of existing programs
- Enrollment in the school and the programs within the school
- Academic success of the school
- Cost of operating the educational programs at the school

**Facility Capacity/Use**
- Size of school and/or property and capability of expansion
- Amount of excess space and the cost to operate that space

**Condition of Site and Buildings**
- Cost of improving the facility to meet suitability and condition requirements
- Cost of maintaining the facility in operable condition or to restore the facility to operable condition

**Neighborhood/Community**
- Location of school in relationship to the overall feeder progression
- Neighborhood relationships/identity
- Impact of closing the school on the community
- Location and accessibility of the school and proximity of other schools
- Demographic data
- Safe routes to school

**At a minimum, and in addition to applicable Board policies and State requirements, a review of the following is recommended prior to Board of Education consideration and final approval of reuse or closure of any school site:**

1. **Utilization.** Analysis shall include consistency with Facilities Master Plan long-term goals, needs of the feeder area, proximity and functionality of schools/program in feeder area, efficient and cost effective space utilization and overall district needs.

2. **Condition/Suitability of School.** Cost of improving or maintaining the school in order to meet district condition and suitability standards.

3. **Demographic and Student Mobility.** A comprehensive demographic analysis which includes enrollment trends and projections, socio-economics, transportation, safe routes to school, and process for reassignment of students.

4. **Educational Focus.** A recommendation identifying the need and benefits for changing the educational focus and/or instructional programs.

5. **Public Input.** An opportunity for the public to comment on the proposed school closure/reuse.

In addition to the schools named above, other school sites throughout the district may need to be considered for reuse or closure during Facilities Master Plan implementation. The Plan identifies three high school areas that are projected to have underutilized facilities during plan implementation: Bullard, Edison and Hoover.
Educational Program Vision
On December 18th and 19th of 2007, a large group of district administrators, educators, FAAC members, facility representatives and consultants gathered to discuss the educational vision for the district and the impact on facilities. Initial objectives included:

- To establish a vision for Fresno Unified School District facilities that embraces world class educational trends
- To establish a vision that is based on “beyond the 21st century” education trends
- To establish a vision that promotes student success
- To provide a framework for developing facility recommendations based on a comprehensive district vision
- To utilize a process that actively engages key decision-makers in the development of the vision

The participants reviewed the district’s core beliefs, mission and vision and then proceeded with discussions on developing an overall educational vision that would align with the current values of the district and the educational program. Initially the group started with these broad statements:

By 2015, Fresno Schools will be a place where:

- Ninety percent of K-12 students are reading at or above grade level
- All schools are achieving Adequate Yearly Progress
- Twenty-five students have been named National Merit Scholars
- All schools will continue to achieve important measurable outcomes
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In particular they discussed facility implications relevant to the implementation of these broad statements such as:

- School size
- Class size
- Grade alignment
- Program space characteristics
- Flexibility

At the end of the two day session, significant key facility design criteria were generated to guide future community dialogues:

1. School Size. Research has indicated that smaller school sizes improve the educational opportunities for the students. The district should explore all alternatives to reduce school sizes, including delivery methods that would help in achieving intimate and smaller learning environments.

2. Safety and Security. All school sites and facilities, new or existing, need to be provided with design elements that:
   - Provide ease of supervision and line of sight
   - Provide landscaping that is maintained to allow visibility and avoid hiding places
   - Provide maintenance and cleanliness that promotes the perception of safety and security
   - Provide lockable storage for departments
   - Provide safe pedestrian and vehicular access with well lit parking lots

3. Career-Technical Education. Design parameters should support a seamless integration into comprehensive high schools. Vocational technical education opportunities should be supported by design, especially career pathways in grades 7-12 in order to prepare students for the worlds of work and higher education. Facilities should provide project-based learning areas that replicate industry and can be adapted to multiple technical uses.

4. Student Engagement. All schools should promote and then demonstrate the value of all students. Schools should provide a variety of spaces, tools, and resources at each level of education to promote student engagement. All schools should provide comfortable and inviting environments through the use of:
   - Common learning areas
   - Group work areas for various groups sizes and activities
   - Socialization spaces
   - Ease of access to resources and technology

5. Flexibility. Designs should allow flexible use of space. Learning spaces should support multiple purposes. Large facilities designed for physical education, dance and theatre should be multiple-use and should permit co-curricular education. Versatile spaces should accommodate today’s and tomorrow’s instructional needs and community use.

FUSD MISSION: PREPARING CAREER READY GRADUATES

FUSD GOALS:

- All students will excel in reading, writing and math
- All students will engage in arts, activities and athletics
- All students will demonstrate the character and competencies for workplace success
- All students will stay in school on target to graduate

FUSD CORE BELIEFS:

- Student Learning
- High Quality Instruction
- Leadership
- Safety
- Culture
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Action with vision is making a positive difference.”

JOEL BARKER, “THE PARADIGM MAN” INDEPENDENT SCHOLAR & FUTURIST
6. **System Pathways.** All schools should maintain flexibility for a variety of grade configurations. Design factors should enhance feeder patterns, fields of study, and athletics to allow strategic, meaningful, and relevant progression for students thereby enhancing student engagement. Pathways should facilitate transitions from elementary school to middle school, middle school to high school, and high school to post secondary.

7. **Classroom Design.** Classrooms should facilitate a variety of learning styles. Classrooms should be project-oriented and designed to provide multi-use spaces that support small and large group (collaborative) learning in a broad array of curricular and co-curricular offerings. Classrooms should promote thinking atmospheres and student learning. Classrooms should be of adequate size with good acoustics and should have appropriate furniture and technology, individual HVAC controls, water, wall display space, and should be handicap-accessible. Additionally, classrooms should provide space where teachers can work when other classes are being taught “in their space.”

8. **Dedicated, Specialized and Flexible Spaces.** Designs should provide dedicated flexible spaces for:

- Early intervention areas for literacy
- Confidential meeting rooms
- Music
- Integrated arts
- Visual and performing arts rooms, including “cafeterias” at elementary schools
- Large group activities space
- Professional development space
- Alternative education space for students who are better served outside the traditional school setting

9. **Library Media Center.** In addition to the need for a centralized “library” in modern schools, there is a demand for de-centralized approach in providing these services at satellite locations throughout the facility, allowing ease of access by students, faculty, and community. Physical placement of the library and these satellite access points in relationship to the main entry of the school is critical in providing easy community access.

10. **Collaboration.** Design of learning spaces should support varied methods and approaches to the teaching environment. With society moving toward a “project based” style of employment, students should experience a team effort toward planning, development, presentation and implementation to prepare them as “job ready” graduates. “Classrooms” would include larger “lab” spaces, breakout/meeting rooms, indoor/outdoor areas, production and presentation spaces as well as lecture/traditional areas.
11. Parent and Community Involvement. Clear points of entry and public access should be provided to parents and community members. Access to all facilities should be zoned allowing multiple use of resource centers, meeting rooms, athletic and performing arts facilities and parent education space, while restricting access to other areas of the facility. Facilities should demonstrate a “kid and parent friendly” atmosphere. Effective way-finding, including signage, and location maps in appropriate languages should be provided.

