

**Berryessa Union School District
School Consolidation Advisory Committee**

Criteria		Scoring methodology	Weighted methodology
Demographics and Capacity			
1.	School enrollment is low and projected to remain low (enrollment below 70% of capacity), including considering special day classes	Yes=2; No=1	Highest score goes to school with lowest enrollment (rank down)
2.	Demographically diverse population based on the unduplicated pupil percentage (within the range of 40%-60%)	Yes=1; No=2	Highest score goes to school with least diverse population (variance from 50%) (rank down)
3.	Excess classroom capacity	Yes=2; No=1	Highest score goes to school with most excess capacity (rank down)
4.	Proximity to schools with capacity to accommodate incoming students	Yes=2; No=1	Highest score goes to school with the closest three schools with the highest total available capacity (rank down)
Facilities			
5.	Facilities are in good condition (based on cost of facility needs and proposed modernization/construction projects)	Good=1; Fair=2; Poor=3	Highest score goes to school with most expensive needs (rank down)
6.	Modernization, construction or other projects (e.g., technology upgrades) recently completed	Yes=1; No=2	Highest score goes to school with least expensive projects (rank down)
7.	Total historical investments in facilities at the school site	Yes=2; No=1	Highest score goes to school with highest total historical investments in facilities (rank down)
8.	Unique facilities (i.e., facilities that could not be readily replicated) not found at other school sites	Yes=1; No=2	
9.	Support spaces (e.g., cafeteria, multi-purpose room, playgrounds, etc.) have sufficient capacity to meet current and projected enrollment	Yes=1; No=2	

		Brooktree ES			Cherrywood ES		
		Data	Score	Weighted	Data	Score	Weighted
		Demographics and Capacity			Demographics and Capacity		
(a)	2025-26 Enrollment:	343	2	8	519	1	3
(b)	Capacity:	550			694		
(a)/(b)	Utilization Rate:	62.4%			74.8%		
(c)	Capacity (Perm):	370			454		
(a)/(c)	Utilization Rate:	92.7%			114.3%		
	Capacity (Addtl):	140			84		
	UPP:	54.17%	1	4	44.27%	1	6
(b)-(a)	Excess Capacity:	207	2	6	175	2	3
(c)-(a)	Excess Capacity (Perm):	27			-65		
	School 1:	Cherrywood ES 175	143	70.6%	Brooktree ES 207	343	60.2%
	School 2:	Northwood ES 137			Ruskin ES 346		
	School 3:	Vinci Park ES 174			Summerdale ES 309		
	Total:	486	2	1	862	2	9
	School 1 (Perm):	Cherrywood ES -65	-367		Brooktree ES 27	-107	
	School 2 (Perm):	Northwood ES 17			Ruskin ES 256		
	School 3 (Perm):	Vinci Park ES 24			Summerdale ES 129		
	Total:	-24			412		
		Facilities			Facilities		
	Year Built:	1975	1	8	1973	1	10
(d)	Mod/Maint. Costs:	\$17,425,288			\$18,821,461		
(d)/(b)	Cost/Student (Capacity):	\$31,682			\$27,120		
(e)	Completed/Encumbered Bond Projects:	\$1,493,731	1	4	\$861,553	1	9
(e)/(b)	Cost/Student (Capacity):	\$2,716			\$1,241		
(f)	Historical Investments:	\$2,428,254	2	2	\$4,201,993	2	10
(f)/(b)	Cost/Student (Capacity):	\$4,415			\$6,055		
(e)+(f)	Total Investment:	\$3,921,985			\$5,063,546		
	Unique Facilities:	n/a	2		n/a	2	
	Support Spaces:	n/a	1		Need larger kitchen and reconfigured entry	2	

**Berryessa Union School District
School Consolidation Advisory Committee**

Criteria		Scoring methodology	Weighted methodology
10.	Environmental factors effect current or future use of property (e.g., earthquake faults, high speed rail, etc.)	Yes=2; No=1	
11.	Leases or other outside uses currently utilizing site/generating income	Yes=1; No=2	
Educational/Student Support Services			
12.	School does not meet performance in two or more state priorities	Yes=2; No=1	1 point for each indicator with an orange or red performance level
13.	District-wide/special programs would need to be relocated	Yes=1; No=2	
14.	District-wide/special programs can be relocated	Yes=2; No=1; N/A=3	
Fiscal and Other Impacts			
15.	Existing safety concerns regarding traffic and safe routes to school	Yes=2; No=1	n/a
16.	Safety concerns regarding traffic and safe routes to school if students are relocated	Yes=2; No=1	n/a
17.	Would require transportation for relocated students to new school sites	Yes=2; No=1	n/a
18.	Alternative uses identified if site is closed (e.g., use for other district functions, joint-use/joint occupancy agreements, community day school use, use by charter school [Proposition 39], shift to full-day kindergarten or universal pre-school program, etc.)	Yes=2; No=1	n/a
19.	District would benefit from net savings if closed	Yes=2; No=1	Highest score goes to school with most savings (rank down)
20.	Per-student operating costs, excluding staff	n/a	Highest score goes to school with the highest per-student operating cost (rank down)

Scores for metrics in blue (permanent classrooms only) provided for information purposes only and NOT included in total scores

