

Listening Session 10-1-09
Traut Core Knowledge

Approximately 200 in attendance.

Dr. Wilson indicated to the audience that he had been at both Lopez and Riffenburgh that afternoon to listen to their concerns. At this time he asked if there were others in the audience that wanted to discuss other topics. Dr. Wilson stated at Listening Sessions he asks for questions and responds as appropriate.

General questions from the audience:

- ✚ The majority of those attending asked questions regarding the potential closure of Lopez.
- ✚ Questions on Boundaries—use of other buildings across the city.
- ✚ Closures and moves of the mountain schools and Riffenburgh.
- ✚ Graduation requirements – how can we respond during this fiscal situation?
- ✚ What is the impact of the On-line Academy?
- ✚ What other options are there other than consolidating schools?
- ✚ Impact of going for a Mill/Bond?
- ✚ Who will be on the Feasibility Committee Study

Superintendent's Response:

- ✚ Dr. Wilson talked about the feasibility study that we are conducting, looking at Lab School, Early Childhood, Red Feather and a small high school consideration – which is a long-term study. He stated the small high school may not be looked at until 2010.
- ✚ PSD needs to look at capacity of schools first, then the boundary committee can take this into account. With 34% of our students exercising School Choice it is difficult to determine boundaries.
- ✚ Some of the charges of the Feasibility Study will be to look at transportation, educational programs, and geographical proximity.
- ✚ The responsibility of PSD is in the overall use of our facilities. We need to act responsibly in how to handle the many vacant seats in our district.
- ✚ Dr. Wilson assured the listening audience that no decisions have been made. The district is committed to work with results. The Feasibility Study is intentional of taking the outcome, looking at all the other variables and coming up with recommendations. The Feasibility Study charge will be to work with the principal to better understand the needs of the community.
- ✚ The small high school concept is a long range plan looking at 2016. We have found through research success in specialty high schools in other districts.
- ✚ Facility Committee was not given any pre-determinations of which schools to look at.

- ✚ It is less cost to use our own buildings—using the resources we have, instead of using vacant public buildings.
- ✚ We have short-term and long-term goals and need to address the short-term goals first.
- ✚ State of Colorado is looking at changing the timeline for graduation requirements. We may be looking at pushing this back a little.
- ✚ The target for the PSD On-line Academy was home school students and those students not enrolled in PSD. It is difficult to predict the impact of an on-line school. Our community values the current educational offerings of PSD.
- ✚ The Boundary Steering committee provides options, it is composed of representatives from each school and the principal.
- ✚ PSD has made reductions in programs, keeping away from schools. We are looking at all of our expenditures and prioritizing.
- ✚ We have the same number of seats open regardless of grade configuration. Our high schools are now fully utilized.
- ✚ Asking for a Mill is an operational expenditure. A Bond is to support building schools. What we will be doing in the future is supporting more and more small schools unless we do something with the current buildings.
- ✚ The Feasibility committee will be comprised of approximately 15 people with regional representation. We will look for expertise from human resources, transportation, and finance.