12. Traffic/Entrance/Exit. Traffic flow should facilitate efficient and safe drop off and pick up through a designated entry point flowing toward multiple exits. Parking lots should be well lit. Vehicular and pedestrian pathways should be safe.

13. Technology and Communication. Schools should be designed with “anyone, anytime, anywhere” technology for learning and communication, allowing for instantaneous communication between individuals, groups and campuses. Available technology should enable efficient and effective processes to accelerate learning.

14. Curb Appeal. Physical aesthetics of overall facilities and grounds contribute to improved student engagement. All schools should provide attractive and welcoming environments making students and their families feel valued. Design should allow ease of maintenance and cleaning to contribute to eye appeal, pride, and safety, while supporting neighborhood revitalization.

15. Early Childhood Education. Pre-school services are a critical consideration in the allocation of space. Pre-school programs should be provided on sites based on assessed community needs.

16. Storage. Facilities should provide secure storage for all academic and athletic programs.

17. Administrative. Centralized services should be housed under one roof, providing adequate office, meeting, collaborative and confidential spaces. New facilities should allow ease of access while maintaining some satellite service centers.

18. Other Spaces. Special use rooms and restrooms for special needs should be provided. Spaces for extended day programs and after school programs should also be provided.

These 18 points were used in formulating future discussions with the FAAC, the Community and the Board of Education. They set the stage for the development of a plan that was to be a Facilities Master Plan developed in conjunction with the educational program.
Various discussions were held with stakeholders on the definition of “world class.” As our nation contemplates and debates the future of how education will be defined and funded, the definition of “world class” is also debated. Fresno Unified School District is committed to strive for academic achievement and the success of all students. An important element of the district’s goals is to make sure that all students are on target to graduate and are able to be part of the greater society.

The district recognizes that establishing standards in which facilities at all levels can be planned, programmed and designed is essential in creating a world class district. The district facility standards grew out of the visioning session input and other community and stakeholder activities. The standards incorporate guidelines that match local needs and trends in education delivery systems that promote:

- Student total immersion or engagement
- Hands-on, creative active learning
- Real World immersion
- Adult connections either with on campus or off campus experiences
- Internships with the community

**What is a World Class District?**

**How is it defined?**

And what specifically determines if a facility meets this criteria?

World-class may be defined when students leave a district, they will become successful citizens, equipped to understand, appreciate and compete in an increasing global society.

--Dr. Suzanne Boxer-Glassman

**“WORLD CLASS EDUCATION.” WHAT DOES THAT MEAN? ONE WAY OF LOOKING AT IT:**

- Provide kindergarten readiness and early childhood care and expand head start programs
- Reform No Child Left Behind by improving assessments and supporting schools that need improvement, not punishing them
- Make math and science a priority by recruiting top teachers in this area
- Provide early intervention to address the dropout crisis
- Provide high quality after school opportunities
- Provide educational opportunities in the summer
- Encourage more low income families to consider and prepare for college
- Support bilingual students
- Recruit teachers with Teacher Service Scholarships
- Require all schools to be accredited. Make sure every educator is trained to teach effectively
- Start teacher mentoring programs and reward accomplished teachers

_-Dr. Andrea Hermit, Education Examiner_

**DALLAS EXAMINER, AUGUST 30TH, 2008**

**ANDREA HERMITT, EDUCATION EXAMINER**

- "WORLD CLASS EDUCATION." WHAT DOES THAT MEAN? ONE WAY OF LOOKING AT IT:
  - Provide kindergarten readiness and early childhood care and expand head start programs
  - Reform No Child Left Behind by improving assessments and supporting schools that need improvement, not punishing them
  - Make math and science a priority by recruiting top teachers in this area
  - Provide early intervention to address the dropout crisis
  - Provide high quality after school opportunities
  - Provide educational opportunities in the summer
  - Encourage more low income families to consider and prepare for college
  - Support bilingual students
  - Recruit teachers with Teacher Service Scholarships
  - Require all schools to be accredited. Make sure every educator is trained to teach effectively
  - Start teacher mentoring programs and reward accomplished teachers

**APRIL 29, 2009**
The standards for Fresno Unified state that all schools in the district should:

- Align with the district's roadmap to excellence, mission and education programs
- Provide for an attractive and safe learning environment that engages students and encourages creativity and innovation
- Maximize assignable space
- Strengthen the overall learning communities by maintaining clear feeder progression from elementary to middle to high
- Promote “life-long” physical education and athletic programs

The FUSD standards are to promote equity and consistency throughout the district.

**Key Standards**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Level</th>
<th>Grade Configuration</th>
<th>Standard Class Size</th>
<th>Optimum School Size*</th>
<th>Room Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>PK-6</td>
<td>PK-3rd – 20, 4th-6th - 30</td>
<td>650-750</td>
<td>PK-K 1,350 SF, Grades 1-6, 960 SF, Art/Music, 960 – 1,200 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>5-8 or 7-8</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>700-1000</td>
<td>General Classroom, 900SF, General Lab 1,300 SF, Art 1,200 – 1,500 SF, Career-Technical Education 2,000 – 2,500 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>9-12</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2100-2600</td>
<td>General Classroom 900 SF, General Lab 1,300 SF, Art 1,200 – 1,500 SF, Career-Technical Education 2,500 – 3,000 SF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Optimum school size is a guideline which may not be appropriate for every school. Educational program, population density, site constraints and facility layout and design may dictate a variance from this guideline.
DEMOGRAPHIC ANALYSIS AND TRENDS
Demographic changes have short and long term planning implications for school facilities. Changes in the overall population within the district attributable to the birth rate, the aging neighborhood population in sections of the district, and the transient nature of various populations within the neighborhoods require a facility plan that is flexible.

Fresno Unified School District covers a 65 square mile geographical area with a diverse population. It is extremely important that the Facilities Master Plan be flexible enough to respond to the changing nature of its locale with adaptable programs in appropriately located schools.

A demographic study for Fresno Unified School District was conducted to meet these objectives:

1. Analyze trends in kindergarten capture rate
2. Analyze trends in high school enrollment
3. Develop a recommended enrollment projection, including reviewing/validating existing enrollment projections
4. Develop, in concert with the other tasks of the Facilities Master Plan, adjustments to school boundaries, high school feeder patterns and other ways and means to balance the current enrollment with current capacity
BACKGROUND

Fresno is the sixth largest city in the State of California with an estimated 2007 population of 481,035. The population of the city is projected to increase to 504,243 by 2012, while the population of Fresno County is expected to grow from an estimated 2007 population of 917,515 to more than 1.1 million people by 2020.

Historical enrollment data provided the foundation for the enrollment trend analysis. Enrollment across the district has declined 5.85% since 1998. Enrollment increased over the first couple years of the decade, peaking at 80,059 students in 2002-03. Since then, student enrollment has dropped to 73,763 in 2007-08.