		Brooktree ES			Cherrywood ES		
		Data	Score	Weighted	Data	Score	Weighted
Environmental Factors:		n/a	1		n/a	1	
Leases/Other:		n/a	2		n/a	2	
		Educational/Student Support			Educational/Student Support		
State Indicators:		n/a	1	0	n/a	1	0
Programs:		AVID SEAL	1		Mandarin Immersion Program SEAL	1	
			2			2	
		Fiscal and Other Impacts			Fiscal and Other Impacts		
Existing Safety Concerns:		n/a	1		n/a	1	
Possible Safety Concerns:		n/a	1		n/a	1	
Transportation:		No	1		No	1	
Alternative Uses:		n/a	1		n/a	1	
Net Savings:		\$835,548	2	5	\$844,420	2	6
(g)	Total Unrestricted Budget:	\$3,358,825		9	\$4,256,057		5
(h)	Unrestricted Budget Excluding Staff:	\$304,954			\$310,430		
(h)/(a)	Cost/Student (Enrollment):	\$889			\$598		
TOTAL			27	47		27	61

**Berryessa Union School District
School Consolidation Advisory Committee**

Criteria		Scoring methodology	Weighted methodology
Demographics and Capacity			
1.	School enrollment is low and projected to remain low (enrollment below 70% of capacity), including considering special day classes	Yes=2; No=1	Highest score goes to school with lowest enrollment (rank down)
2.	Demographically diverse population based on the unduplicated pupil percentage (within the range of 40%-60%)	Yes=1; No=2	Highest score goes to school with least diverse population (variance from 50%) (rank down)
3.	Excess classroom capacity	Yes=2; No=1	Highest score goes to school with most excess capacity (rank down)
4.	Proximity to schools with capacity to accommodate incoming students	Yes=2; No=1	Highest score goes to school with the closest three schools with the highest total available capacity (rank down)
Facilities			
5.	Facilities are in good condition (based on cost of facility needs and proposed modernization/construction projects)	Good=1; Fair=2; Poor=3	Highest score goes to school with most expensive needs (rank down)
6.	Modernization, construction or other projects (e.g., technology upgrades) recently completed	Yes=1; No=2	Highest score goes to school with least expensive projects (rank down)
7.	Total historical investments in facilities at the school site	Yes=2; No=1	Highest score goes to school with highest total historical investments in facilities (rank down)
8.	Unique facilities (i.e., facilities that could not be readily replicated) not found at other school sites	Yes=1; No=2	
9.	Support spaces (e.g., cafeteria, multi-purpose room, playgrounds, etc.) have sufficient capacity to meet current and projected enrollment	Yes=1; No=2	

		Laneview ES			Majestic Way ES				
		Data	Score	Weighted	Data	Score	Weighted		
		Demographics and Capacity			Demographics and Capacity				
(a)	2025-26 Enrollment:	360	2	6	400	2	4		
(b)	Capacity:	590			588				
(a)/(b)	Utilization Rate:	61.0%			68.0%				
(c)	Capacity (Perm):	440			408				
(a)/(c)	Utilization Rate:	81.8%			98.0%				
	Capacity (Addt'l):	112			140				
	UPP:	54.26%	1	5	42.83%	1	7		
(b)-(a)	Excess Capacity:	230	2	7	188	2	5		
(c)-(a)	Excess Capacity (Perm):	80			8				
	School 1:	Brooktree ES	207	172	67.7%	Laneview ES	230	361	52.6%
	School 2:	Majestic Way ES	188			Noble ES	185		
	School 3:	Northwood ES	137			Ruskin ES	346		
			532	2	2		761	2	6
	School 1 (Perm):	Brooktree ES	27	-308		Laneview ES	80	-64	
	School 2 (Perm):	Majestic Way ES	8			Noble ES	0		
	School 3 (Perm):	Northwood ES	17			Ruskin ES	256		
			52				336		
		Facilities			Facilities				
	Year Built:	1967	1	2	1975	1	6		
(d)	Mod/Maint. Costs:	\$13,920,336			\$15,826,087				
(d)/(b)	Cost/Student (Capacity):	\$23,594			\$26,915				
(e)	Completed/Encumbered Bond Projects:	\$1,201,473	1	6	\$1,639,079	1	2		
(e)/(b)	Cost/Student (Capacity):	\$2,036			\$2,788				
(f)	Historical Investments:	\$2,636,487	2	4	\$2,410,582	2	1		
(f)/(b)	Cost/Student (Capacity):	\$4,469			\$4,100				
(e)+(f)	Total Investment:	\$3,837,960			\$4,049,661				
	Unique Facilities:	n/a	2		n/a	2			
	Support Spaces:	n/a	1		n/a	1			

**Berryessa Union School District
School Consolidation Advisory Committee**

Criteria		Scoring methodology	Weighted methodology
10.	Environmental factors effect current or future use of property (e.g., earthquake faults, high speed rail, etc.)	Yes=2; No=1	
11.	Leases or other outside uses currently utilizing site/generating income	Yes=1; No=2	
Educational/Student Support Services			
12.	School does not meet performance in two or more state priorities	Yes=2; No=1	1 point for each indicator with an orange or red performance level
13.	District-wide/special programs would need to be relocated	Yes=1; No=2	
14.	District-wide/special programs can be relocated	Yes=2; No=1; N/A=3	
Fiscal and Other Impacts			
15.	Existing safety concerns regarding traffic and safe routes to school	Yes=2; No=1	n/a
16.	Safety concerns regarding traffic and safe routes to school if students are relocated	Yes=2; No=1	n/a
17.	Would require transportation for relocated students to new school sites	Yes=2; No=1	n/a
18.	Alternative uses identified if site is closed (e.g., use for other district functions, joint-use/joint occupancy agreements, community day school use, use by charter school [Proposition 39], shift to full-day kindergarten or universal pre-school program, etc.)	Yes=2; No=1	n/a
19.	District would benefit from net savings if closed	Yes=2; No=1	Highest score goes to school with most savings (rank down)
20.	Per-student operating costs, excluding staff	n/a	Highest score goes to school with the highest per-student operating cost (rank down)

Scores for metrics in blue (permanent classrooms only) provided for information purposes only and NOT included in total scores

		Laneview ES			Majestic Way ES		
		Data	Score	Weighted	Data	Score	Weighted
Environmental Factors:		n/a	1		n/a	1	
Leases/Other:		n/a	2		n/a	2	
Educational/Student Support Services				Educational/Student Support			
State Indicators:		Chronic Absenteeism Suspension Rate English Learner Progress	2	3	n/a	1	0
Programs:		AVID SEAL	1 2		n/a	2 3	
Fiscal and Other Impacts				Fiscal and Other Impacts			
Existing Safety Concerns:		n/a	1		n/a	1	
Possible Safety Concerns:		n/a	1		n/a	1	
Transportation:		No	1		No	1	
Alternative Uses:		n/a	1		n/a	1	
Net Savings:		\$859,643	2	8	\$805,198	2	4
(g)	Total Unrestricted Budget:	\$2,971,762		7	\$3,514,034		3
(h)	Unrestricted Budget Excluding Staff:	\$248,176					
(h)/(a)	Cost/Student (Enrollment):	\$689					
TOTAL			28	50		29	38

**Berryessa Union School District
School Consolidation Advisory Committee**

Criteria		Scoring methodology	Weighted methodology
Demographics and Capacity			
1.	School enrollment is low and projected to remain low (enrollment below 70% of capacity), including considering special day classes	Yes=2; No=1	Highest score goes to school with lowest enrollment (rank down)
2.	Demographically diverse population based on the unduplicated pupil percentage (within the range of 40%-60%)	Yes=1; No=2	Highest score goes to school with least diverse population (variance from 50%) (rank down)
3.	Excess classroom capacity	Yes=2; No=1	Highest score goes to school with most excess capacity (rank down)
4.	Proximity to schools with capacity to accommodate incoming students	Yes=2; No=1	Highest score goes to school with the closest three schools with the highest total available capacity (rank down)
Facilities			
5.	Facilities are in good condition (based on cost of facility needs and proposed modernization/construction projects)	Good=1; Fair=2; Poor=3	Highest score goes to school with most expensive needs (rank down)
6.	Modernization, construction or other projects (e.g., technology upgrades) recently completed	Yes=1; No=2	Highest score goes to school with least expensive projects (rank down)
7.	Total historical investments in facilities at the school site	Yes=2; No=1	Highest score goes to school with highest total historical investments in facilities (rank down)
8.	Unique facilities (i.e., facilities that could not be readily replicated) not found at other school sites	Yes=1; No=2	
9.	Support spaces (e.g., cafeteria, multi-purpose room, playgrounds, etc.) have sufficient capacity to meet current and projected enrollment	Yes=1; No=2	

		Noble ES			Northwood ES		
		Data	Score	Weighted	Data	Score	Weighted
		Demographics and Capacity			Demographics and Capacity		
(a)	2025-26 Enrollment:	373	2	5	533	1	2
(b)	Capacity:	558			670		
(a)/(b)	Utilization Rate:	66.8%			79.6%		
(c)	Capacity (Perm):	0			550		
(a)/(c)	Utilization Rate:	n/a			96.9%		
	Capacity (Addtl):	112			84		
	UPP:	35.27%	2	10	39.84%	2	9
(b)-(a)	Excess Capacity:	185	2	4	137	2	1
(c)-(a)	Excess Capacity (Perm):	n/a			17		
	School 1:	Ruskin ES 346	590	38.7%	Brooktree ES 207	79	87.1%
	School 2:	Summerdale ES 309			Cherrywood ES 175		
	School 3:	Toyon ES 308			Laneview ES 230		
		963	2	10	612	2	3
	School 1 (Perm):	Ruskin ES 256	200	65.1%	Brooktree ES 27	-491	
	School 2 (Perm):	Summerdale ES 129			Cherrywood ES -65		
	School 3 (Perm):	Toyon ES 188			Laneview ES 80		
		573			42		
		Facilities			Facilities		
	Year Built:	1962	1	1	1965	1	3
(d)	Mod/Maint. Costs:	\$13,366,343			\$14,822,705		
(d)/(b)	Cost/Student (Capacity):	\$23,954			\$22,123		
(e)	Completed/Encumbered Bond Projects:	\$1,607,856	1	3	\$2,115,836	1	1
(e)/(b)	Cost/Student (Capacity):	\$2,881			\$3,158		
(f)	Historical Investments:	\$2,703,324	2	5	\$2,585,236	2	3
(f)/(b)	Cost/Student (Capacity):	\$4,845			\$3,859		
(e)+(f)	Total Investment:	\$4,311,180			\$4,701,072		
	Unique Facilities:	n/a	2		n/a	2	
	Support Spaces:	n/a	1		n/a	1	