Data for the enrollment trends came from a variety of sources including school officials, historical enrollment records and county information. In addition to the “hard” data, qualitative information was gathered through interviews and conversations with district officials and consultants regarding the trends and the potential conclusions to be drawn there from.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>6,706</td>
<td>6,406</td>
<td>6,423</td>
<td>6,289</td>
<td>6,283</td>
<td>6,381</td>
<td>6,177</td>
<td>6,032</td>
<td>5,864</td>
<td>5,831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6,860</td>
<td>6,812</td>
<td>6,645</td>
<td>6,779</td>
<td>6,637</td>
<td>6,530</td>
<td>6,524</td>
<td>6,392</td>
<td>6,142</td>
<td>6,076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6,861</td>
<td>6,740</td>
<td>6,744</td>
<td>6,616</td>
<td>6,534</td>
<td>6,410</td>
<td>6,510</td>
<td>6,519</td>
<td>5,984</td>
<td>5,843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,417</td>
<td>6,582</td>
<td>6,757</td>
<td>6,885</td>
<td>6,762</td>
<td>6,717</td>
<td>6,798</td>
<td>6,798</td>
<td>6,798</td>
<td>5,751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6,202</td>
<td>6,243</td>
<td>6,512</td>
<td>6,658</td>
<td>6,521</td>
<td>6,913</td>
<td>6,207</td>
<td>5,984</td>
<td>5,839</td>
<td>5,741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6,077</td>
<td>6,081</td>
<td>6,135</td>
<td>6,433</td>
<td>6,343</td>
<td>6,474</td>
<td>6,410</td>
<td>6,154</td>
<td>6,028</td>
<td>5,835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5,865</td>
<td>6,040</td>
<td>6,512</td>
<td>6,658</td>
<td>6,521</td>
<td>6,913</td>
<td>6,207</td>
<td>5,984</td>
<td>5,839</td>
<td>5,741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5,727</td>
<td>5,737</td>
<td>5,940</td>
<td>5,950</td>
<td>5,961</td>
<td>6,217</td>
<td>6,288</td>
<td>5,975</td>
<td>5,877</td>
<td>5,669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5,996</td>
<td>7,220</td>
<td>7,282</td>
<td>7,282</td>
<td>7,176</td>
<td>7,064</td>
<td>7,027</td>
<td>7,060</td>
<td>7,142</td>
<td>6,782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>6,202</td>
<td>6,243</td>
<td>6,512</td>
<td>6,658</td>
<td>6,521</td>
<td>6,913</td>
<td>6,207</td>
<td>5,984</td>
<td>5,839</td>
<td>5,741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>6,077</td>
<td>6,081</td>
<td>6,135</td>
<td>6,433</td>
<td>6,343</td>
<td>6,474</td>
<td>6,410</td>
<td>6,154</td>
<td>6,028</td>
<td>5,835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>5,865</td>
<td>6,040</td>
<td>6,512</td>
<td>6,658</td>
<td>6,521</td>
<td>6,913</td>
<td>6,207</td>
<td>5,984</td>
<td>5,839</td>
<td>5,741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>5,727</td>
<td>5,737</td>
<td>5,940</td>
<td>5,950</td>
<td>5,961</td>
<td>6,217</td>
<td>6,288</td>
<td>5,975</td>
<td>5,877</td>
<td>5,669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-6</td>
<td>45,818</td>
<td>45,541</td>
<td>45,759</td>
<td>46,059</td>
<td>46,104</td>
<td>45,524</td>
<td>44,463</td>
<td>43,409</td>
<td>41,955</td>
<td>40,837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 7-8</td>
<td>11,592</td>
<td>11,767</td>
<td>11,852</td>
<td>11,967</td>
<td>12,384</td>
<td>12,762</td>
<td>12,579</td>
<td>12,261</td>
<td>11,887</td>
<td>11,636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 9-12</td>
<td>20,934</td>
<td>21,198</td>
<td>20,780</td>
<td>21,617</td>
<td>21,021</td>
<td>21,627</td>
<td>22,126</td>
<td>21,177</td>
<td>20,081</td>
<td>21,404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>78,344</td>
<td>78,506</td>
<td>78,361</td>
<td>79,443</td>
<td>80,059</td>
<td>79,923</td>
<td>79,178</td>
<td>77,387</td>
<td>75,903</td>
<td>73,763</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CBEDS
Within the boundaries of the district, there are 23 private schools that have enrolled students for one or more years between 1999 and 2006. As a part of the demographic study, and in order to fully understand the dynamics of the student population in the district area, the enrollment trends of these private schools were studied. Since 1999, total private school enrollment has decreased. The decline in private school enrollment began in 2001, which corresponds closely with the beginning of FUSD’s decline in 2002.

At the grade band level, the decrease in private school enrollment resembles the decrease in enrollment experienced by the district, particularly at the K-6 grade band.

**Kindergarten Capture Rate**

The demographic analysis examined live birth trends and the live-births-to-kindergarten capture rate. Since 1993, total live births in the zip code area decreased from 9,084 in 1993 to 7,952 in 2002. Over the corresponding kindergarten enrollment period (1998 to 2007), kindergarten enrollment decreased from 6,706 in 1998 to 5,831 in 2007. Kindergarten enrollment was somewhat flat from 1998 through 2002, while the corresponding live births declined significantly (1993 through 1997). Kindergarten enrollment has decreased over the last five years (2002 to 2007) while live births were relatively flat over the corresponding previous five years in which potential kindergartners would have been born (1997 through 2002). Since 2000, live births have been steadily increasing.

When analyzing the relationship between live births and eventual kindergarten enrollment, the primary indicator is capture rate. The capture rate is the percentage of kindergarten students enrolled in a given year as a percentage of the live births in the district five years before the year of enrollment.

\[
\text{1998 Kindergarten Enrollment} = \frac{50}{100} = 50\%
\]
The analysis of the relationship between the historical live births and the related kindergarten enrollment indicates a fairly strong relationship. Over the last 10 years, the kindergarten capture rate has averaged 80.76%. The capture rate has increased from 73.82% in 1998 to 77.36% in 2007; however, the capture rate has been declining since peaking in 2003 at 86.52%.

Since 1999, the private school kindergarten enrollment and capture rate have declined, as well. Private school kindergarten enrollment has fallen steadily from 441 students in 1999 to 309 students in 2006. After peaking at 5.56% in 2002, the private school kindergarten capture rate fell to 4.24% in 2006. Private school kindergarten enrollment has increased or decreased in concert with the live births within the district’s zip codes.

Together, the district kindergarten capture rate and the private school capture rate have averaged a total of 86.83% from 1999 to 2006. A percentage of children born in the district’s boundaries are leaving before enrolling in school, or not enrolling in kindergarten.

**PROJECTIONS**

It is important to remember that enrollment projections are merely an estimate of future activity based on the historical data and information provided.

Live births in the district zip codes have been steadily increasing since 2000. Using linear regression to forecast future live births, it can be reasonably anticipated that the district’s area will experience a continued increase in the number of live births over the next 10 years.