**Berryessa Union School District
School Consolidation Advisory Committee**

Criteria		Scoring methodology	Weighted methodology
10.	Environmental factors effect current or future use of property (e.g., earthquake faults, high speed rail, etc.)	Yes=2; No=1	
11.	Leases or other outside uses currently utilizing site/generating income	Yes=1; No=2	
Educational/Student Support Services			
12.	School does not meet performance in two or more state priorities	Yes=2; No=1	1 point for each indicator with an orange or red performance level
13.	District-wide/special programs would need to be relocated	Yes=1; No=2	
14.	District-wide/special programs can be relocated	Yes=2; No=1; N/A=3	
Fiscal and Other Impacts			
15.	Existing safety concerns regarding traffic and safe routes to school	Yes=2; No=1	n/a
16.	Safety concerns regarding traffic and safe routes to school if students are relocated	Yes=2; No=1	n/a
17.	Would require transportation for relocated students to new school sites	Yes=2; No=1	n/a
18.	Alternative uses identified if site is closed (e.g., use for other district functions, joint-use/joint occupancy agreements, community day school use, use by charter school [Proposition 39], shift to full-day kindergarten or universal pre-school program, etc.)	Yes=2; No=1	n/a
19.	District would benefit from net savings if closed	Yes=2; No=1	Highest score goes to school with most savings (rank down)
20.	Per-student operating costs, excluding staff	n/a	Highest score goes to school with the highest per-student operating cost (rank down)

Scores for metrics in blue (permanent classrooms only) provided for information purposes only and NOT included in total scores

		Noble ES			Northwood ES		
		Data	Score	Weighted	Data	Score	Weighted
Environmental Factors:		n/a	1		n/a	1	
Leases/Other:		n/a	2		n/a	2	
Educational/Student Support Services				Educational/Student Support			
State Indicators:		Chronic Absenteeism	1	1	English Learner Progress	1	1
Programs:		Parent Participation Program	1		n/a	2	
			2			3	
Fiscal and Other Impacts				Fiscal and Other Impacts			
Existing Safety Concerns:		n/a	1		n/a	1	
Possible Safety Concerns:		n/a	1		n/a	1	
Transportation:		No	1		No	1	
Alternative Uses:		n/a	1		n/a	1	
Net Savings:		\$728,701	2	1	\$853,386	2	7
(g)	Total Unrestricted Budget:	\$2,931,702		2	\$4,063,694		1
(h)	Unrestricted Budget Excluding Staff:	\$188,271			\$231,942		
(h)/(a)	Cost/Student (Enrollment):	\$505			\$435		
TOTAL			28	42		29	31

**Berryessa Union School District
School Consolidation Advisory Committee**

Criteria		Scoring methodology	Weighted methodology
Demographics and Capacity			
1.	School enrollment is low and projected to remain low (enrollment below 70% of capacity), including considering special day classes	Yes=2; No=1	Highest score goes to school with lowest enrollment (rank down)
2.	Demographically diverse population based on the unduplicated pupil percentage (within the range of 40%-60%)	Yes=1; No=2	Highest score goes to school with least diverse population (variance from 50%) (rank down)
3.	Excess classroom capacity	Yes=2; No=1	Highest score goes to school with most excess capacity (rank down)
4.	Proximity to schools with capacity to accommodate incoming students	Yes=2; No=1	Highest score goes to school with the closest three schools with the highest total available capacity (rank down)
Facilities			
5.	Facilities are in good condition (based on cost of facility needs and proposed modernization/construction projects)	Good=1; Fair=2; Poor=3	Highest score goes to school with most expensive needs (rank down)
6.	Modernization, construction or other projects (e.g., technology upgrades) recently completed	Yes=1; No=2	Highest score goes to school with least expensive projects (rank down)
7.	Total historical investments in facilities at the school site	Yes=2; No=1	Highest score goes to school with highest total historical investments in facilities (rank down)
8.	Unique facilities (i.e., facilities that could not be readily replicated) not found at other school sites	Yes=1; No=2	
9.	Support spaces (e.g., cafeteria, multi-purpose room, playgrounds, etc.) have sufficient capacity to meet current and projected enrollment	Yes=1; No=2	