Since 1999, the private school kindergarten enrollment and capture rate have declined, as well. Private school kindergarten enrollment has fallen steadily from 441 students in 1999 to 309 students in 2006. After peaking at 5.56% in 2002, the private school kindergarten capture rate fell to 4.24% in 2006. Private school kindergarten enrollment has increased or decreased in concert with the live births within the district’s zip codes.

Together, the district kindergarten capture rate and the private school capture rate have averaged a total of 86.83% from 1999 to 2006. A percentage of children born in the district’s boundaries are leaving before enrolling in school, or not enrolling in kindergarten.
During the next two to five years, the district may see a continuing decline in student enrollment; however, over the coming ten-year period the trend should reverse and enrollment should be back to the 2007/08 level. Because specific areas within the district may experience more enrollment growth than others, flexibility and adaptability have been considered and built into the master plan. The recommendations of the plan reflect the demographic analysis, the overall balance of student populations between schools, school locations, and school capacity and utilization.

The color designation in the enrollment maps correspond to the optimum school size developed in the Visioning and Standards sections of this plan. The optimum school sizes are elementary 650-750, middle 700-1000, high school 2100-2800. The schools shown in the gray are within this range while the green and yellow designations are schools below or above the range by 100 students or less. Blue and orange identify the schools which are significantly below or above the optimum range.

On the elementary map, there is a large group of blue colored schools in the northern area of the district. This is attributed to the declining enrollment in this area, while the area of blue in the downtown Fresno vicinity is partially caused by the constraints of smaller school sites, which are not capable of supporting larger student populations. The overcrowding in the southeast is apparent in the areas of orange.
The middle school map indicates that all the middle schools are either at or below the optimum range. This will allow the district to create smaller 5-8 choice schools in several high school areas while also adding a neighborhood school in the southwest. At the same time, the map shows the large area in the southwest that is currently a transport area, where students who live in the neighborhoods are transported to four middle schools in other parts of the district. This practice has led to the erosion of the neighborhood school concept and contributes to the current complicated feeder patterns.

The high school enrollment mirrors the elementary enrollment with overcrowding in the southeast with smaller school enrollment in the north.
The color designation in the existing capacity maps correspond to the optimum school size developed in the Visioning and Standards sections of this plan. The optimum school sizes are elementary 650-750, middle 700-1000, high school 2100-2600. The schools shown in the gray are within this range while the green and yellow designation are schools below or above the range by 100 students or less. Blue and orange identify the schools which are significantly below or above the optimum range.

The capacity shown is calculated using only built space and not portable buildings. Also, 100% utilization is typically unrealistic in planning school facilities; therefore, a percentage of underutilization has been accounted for in the capacity calculations. For elementary schools, where only a small amount of the school is designated as specialized space, students shift minimally from one room to another and teachers do not have preparation periods; the underutilization percentage is 5%. Specialized programs and spaces are more prevalent in middle and high schools, and the percentage increases to 15% for middle schools and 25% for high schools.

Overall, the built space in the district is below or in the optimum range. Currently, the district is using portables, especially at the elementary school level, to increase capacity to achieve or exceed the optimum range.

Utilization refers to how efficiently a facility is used. If the utilization rate or percentage is close to 100 then the school facility is filling all the seats that are available. Rates below 100 denote empty seats and rates above 100 imply more students than space available. At the secondary level, a utilization rate of 85% is standard. The utilization rate is calculated by dividing the capacity, shown in the maps above, by the enrollment, which is shown in the maps on the previous page; therefore, the utilization depicted does not take into account portable space and has a built in underutilization factor.

The yellow and orange shaded areas in the elementary and high school maps illustrate that these school currently have more students than space available in permanent facilities. Most of these students are accommodated in portable buildings.
Site Needs Assessments
Fresno Unified recognizes that the condition of school facilities is an important part of the overall environment in which teaching and learning occur. To objectively determine the existing conditions of school facilities and sites, the district undertook an assessment process conducted by independent facilities experts. There were four components to the facility assessment process:

- The physical conditions assessment of the buildings
- The site conditions (grounds, parking, etc.)
- The technology readiness of each site
- The educational suitability

The physical condition assessments were developed using an industry standard scoring system; however, the actual inspections of the facilities and their sites varied. FUSD has, over the past 10 years, completed renovations and modernizations to many of the elementary and middle schools. Information brought forward by district facility staff for the elementary schools and the middle schools was recorded, and a specific condition score for each of the facilities was generated from that data.

Architects and engineers completed inspections of all high schools and district-wide support facilities. This process involved several weeks of detailed inspections including building systems, code concerns, accessibility and environmental concerns.

As expressed by the FAAC, the district staff and the various stakeholders, an extremely important component in the site needs assessment was the educational suitability of each school facility. Educational suitability responds to the question: “Does the building and the site support and enhance the delivery of the educational program?” A team of experienced educators visited each and every school facility in the district. The site visit started with a meeting with the school’s principal or designated representative and proceeded to a room by room inspection. These reviews took place during the active part of a school day to assess how the facilities were being used. A school’s ability to meet the educational program needs was determined with reference to the school facility standards. Overall 49 individual components were included in the review, including these major items:

- Traffic Patterns
- Library Adjacency
- Safety and Security
- Storage
- Learning Style Variety
- Ease of Supervision
- Classrooms sizes

A complete suitability assessment for each facility in the district is included in appendix 5.

Final results of the assessment reports were used in the discovery of alternative solutions. Based on the scores of the various components and an agreed upon formula, a combined score for each of the school sites was developed. The combined score, as well as its component parts, have been used in a facility to facility condition comparison and as a means to determine priorities for improvements.
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Elementary School Combined Assessment Score Map

Middle School Combined Assessment Score

High School Combined Assessment Score Map

FUSD Combined Scores - Elementary

FUSD Combined Scores - Middle

FUSD Combined Scores - High
## Building Conditions Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type</th>
<th>Building Condition Score</th>
<th>Avg Suitability Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td>74.24</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td>73.17</td>
<td>90.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>68.03</td>
<td>89.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. and Special Programs</td>
<td>78.83</td>
<td>90.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Sites</td>
<td>24.79</td>
<td>90.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sampling of Observed Conditions
- Aged and obsolete electrical distribution and branch panels with limited circuit capacity
- Energy efficient light fixtures using T-8 lamps and electronic ballasts not installed district-wide
- Aged and obsolete HVAC equipment including chilled water and hot water circulating pumps and piping, fan coil units, and exhaust fans
- Aged and worn roof systems
- Hot water boilers, storage tanks, and piping require replacement

As the district implements the facilities master plan, the buildings and site conditions assessment will be used as a baseline for school improvements at each existing school.

The conditions assessments, detailed in appendix 5.A, will be used in preparing a school improvement program for each school in each high school area. The detailed information contained in the appendix includes construction dollars (based on 2008 costs) in order to establish baseline budgeting for the district. Final reports have been prepared in a spreadsheet format which show the effects of changing the percentage of improvements. The spreadsheets also show the effects of replacing portables on a site with permanent facilities and an estimate of new space based on identified need. This information was used in the implementation section of this report.
## SITE CONDITIONS ASSESSMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE TYPE</th>
<th>SITE CONDITION SCORE</th>
<th>AVG SUITABILITY SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td>59.42</td>
<td>78.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td>64.08</td>
<td>76.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>53.83</td>
<td>71.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. and Special Programs</td>
<td>62.25</td>
<td>78.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Sites</td>
<td>15.36</td>
<td>68.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SAMPLING OF OBSERVED CONDITIONS
- Baseball fields with muddy and flooded infields; bare spots
- Dirt track with poor drainage; flooding
- Track surface is not all-weather surface
- Swimming pool is not retaining water or not meeting competition requirements
- Degraded parking lot and driveway surfaces
- Damaged or missing fencing
## Site Needs Assessments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type</th>
<th>Suitability Score</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Avg Suitability Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td>23.09</td>
<td>76.25</td>
<td>53.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td>40.26</td>
<td>97.21</td>
<td>62.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>43.96</td>
<td>92.19</td>
<td>56.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. and Special Programs</td>
<td>33.72</td>
<td>85.93</td>
<td>56.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Sites</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Educational Suitability Assessment

- **Art rooms were too small, did not have sufficient storage**
- **Music rooms were not sized appropriately**
- **Schools did not support a variety of learning styles**

### Sampling of Observed Conditions

#### Elementary Schools
- Art rooms too small, did not have sufficient storage
- P.E. rooms were not sized appropriately, did not have sufficient storage, or good adjacencies
- Schools were not configured for ease of supervision
- Schools did not support a variety of learning styles

#### Middle Schools
- Schools did not have limited entrances

#### High Schools
- Schools were not configured for ease of supervision
- Schools did not support a variety of learning styles
- Special education spaces were too small
- P.E. spaces were too small

Of the four assessments, educational suitability was the area most in need of improvements. Educational delivery has changed since many of the facilities were built in the district. Most of the schools in the district were built before 1970; the more recently built schools scored higher than the older facilities. As the district implements the facilities master plan, the suitability assessment will be used to guide school improvements at each existing school. The suitability assessments are detailed in appendix 5.B and each of these improvements contain construction dollars (based on 2008 costs) for establishing baseline budgets for the district. Final reports have been prepared in a spreadsheet format which can be modified to show the effects of changing the suitability for a site simply by changing the percentage of upgrades. This information was used in the implementation planning section of this report.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type</th>
<th>Technology Readiness Score</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Ave Suitability Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td>39.15</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>80.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td>56.75</td>
<td>90.90</td>
<td>79.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>58.40</td>
<td>89.20</td>
<td>78.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alt. and Special Programs</td>
<td>58.40</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>79.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Sites</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The classrooms did not have a sufficient number of computer drops or have a wireless system for student access.

The classrooms did not have the minimum number of electrical outlets for computers.

Technology readiness is considered technology behind the walls, not the equipment that is in the classroom or in the facility. Overall, the schools scored in the fair range and are lacking in some infrastructure. However, significant improvements to technology were underway after site visitations for this assessment. The major deficiency was the limited number of electrical outlets and data receptacles, especially in older schools. As the district implements the facilities master plan the technology readiness assessment will be used as a guide for school improvements at each existing school. These assessments are detailed in appendix 5.B and each of these improvements contain construction dollars (based on 2008 costs) for establishing baseline budgets for the district. Final reports have been prepared in a spreadsheet format which can be modified to show the effects of changing the percentage of improvement for a site simply by changing the percentage of upgrades. This information was used in the implementation planning section of this report.
COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

After starting the initial data collection and during the very early processing and discovery, community meetings were scheduled in February of 2008. The main purpose of these community meetings was to inform the community of the facility master planning process and to listen to concerns about the school facilities and the programs. The community was informed of the meeting through various media including:

- Flyers mailed to each family in the district
- Posters
- Bulletins and pamphlets
- District employees were informed through district newsletters and discussions
- The Fresno Bee published an announcement of the meetings
- District’s web site

Although a tremendous effort went into planning the community meetings, only a small representation from the community attended the meetings.

There were a total of six meetings on consecutive nights over a two week period. The format of the meetings included a brief introduction by the Superintendent and the Facilities Executive Director. There were several key audience participants from County and City government offices, neighboring school districts and local universities. The community meetings took place in the following locations:

- Sunnyside High
- Edison High
- Bullard High
- Fresno High
- Hoover High
- Wishon Elementary

The following themes were developed from these initial community meetings:

- Establish district-wide equity for facilities and technology in educational and athletic programs
- Provide facilities to meet the Title IX requirements
- Provide appropriate and adequate amount of space for educational and athletic programs
- Provide cafeterias that are large enough to accommodate student populations in every school
- Provide better maintenance, regardless of facility age
- Instill pride at every school with good facilities sending a message that the district cares
- Provide pick-up and drop-off areas that are designed for efficient and safe access for cars, buses, and pedestrians
- Provide community 24/7 access to facilities and grounds, remove the barriers
- Provide technology ready access to all classrooms
- Provide distinguishable school identification and a strong curb appeal
- Provide facilities that excite and motivate students through use of color and landscaping
- Insure a safe environment by providing and enforcing supervision and safety policies
- Minimize campus access points and provide control and monitoring by utilizing surveillance cameras and enforcing visitor check-in
- Provide better campus and facility sight lines for ease of supervision
- Remove unattractive portables from schools
- Provide dedicated spaces for specialty programs
- Provide key facilities at all schools
- Create attractive schools that are welcoming
- Provide space to improve the Adult Education System
- Provide operable heating and ventilation systems with controls for individual classrooms
In February 2009 a second round of community meetings took place, to update the community on the facilities plan’s progress and to gain input on the new feeder pattern and anticipated changes in each of the proposed high school attendance areas. These meetings were better attended compared to the initial community meetings. Several key points were conveyed to the audiences, including “what is expected in each of the district’s school facilities.”

Each of the audiences gave input to the plan and the following represents the major concerns voiced at these community meetings:

- Safety issues related to walking routes where students would be crossing major streets
- Proximity of schools to where students live
- Length of time to fully implement the master plan is too long
- Availability and placement of Special Education programs
- Overall cost and how the plan will be funded
- Socioeconomic balance between high school areas
- Boundary changes and their effect on students and their families
- Availability of choice programs and transfer options throughout the district; district-wide programs versus high school area programs
- Impact of feeder progression changes on programs (International Baccalaureate - IB)
- Neighborhood schools and consistent feeder progression provides consistency for families and school friends
- Upgrading the condition at all the schools is important
- Uncertainty regarding school reuse and what happens to the students and teachers at the schools
- Transportation impacts at specific schools and district-wide on students and families
- Choice 5-8 middle schools and interaction between age groups
- Excessive use of portables through out the district; reduction of portables a positive
- Overcrowding at some schools
- Program articulation from elementary, middle and high school
- Community engagement / information sharing effort by district appreciated
- Impact on school achievement
- Recommended school sizes under the Facilities Master Plan
- Availability of preschool and after school programs
- Impact the changes will have on parent participation
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“Students need opportunities to broaden their concept of learning, to integrate and connect it to real-life challenges.