		Ruskin ES			Summerdale ES			
		Data	Score	Weighted	Data	Score	Weighted	
		Demographics and Capacity			Demographics and Capacity			
(a)	2025-26 Enrollment:	360	2	6	305	2	9	
(b)	Capacity:	706			614			
(a)/(b)	Utilization Rate:	51.0%			49.7%			
(c)	Capacity (Perm):	616			434			
(a)/(c)	Utilization Rate:	58.4%			70.3%			
	Capacity (Addtl):	28			84			
	UPP:	40.43%	1	8	51.76%	1	3	
(b)-(a)	Excess Capacity:	346	2	10	309	2	9	
(c)-(a)	Excess Capacity (Perm):	256			129			
	School 1: Majestic Way ES	188	322	52.8%	Noble ES	185	534	36.4%
	School 2: Noble ES	185			Ruskin	346		
	School 3: Summerdale ES	309			Toyon ES	308		
		682	2	4	839	2	7	
	School 1 (Perm): Majestic Way ES	8	-223		Noble ES	0	139	68.7%
	School 2 (Perm): Noble ES	0			Ruskin	256		
	School 3 (Perm): Summerdale ES	129			Toyon ES	188		
		137			444			
		Facilities			Facilities			
	Year Built:	1969	1	4	1975	1	7	
(d)	Mod/Maint. Costs:	\$15,070,977			\$15,867,064			
(d)/(b)	Cost/Student (Capacity):	\$21,347			\$25,842			
(e)	Completed/Encumbered Bond Projects:	\$924,201	1	8	\$1,272,291	1	5	
(e)/(b)	Cost/Student (Capacity):	\$1,309			\$2,072			
(f)	Historical Investments:	\$3,132,330	2	8	\$3,224,537	2	9	
(f)/(b)	Cost/Student (Capacity):	\$4,437			\$5,252			
(e)+(f)	Total Investment:	\$4,056,531			\$4,496,828			
	Unique Facilities:	n/a	2		n/a	2		
	Support Spaces: Need reconfigured/larger office		2		n/a	1		

**Berryessa Union School District
School Consolidation Advisory Committee**

Criteria		Scoring methodology	Weighted methodology
10.	Environmental factors effect current or future use of property (e.g., earthquake faults, high speed rail, etc.)	Yes=2; No=1	
11.	Leases or other outside uses currently utilizing site/generating income	Yes=1; No=2	
Educational/Student Support Services			
12.	School does not meet performance in two or more state priorities	Yes=2; No=1	1 point for each indicator with an orange or red performance level
13.	District-wide/special programs would need to be relocated	Yes=1; No=2	
14.	District-wide/special programs can be relocated	Yes=2; No=1; N/A=3	
Fiscal and Other Impacts			
15.	Existing safety concerns regarding traffic and safe routes to school	Yes=2; No=1	n/a
16.	Safety concerns regarding traffic and safe routes to school if students are relocated	Yes=2; No=1	n/a
17.	Would require transportation for relocated students to new school sites	Yes=2; No=1	n/a
18.	Alternative uses identified if site is closed (e.g., use for other district functions, joint-use/joint occupancy agreements, community day school use, use by charter school [Proposition 39], shift to full-day kindergarten or universal pre-school program, etc.)	Yes=2; No=1	n/a
19.	District would benefit from net savings if closed	Yes=2; No=1	Highest score goes to school with most savings (rank down)
20.	Per-student operating costs, excluding staff	n/a	Highest score goes to school with the highest per-student operating cost (rank down)

Scores for metrics in blue (permanent classrooms only) provided for information purposes only and NOT included in total scores

		Ruskin ES			Summerdale ES		
		Data	Score	Weighted	Data	Score	Weighted
Environmental Factors:		n/a	1		n/a	1	
Leases/Other:		n/a	2		n/a	2	
		Educational/Student Support Services			Educational/Student Support		
State Indicators:		n/a	1	0	n/a	1	0
Programs:		n/a	2		AVID SEAL	1	
			3			2	
		Fiscal and Other Impacts			Fiscal and Other Impacts		
Existing Safety Concerns:		Closed cross walk	2		n/a	1	
Possible Safety Concerns:		Closed cross walk	2		n/a	1	
Transportation:		No	1		No	1	
Alternative Uses:		n/a	1		n/a	1	
Net Savings:		\$872,505	2	9	\$764,794	2	2
(g)	Total Unrestricted Budget:	\$3,464,077		6	\$2,622,071		8
(h)	Unrestricted Budget Excluding Staff:	\$225,299			\$210,473		
(h)/(a)	Cost/Student (Enrollment):	\$626			\$690		
TOTAL			32	63		27	59

**Berryessa Union School District
School Consolidation Advisory Committee**

Criteria		Scoring methodology	Weighted methodology
Demographics and Capacity			
1.	School enrollment is low and projected to remain low (enrollment below 70% of capacity), including considering special day classes	Yes=2; No=1	Highest score goes to school with lowest enrollment (rank down)
2.	Demographically diverse population based on the unduplicated pupil percentage (within the range of 40%-60%)	Yes=1; No=2	Highest score goes to school with least diverse population (variance from 50%) (rank down)
3.	Excess classroom capacity	Yes=2; No=1	Highest score goes to school with most excess capacity (rank down)
4.	Proximity to schools with capacity to accommodate incoming students	Yes=2; No=1	Highest score goes to school with the closest three schools with the highest total available capacity (rank down)
Facilities			
5.	Facilities are in good condition (based on cost of facility needs and proposed modernization/construction projects)	Good=1; Fair=2; Poor=3	Highest score goes to school with most expensive needs (rank down)
6.	Modernization, construction or other projects (e.g., technology upgrades) recently completed	Yes=1; No=2	Highest score goes to school with least expensive projects (rank down)
7.	Total historical investments in facilities at the school site	Yes=2; No=1	Highest score goes to school with highest total historical investments in facilities (rank down)
8.	Unique facilities (i.e., facilities that could not be readily replicated) not found at other school sites	Yes=1; No=2	
9.	Support spaces (e.g., cafeteria, multi-purpose room, playgrounds, etc.) have sufficient capacity to meet current and projected enrollment	Yes=1; No=2	