Board Workshops

1. Board of Education workshops were a vital part of the Facilities Master Plan development. Workshops were planned during the input and data collection phase, the output and reaction phase and the results phase. All workshops were preceded by several work sessions with the district staff and a FAAC meeting for input and recommendations. The first workshop was held on February 12, 2008, prior to the first community meeting and just after the input and data collection phase had started. The Board of Education was informed of the overall facilities master plan process, the community meeting schedule and agenda, the educational visioning session agenda, and the upcoming facilities assessment and educational suitability reviews. The Board of Education also reviewed the makeup of the facility standards.

2. The second Board of Education workshop occurred on May 28, 2008. It was preceded by a FAAC meeting where the material was reviewed. The Board reviewed the definition of a “world class district”, a phrase used to describe the district’s desire to have facilities supporting its ambitious academic program reforms. Educational program delivery for the 21st Century is all about:

- Engagement
- Hands-On
- Adult Connections
- Real World Immersion
- Project Management
- Teamwork
- Oral Communication
- Presentation

The Board was presented with a summary of the community workshops, the focus groups held with middle school students and the Building Conditions Assessment including the Educational Suitability reports. The results of the Community Meetings, Student Focus and Faculty Workshops are contained in appendix 6.

3. The third Board of Education workshop occurred on July 30, 2008. This workshop was centered around the recently developed report on education suitability. Scores for the elementary, middle and high schools were explained and detailed. A system by system analysis was presented, with recommendations for basic classroom design, art and music rooms, career-technical spaces, computer areas, and other spaces within the various grade levels. This report can be found in appendix 5 of this report.

The Board of Education was also presented a report on the technology readiness of the district. This report can be found in appendix 5.

The final topic of this workshop was the current feeder pattern compared with an ideal feeder pattern illustrated with a typical high school feeder area in Fresno Unified. The full Board of Education workshop can be found in appendix 6.
to know that learning is not just something you do at school but a life-long endeavor.”

-CAROL BARTZ, CEO, CHAIRMAN, AND PRESIDENT, AUTODESK INC.

The fourth Board of Education workshop occurred on November 19, 2008. The workshop discussion centered on the identified number one issue in the district, high school feeder progression. The proposed feeder pattern models were presented, along with recommendations for each individual high school area. The Board of Education reviewed alternative uses for schools and justifications for new schools in the southern area of the district. The full presentation of this workshop can be found in appendix 6.

The fifth Board of Education workshop occurred on February 11, 2009. The workshop discussion focused on the identified issues in the district, the alternative solutions, a draft implementation plan that included preliminary cost projections and a timeline for the various phases of work. The discussion included potential financing options, such as lease/lease back. Initial input from the second round of community meetings was also presented and discussed. The full presentation of the workshop can be found in appendix 6.

The sixth Board of Education workshop was held on March 11, 2009, at which time the draft Facilities Master Plan - Final Report was distributed. The feedback received at the February 2009 community meetings in all high school areas was presented, both overall themes and feedback specific to high schools. The major issues identified and recommendations of the Facilities Master Plan were summarized, and impacts of the proposals for each high school area were discussed. In addition, a preliminary implementation plan with estimated order-of-magnitude costs was presented. The full presentation of the workshop can be found in appendix 6.
ALTERNATIVE SOLUTIONS AND GOALS
A clear feeder pattern from neighborhood elementary schools to local middle and high schools builds strong community pride, improves the educational delivery system.

Perspectives from the various district stakeholders were added to volumes of technical data to develop alternative solutions to the district identified major issues.

This information was used to determine prioritization and sequencing. During an interactive FAAC meeting these issues were identified as priorities.

1. Clear feeder patterns do not exist throughout the district
2. Available capacity and site utilization vary throughout the district and affect the learning and teaching environments of the schools
3. Schools are overcrowded in the southeast
4. Middle school students in the southwest are transported to several different schools outside of the area
5. Schools do not meet facility condition and educational suitability standards
6. One-third (1/3) of classrooms in the district are in portables
7. Grade-level configuration should be assessed
8. Choice programs and special education should be available in every high school feeder area

The district’s current complex feeder pattern emerged as the number one issue facing the district. During many discussions with the community, students and staff, a clear pathway to a single high school was
build strong ties with our high schools and takes an important step to improve the quality of education

identified as extremely important. Correcting this issue alone would help develop a strong supportive community attitude. Many felt that correcting this one single issue would create an atmosphere for better academic achievement. One of the most obvious areas of concern was in the Edison High School feeder area. No middle school exists in that area and students are transported to middle schools in both the north and east sections of the district. Many of these students are separated from their grade school friends, and many do not return to their neighborhood high school.

Overlaying career pathways, magnet school programs and other specialty programs became another priority in developing alternative feeder patterns. Other issues such as the number of portables in the district, achieving the established standards, the combined site scores and capacity and utilization figures all became important in narrowing the solutions and evaluating schools for alternative use in various areas of the district. Based on analysis, and reacting to current grade configuration inconsistencies in the district, two alternative solutions were initially presented, one for a K-6, 7-8, 9-12 program, and the second for a K-5, 6-8, 9-12 configuration.

A working group of administrators, FAAC members, staff and educators worked diligently on the various options and solutions, looking at ways and means to accomplish the goal of having consistent, workable feeder patterns while balancing student population and school size. Pressing issues, such as the current overcrowding in the south east and south section of the district incited an interim solution that would tie the overall plan together with the need to develop more choice opportunities for students.
Various charts were developed and calculations were completed on capacity, utilization and alternative functional uses for school facilities. Changing demographics in the southern sections of the district, and future growth in other neighborhoods of the district lead to discussions concerning current and future school sizes and feeder pattern models. The ideal model of a clear feeder from a neighborhood elementary school to a middle school to a high school was explored in each area of the district, giving consideration to the social economic aspects, transportation of students and size of schools. The initial models contained either one or two middle schools, but upon further study and based on program, utilization and capacity issues, and standard size considerations, it became necessary to look at an alternative to a full comprehensive middle school in certain areas of the district. Various solutions were considered, and a grade configuration of one 5-8 choice middle school and one 7-8 comprehensive middle school answered many of the academic program questions and, at the same time, answered capacity and utilization needs in some high school areas.

The 5-8 school can bring to the district:

- Accelerated program opportunities for 5th and 6th graders to participate in advanced learning
- Strong ties to the high school
- Academic focus
- Expanded AVID program

In conjunction with the Comprehensive Middle school:

- Music
- Athletics
- Extended Day (after/before school)
- Extended Year (Saturdays/summer school)

A considerable enthusiasm developed for the 5-8 choice program concept. At one point there was a discussion concerning school colors and mascot identity that emphasized the new feeder from elementary to high school.
Fresno Unified School District Proposed Feeder Patterns (K-5)

Other factors used in the discussion of alternative solutions included building conditions, educational program suitability, historical data, neighborhood concerns, and portable counts. As the plan matured through the discussions, a final feeder progression chart and high school boundary map were developed. Although high school boundaries need to be further defined with more specific data concerning transportation and student flow, the boundary map developed for the new feeder pattern remedies the under-utilized schools in the north by moving boundaries south. This movement relieves some of the overcrowding in the south. However, even with the boundary shifts, a new high school area is needed in the south to accommodate current and anticipated growth. The plan also adds a new southwest middle school and a new southeast elementary school. Special education programs, career-technical, and other program discussions ensued. The district established a Superintendent’s Commission on Workforce Readiness and Career-Technical Education to further study the programs. The committee’s results will be incorporated into the facilities master plan once developed. For more information see appendix 7.
Special Programs

Alternative Education:

Alternative education at the high school level is currently provided at Cambridge Continuation High School, DeWolf Continuation High School and JE Young Academic Center. The plan proposes moving Design Science from the DeWolf campus to Heaton Elementary. DeWolf will then have the opportunity to expand and develop its career-technical focus.

Community Day:

The District is considering facilities for a 7-12 Community Day School to serve expelled and high-risk students. Students in grades 7-12 who are expelled from Fresno Unified are referred to the county-wide Teilman Community Day School campus run by Fresno County Office of Education. A Fresno Unified Community Day School that incorporates the district’s core beliefs is critical for these students who need intensive social, behavioral, emotional and academic support. Facility options are being explored with the goal to open a Community Day School during the 2009/2010 school year. The objective is to locate such a facility in a central, non-residential/neighborhood setting, convenient to transportation.

Adult Education:

Adult education is currently offered at a variety of district schools, Cesar E. Chavez Adult Educational Center and Manchester Center. A particular concern at Chavez is the limited parking and land availability around this site. The lease at the Manchester Center should be reevaluated and possible alternative or additional satellite facilities should be identified.

District-wide Choice Options:

The District will continue having district-wide choice programs at Design Science High School, Duncan High School, Baird Middle School (5-8), Computech Middle School (7-8), Bullard Talent K-8, Manchester GATE (2-6), Sunset K-8 and Center for Advanced Research and Technology (CART). Also choice programs will co-exist with the regular education program at Bullard High School (Law), Fresno High School (IB), Roosevelt High School (Arts), Sunnyside High School (Doctor’s Academy), McLane High School (Medical), Hoover High School (Engineering Technology), Yokomi Elementary School (Science) and Hamilton K-8 (Global Studies).

The Facilities Master Plan also recommends that choice middle school programs be an integral part of most feeder progression areas. Ahwahnee, Anthony, Greenberg, Sequoia and Wawona will open a multi-grade educational environment as a compliment to the traditional comprehensive 7-8 middle school. In addition, the Board of Education approved a specialty Leadership and World Language intensive program at Dailey Elementary to open when the 2008-09 budget crisis is resolved. Concerns were raised by the Fresno High School community regarding moving Wawona to the Bullard High School area and its impacts on the IB program at Fresno High. Students attending the IB program at Wawona can continue the IB program at Fresno High School.

Preschool:

Preschool programs are currently being offered at most comprehensive elementary school sites. While these varied other early education programs will be maintained at the current level, there is a goal to offer a preschool program at every elementary school.

As the Facilities Master Plan is implemented, a percentage of the portables will be removed and replaced with permanent facilities and all schools will be updated to meet the established combined score for condition, technology and educational suitability. For more information, see the Special Program School Report.

Existing Preschool Programs

Preschool Program at campus to be converted to a High School or an Adult Program
Preschool Program at campus to be converted to a Middle School
Preschool Program
Transport Area
High School PACE Program
Early Childhood Education Center
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**SPECIAL EDUCATION:**

Special education programs currently are offered throughout the district. Although some of these programs have been strategically placed, the inconsistent feeder pattern and availability of space at existing facilities have made locating programs difficult. The link between elementary, middle and high schools, similar to the general education program, has been limited by these program issues. The benefits of establishing neighborhood schools and fortifying connections through the grade levels will be applied to special education programs. As the feeder pattern is implemented and school sites are being upgraded, special education programs will provide a comprehensive overlay that will parallel the general educational flow. In the future, the friends that are created both within and outside the special educational program will progress through the school pyramid together, enhancing the feeling of community. The diagram on the right depicts how this relationship will be implemented. As a rule the special education programs should not, feed across pyramids but exist within the regular feeder progression. Specific specialty programs will remain vested in current high school feeders.

Beyond the programs that exist at regular school sites, special education programs are offered at the following dedicated school sites: Addicott, Heckman and RATA.

Special education extends beyond the normal age parameters of general education and has programs for students who are younger and older than the standard school age. The adult program is being offered at Fresno City College. This program is having difficulty securing the facilities. A possible solution for this program is to use a portion of Heaton Elementary in conjunction with Design Science. The Lori Ann Infant Program located on the Powers/Ginsburg campus is also in need of additional space for office and meeting rooms.
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Sequence of Work and Preliminary Implementation Plan
The purpose of the Facilities Master Plan is to guide decisions affecting the physical planning of facilities in the District. The Plan is a “today” plan-indicating the current intent of the District. Its recommendations reflect the ideals toward which the District will be constantly striving. Board of Education decisions will implement Plan proposals and will provide the framework for others to act in accordance with the Plan.

The plan describes the current issues the District is facing including, but not limited to, student enrollment, feeder progression, and utilization of facilities. Beyond its specific proposals, the plan identifies a number of remaining issues, and provides the standards and criteria to be used in reaching decisions relative to those issues. Each and every day, data changes and activities are occurring which could affect the specific recommendations contained in the Facilities Master Plan. The recommendations will need to be reviewed periodically to identify which have been achieved, what changes may be needed and what additional policies are appropriate. The ambitions of the Facilities Master Plan will be realized incrementally.

Implementation steps, ranking of projects and a timeline were developed and presented to the Facilities Ad Hoc Advisory Committee (FAAC) and the Board of Education. The implementation plan reflects a priority given to new construction in the southeast and southwest areas of the district. Major growth in the southeast has resulted in overcrowding in several schools, and the lack of a neighborhood middle school in the southwest contributes to inconsistencies in the overall feeder progression.