		Toyon ES			Vinci Park ES		
		Data	Score	Weighted	Data	Score	Weighted
		Demographics and Capacity			Demographics and Capacity		
(a)	2025-26 Enrollment:	236	2	10	570	1	1
(b)	Capacity:	544					
(a)/(b)	Utilization Rate:	43.4%					
(c)	Capacity (Perm):	424			594		
(a)/(c)	Utilization Rate:	55.7%					
	Capacity (Addt'l):	56					
	UPP:	51.09%	1	2	50.06%	1	1
(b)-(a)	Excess Capacity:	308	2	8	174	2	2
(c)-(a)	Excess Capacity (Perm):	188			24		
	School 1:	Noble ES 185	604	28.1%	Brooktree ES 207	121	82.5%
	School 2:	Ruskin ES 346					
	School 3:	Summerdale ES 309					
		840	2	8	691	2	5
	School 1 (Perm):	Noble ES 0	149	61.3%	Brooktree ES 27	-479	
	School 2 (Perm):	Ruskin ES 256					
	School 3 (Perm):	Summerdale ES 129					
		385			91		
		Facilities			Facilities		
	Year Built:	1956	1	5	1974	1	9
(d)	Mod/Maint. Costs:	\$15,093,756					
(d)/(b)	Cost/Student (Capacity):	\$27,746					
(e)	Completed/Encumbered Bond Projects:	\$1,107,720	1	7	\$556,175	1	10
(e)/(b)	Cost/Student (Capacity):	\$2,036			\$748		
(f)	Historical Investments:	\$2,913,815	2	6	\$3,101,192	2	7
(f)/(b)	Cost/Student (Capacity):	\$5,356					
(e)+(f)	Total Investment:	\$4,021,535			\$3,657,367		
	Unique Facilities:	n/a	2		n/a	2	
	Support Spaces:	n/a	1		Need reconfigured entry	2	

**Berryessa Union School District
School Consolidation Advisory Committee**

Criteria		Scoring methodology	Weighted methodology
10.	Environmental factors effect current or future use of property (e.g., earthquake faults, high speed rail, etc.)	Yes=2; No=1	
11.	Leases or other outside uses currently utilizing site/generating income	Yes=1; No=2	
Educational/Student Support Services			
12.	School does not meet performance in two or more state priorities	Yes=2; No=1	1 point for each indicator with an orange or red performance level
13.	District-wide/special programs would need to be relocated	Yes=1; No=2	
14.	District-wide/special programs can be relocated	Yes=2; No=1; N/A=3	
Fiscal and Other Impacts			
15.	Existing safety concerns regarding traffic and safe routes to school	Yes=2; No=1	n/a
16.	Safety concerns regarding traffic and safe routes to school if students are relocated	Yes=2; No=1	n/a
17.	Would require transportation for relocated students to new school sites	Yes=2; No=1	n/a
18.	Alternative uses identified if site is closed (e.g., use for other district functions, joint-use/joint occupancy agreements, community day school use, use by charter school [Proposition 39], shift to full-day kindergarten or universal pre-school program, etc.)	Yes=2; No=1	n/a
19.	District would benefit from net savings if closed	Yes=2; No=1	Highest score goes to school with most savings (rank down)
20.	Per-student operating costs, excluding staff	n/a	Highest score goes to school with the highest per-student operating cost (rank down)

Scores for metrics in blue (permanent classrooms only) provided for information purposes only and NOT included in total scores

		Toyon ES			Vinci Park ES		
		Data	Score	Weighted	Data	Score	Weighted
Environmental Factors:		n/a	1		n/a	1	
Leases/Other:		n/a	2		n/a	2	
		Educational/Student Support Services			Educational/Student Support		
State Indicators:		English Learner Progress ELA Math	2	3	n/a	1	0
Programs:		SEAL	1		SEAL	1	
			2			2	
		Fiscal and Other Impacts			Fiscal and Other Impacts		
Existing Safety Concerns:		n/a	1		n/a	1	
Possible Safety Concerns:		n/a	1		n/a	1	
Transportation:		No	1		No	1	
Alternative Uses:		n/a	1		n/a	1	
Net Savings:		\$802,851	2	3	\$895,785	2	10
(g)	Total Unrestricted Budget:	\$2,312,277			\$4,448,241		
(h)	Unrestricted Budget Excluding Staff:	\$256,751		10	\$340,393		4
(h)/(a)	Cost/Student (Enrollment):	\$1,088			\$597		
TOTAL			28	62		27	49