The following chart recommends the five steps for initial implementation of the Facilities Master Plan:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Preliminary Est. Costs</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1     | - Southeast boundary change  
       - Southeast Elementary School (Transitional) | 2009/10 school year | Portable costs and site construction | Approved February 11, 2009 |
| 2     | - Plan for permanent Buildings at Bullard  
       - New Southeast High School  
       - New Southwest Middle School  
       - Plan for temporary buildings at Edison  
       - Convert Greenberg and Anthony to 5-8 campus  
       - Site M Elementary School | Fall 2008 to 2012/13 and 2014/15 school years | $190,000,000 estimate | This is a rough order-of-magnitude cost estimate for a scope of work that has not yet been fully determined. |
| 3     | - Change feeder progression in all high school areas | 2014 | | After steps 4 & 5 the student populations can be more evenly balanced |
| 4/5   | - Improvements at all schools to achieve a targeted level of 80 combined scores and remove 80% of portables | Begin Spring 2013 | $750,000,000 estimate | Breakdown follows on page 64 |
Implementation of the various school site projects that raise the combined score at each site to 80 will be undertaken based on the following priorities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elementary School</th>
<th>Middle School</th>
<th>High School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 ADA accessibility, both site and building</td>
<td>ADA accessibility, both site and building</td>
<td>Curb Appeal - site and building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curb appeal, both site and building</td>
<td>Curb appeal, both site and building</td>
<td>ADA accessibility - site and building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure, including mechanical and electrical</td>
<td>Technology infrastructure</td>
<td>Technology infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Classrooms - size, number, condition</td>
<td>Classrooms - size, number, condition</td>
<td>Classrooms - size, number, condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Labs - size, location, condition</td>
<td>Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>Small group learning space</td>
<td>Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>Multipurpose Room - size, location, condition</td>
<td>Special Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-school</td>
<td>Gym</td>
<td>Multipurpose Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardcourt area</td>
<td>Hardcourt area</td>
<td>Event Center (Gym)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fields</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Performing Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration - location, size, condition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Parking</td>
<td>Administration - location, size, condition</td>
<td>Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pick-up / Drop-off</td>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinic</td>
<td>Pick-up / Drop-off</td>
<td>Small Group Learning Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Services</td>
<td>Student Activity space</td>
<td>Support Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance</td>
<td>Clinic</td>
<td>Clinic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Gym</td>
<td>Support Services</td>
<td>Gym</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guidance</td>
<td>Hardcourt area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Implementation and timing is dependent upon many factors including community input on projects, funding availability, land acquisition, demographic changes, state and local requirements, and Board of Education approval throughout the process. The preliminary timeline proposed is as follows:
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Implementation Time Line

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 1: SE Boundary Changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portable ES Campus in the SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Day School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New SW MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New South HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Building At Bullard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2: New SE ES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 3: Change Feeder Pattern</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**APRIL 29, 2009**
FACILITIES AD HOC ADVISORY COMMITTEE (FAAC)

Approval of the Facilities Master Plan provides the framework for implementation; however, the initiation and completion of the plan recommendations will require a second phase of work to more explicitly prioritize projects, reach out to the community, and undertake detailed planning. The Facilities Ad Hoc Advisory Committee will continue for one (1) year after Facilities Master Plan approval, along with working groups representing each high school area, to provide continued facility recommendations as follows:

Prioritization:
- Recommend a list of facilities project priorities on a regional or high school area basis
- Recommend various financial strategies to implement facility project priorities
- Recommend a schedule to implement facility projects for each high school area

Community Outreach/Leadership:
- Lead community outreach efforts relating to Step 1 projects, including the new elementary school in southeast Fresno and new middle school in southwest Fresno

Planning:
- Coordinate with district staff/committees in planning facilities for adult education, career-technical education, special education, alternative education, community day, an early assessment center, administrative/central offices, and a regional multi-use stadium in the northwest quadrant of the district.
Preliminary Cost Estimates

A breakdown of the estimated costs for Steps 2 and 4/5 is presented in the charts below. (There are no direct facilities costs associated with Step 3.) The costs represent non-escalated, 2008 dollars and include construction costs and related fees only. Site acquisition, development costs, and overall maintenance costs must also be taken into consideration in the overall funding needs.

It should be noted that Step 4/5 shows a cost breakdown by high school area, not individual schools. The intent is to provide funding flexibility from school to school within each feeder area within broad categories of work. The costs identified in Step 4/5 are based upon 2009 permanent capacity, number of portables on the site and the combined score for each school. The 2009 capacity and combined scores can be found in Appendices 7.A. and 5.E., respectively. Cost breakdown by individual school is available in appendix 7.C.

### Preliminary Cost Estimates – Step 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Preliminary Cost Estimate</th>
<th>Proposed Funding Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Southwest Middle School</td>
<td>$33 million</td>
<td>Lease/Lease-back</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Southeast Elementary School</td>
<td>$20 million</td>
<td>Measure K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Southeast High School</td>
<td>$110 million</td>
<td>New bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convert Greenberg to 5-8</td>
<td>$12 million</td>
<td>New bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convert Anthony to 5-8</td>
<td>$12 million</td>
<td>New bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning/Construction for new Bullard High building</td>
<td>$300,000 $30 Million</td>
<td>Other New bond</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### High School Area Breakdown – Step 4/5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High School Area</th>
<th>Replace Portables (+ Capacity as needed)</th>
<th>Refurbish Remaining Portables</th>
<th>Improve Deficiencies (based on Assessment)</th>
<th>Total Preliminary Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bullard Area</td>
<td>$79 M</td>
<td>$3 M</td>
<td>$48 M</td>
<td>$130 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edison Area</td>
<td>$71 M</td>
<td>$2 M</td>
<td>$18 M</td>
<td>$91 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno Area</td>
<td>$84 M</td>
<td>$4 M</td>
<td>$29 M</td>
<td>$117 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoover Area</td>
<td>$43 M</td>
<td>$3 M</td>
<td>$32 M</td>
<td>$78 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McLane Area</td>
<td>$94 M</td>
<td>$4 M</td>
<td>$31 M</td>
<td>$129 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roosevelt Area</td>
<td>$30 M</td>
<td>$2 M</td>
<td>$33 M</td>
<td>$65 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunnyside Area</td>
<td>$30 M</td>
<td>$2 M</td>
<td>$9 M</td>
<td>$41 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New HS Area</td>
<td>$23 M</td>
<td>$3 M</td>
<td>$16 M</td>
<td>$42 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Programs</td>
<td>$36 M</td>
<td>$3 M</td>
<td>$18 M</td>
<td>$57 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$490 M</strong></td>
<td><strong>$26 M</strong></td>
<td><strong>$234 M</strong></td>
<td><strong>$750 M</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* May be in a future phase
EVALUATION PLAN
The Facilities Master Plan is not intended to be a static document, particularly in light of its 10 to 15 year planning time frame. The plan cannot predict, identify or resolve all the issues that may surface during the planning horizon. The Facilities Master Plan must be monitored and amended when necessary to address the changing needs, demographics, economics, and programs that drive facility decisions. As planning and implementation proceed, recommendations to the Board of Education for incremental approval should include an analysis of how the project/phase conforms to the original plan.

Additionally and at a minimum, the Facilities Master Plan final report should be updated and approved by the Board of Education every five years. Annual progress reports should be provided to the Board of Education which would include the following:

1. Progress on plan implementation
2. Updated time lines on plan/phase implementation
3. Changes in demographics that affect outcomes in the plan
4. Recommended revisions to project scope or implementation