**Berryessa Union School District
School Consolidation Advisory Committee**

Criteria		Scoring methodology	Weighted methodology				Morrill MS			Piedmont MS		
				Data	Score	Weighted	Data	Score	Weighted			
Demographics and Capacity				Demographics and Capacity			Demographics and Capacity					
1.	School enrollment is low and projected to remain low (enrollment below 70% of capacity), including considering special day classes	Yes=2; No=1	Highest score goes to school with lowest enrollment (rank down)	(a) 2025-26 Enrollment:	694	2	1	611	2	3		
				(b) Capacity:	1,008			996				
				(a)/(b) Utilization Rate:	68.8%			61.3%				
				(c) Capacity (Perm):	944			836				
				(a)/(c) Utilization Rate:	73.5%			73.1%				
				Capacity (Add'l):	160			96				
2.	Demographically diverse population based on the unduplicated pupil percentage (within the range of 40%-60%)	Yes=1; No=2	Highest score goes to school with least diverse population (variance from 50%) (rank down)	UPP:	46.59%	1	1	42.98%	1	2		
3.	Excess classroom capacity	Yes=2; No=1	Highest score goes to school with most excess capacity (rank down)	(b)-(a) Excess Capacity:	314	2	1	385	2	3		
				(c)-(a) Excess Capacity (Perm):	250			225				
4.	Proximity to schools with capacity to accommodate incoming students	Yes=2; No=1	Highest score goes to school with the closest three schools with the highest total available capacity (rank down)	School 1:	Piedmont MS 385	14	98.0%	Morrill MS 314	26	95.9%		
				School 2:	Sierramont MS 323			Sierramont MS 323				
				School 3:								
					708	2	3	637	2	1		
				School 1 (Perm):	Piedmont MS 225	-306		Morrill MS 250	-198			
				School 2 (Perm):	Sierramont MS 163			Sierramont MS 163				
				School 3 (Perm):								
					388			413				
Facilities				Facilities			Facilities					
5.	Facilities are in good condition (based on cost of facility needs and proposed modernization/construction projects)	Good=1; Fair=2; Poor=3	Highest score goes to school with most expensive needs (rank down)	Year Built:	1972	1	2	1960	1	1		
				(d) Mod/Maint. Costs:	\$18,598,546			\$15,972,477				
				(d)/(b) Cost/Student (Capacity):	\$18,451			\$16,037				
6.	Modernization, construction or other projects (e.g., technology upgrades) recently completed	Yes=1; No=2	Highest score goes to school with least expensive projects (rank down)	(e) Completed/Encumbered Bond Projects:	\$2,808,396	1	2	\$14,010,850	1	1		
				(e)/(b) Cost/Student (Capacity):	\$2,786			\$14,067				
7.	Total historical investments in facilities at the school site	Yes=2; No=1	Highest score goes to school with highest total historical investments in facilities (rank down)	(f) Historical Investments:	\$5,367,478	2	2	\$4,400,240	2	1		
				(f)/(b) Cost/Student (Capacity):	\$5,325			\$4,418				
				(e)+(f) Total Investment:	\$8,175,874			\$18,411,090				
8.	Unique facilities (i.e., facilities that could not be readily replicated) not found at other school sites	Yes=1; No=2		Unique Facilities:	n/a	2		n/a	2			
9.	Support spaces (e.g., cafeteria, multi-purpose room, playgrounds, etc.) have sufficient capacity to meet current and projected enrollment	Yes=1; No=2		Support Spaces:	n/a	1		n/a	1			

**Berryessa Union School District
School Consolidation Advisory Committee**

Criteria		Scoring methodology	Weighted methodology
10.	Environmental factors effect current or future use of property (e.g., earthquake faults, high speed rail, etc.)	Yes=2; No=1	
11.	Leases or other outside uses currently utilizing site/generating income	Yes=1; No=2	
Educational/Student Support Services			
12.	School does not meet performance in two or more state priorities	Yes=2; No=1	1 point for each indicator with an orange or red performance level
13.	District-wide/special programs would need to be relocated	Yes=1; No=2	
14.	District-wide/special programs can be relocated	Yes=2; No=1; N/A=3	
Fiscal and Other Impacts			
15.	Existing safety concerns regarding traffic and safe routes to school	Yes=2; No=1	n/a
16.	Safety concerns regarding traffic and safe routes to school if students are relocated	Yes=2; No=1	n/a
17.	Would require transportation for relocated students to new school sites	Yes=2; No=1	n/a
18.	Alternative uses identified if site is closed (e.g., use for other district functions, joint-use/joint occupancy agreements, community day school use, use by charter school [Proposition 39], shift to full-day kindergarten or universal pre-school program, etc.)	Yes=2; No=1	n/a
19.	District would benefit from net savings if closed	Yes=2; No=1	Highest score goes to school with most savings (rank down)
20.	Per-student operating costs, excluding staff	n/a	Highest score goes to school with the highest per-student operating cost (rank down)

Scores for metrics in blue (permanent classrooms only) provided for information purposes only and NOT included in total scores

		Morrill MS			Piedmont MS		
		Data	Score	Weighted	Data	Score	Weighted
Environmental Factors:		n/a	1		n/a	1	
Leases/Other:		n/a	2		n/a	2	
		Educational/Student Support			Educational/Student Support		
State Indicators:		n/a	1	0	Suspension Rate Math	2	2
Programs:		AVID	1		AVID	1	
			2			2	
		Fiscal and Other Impacts			Fiscal and Other Impacts		
Existing Safety Concerns:		n/a	1		n/a	1	
Possible Safety Concerns:		n/a	1		n/a	1	
Transportation:		No	1		No	1	
Alternative Uses:		n/a	1		n/a	1	
Net Savings:		\$1,236,995	2	2	\$1,254,691	2	3
(g)	Total Unrestricted Budget:	\$5,042,722			\$5,071,618		
(h)	Unrestricted Budget Excluding Staff:	\$334,628		2	\$301,647		3
(h)/(a)	Cost/Student (Enrollment):	\$482			\$494		
TOTAL			27	16		28	20

**Berryessa Union School District
School Consolidation Advisory Committee**

Criteria		Scoring methodology	Weighted methodology
Demographics and Capacity			
1.	School enrollment is low and projected to remain low (enrollment below 70% of capacity), including considering special day classes	Yes=2; No=1	Highest score goes to school with lowest enrollment (rank down)
2.	Demographically diverse population based on the unduplicated pupil percentage (within the range of 40%-60%)	Yes=1; No=2	Highest score goes to school with least diverse population (variance from 50%) (rank down)
3.	Excess classroom capacity	Yes=2; No=1	Highest score goes to school with most excess capacity (rank down)
4.	Proximity to schools with capacity to accommodate incoming students	Yes=2; No=1	Highest score goes to school with the closest three schools with the highest total available capacity (rank down)
Facilities			
5.	Facilities are in good condition (based on cost of facility needs and proposed modernization/construction projects)	Good=1; Fair=2; Poor=3	Highest score goes to school with most expensive needs (rank down)
6.	Modernization, construction or other projects (e.g., technology upgrades) recently completed	Yes=1; No=2	Highest score goes to school with least expensive projects (rank down)
7.	Total historical investments in facilities at the school site	Yes=2; No=1	Highest score goes to school with highest total historical investments in facilities (rank down)
8.	Unique facilities (i.e., facilities that could not be readily replicated) not found at other school sites	Yes=1; No=2	
9.	Support spaces (e.g., cafeteria, multi-purpose room, playgrounds, etc.) have sufficient capacity to meet current and projected enrollment	Yes=1; No=2	

		Sierramont ES		
		Data	Score	Weighted
		Demographics and Capacity		
(a)	2025-26 Enrollment:	673	2	2
(b)	Capacity:	996		
(a)/(b)	Utilization Rate:	67.6%		
(c)	Capacity (Perm):	836		
(a)/(c)	Utilization Rate:	80.5%		
	Capacity (Addt'l):	128		
	UPP:	32.79%	2	3
(b)-(a)	Excess Capacity:	323	2	2
(c)-(a)	Excess Capacity (Perm):	163		
	School 1:	Morril MS	314	26
	School 2:	Piedmont MS	385	
	School 3:			
			699	2
	School 1 (Perm):	Morril MS	250	-198
	School 2 (Perm):	Piedmont MS	225	
	School 3 (Perm):			
			475	
		Facilities		
	Year Built:	1975	1	3
(d)	Mod/Maint. Costs:	\$21,225,874		
(d)/(b)	Cost/Student (Capacity):	\$21,311	1	3
(e)	Completed/Encumbered Bond Projects:	\$1,005,380		
(e)/(b)	Cost/Student (Capacity):	\$1,009	2	3
(f)	Historical Investments:	\$5,764,447		
(f)/(b)	Cost/Student (Capacity):	\$5,788		
(e)+(f)	Total Investment:	\$6,769,827		
	Unique Facilities:	n/a	2	
	Support Spaces:	n/a	1	

**Berryessa Union School District
School Consolidation Advisory Committee**

Criteria		Scoring methodology	Weighted methodology
10.	Environmental factors effect current or future use of property (e.g., earthquake faults, high speed rail, etc.)	Yes=2; No=1	
11.	Leases or other outside uses currently utilizing site/generating income	Yes=1; No=2	
Educational/Student Support Services			
12.	School does not meet performance in two or more state priorities	Yes=2; No=1	1 point for each indicator with an orange or red performance level
13.	District-wide/special programs would need to be relocated	Yes=1; No=2	
14.	District-wide/special programs can be relocated	Yes=2; No=1; N/A=3	
Fiscal and Other Impacts			
15.	Existing safety concerns regarding traffic and safe routes to school	Yes=2; No=1	n/a
16.	Safety concerns regarding traffic and safe routes to school if students are relocated	Yes=2; No=1	n/a
17.	Would require transportation for relocated students to new school sites	Yes=2; No=1	n/a
18.	Alternative uses identified if site is closed (e.g., use for other district functions, joint-use/joint occupancy agreements, community day school use, use by charter school [Proposition 39], shift to full-day kindergarten or universal pre-school program, etc.)	Yes=2; No=1	n/a
19.	District would benefit from net savings if closed	Yes=2; No=1	Highest score goes to school with most savings (rank down)
20.	Per-student operating costs, excluding staff	n/a	Highest score goes to school with the highest per-student operating cost (rank down)

Scores for metrics in blue (permanent classrooms only) provided for information purposes only and NOT included in total scores

		Sierramont ES		
		Data	Score	Weighted
Environmental Factors:		n/a	1	
Leases/Other:		n/a	2	
		Educational/Student Support Services		
State Indicators:		Suspension Rate	1	1
Programs:		AVID Mandarin Immersion Program	1 2	
		Fiscal and Other Impacts		
Existing Safety Concerns:		n/a	1	
Possible Safety Concerns:		n/a	1	
Transportation:		No	1	
Alternative Uses:		n/a	1	
Net Savings:		\$1,151,507	2	1
(g)	Total Unrestricted Budget:	\$5,993,386		1
(h)	Unrestricted Budget Excluding Staff:	\$305,225		
(h)/(a)	Cost/Student (Enrollment):	\$454		
TOTAL			28	21

**Berryessa Union School District
School Consolidation Advisory Committee**

Criterion 1	Score	Weighted Score
School enrollment is low and projected to remain low (enrollment below 70% of capacity), including considering special day classes	Yes=2; No=1	Highest score goes to school with lowest enrollment (rank down)

	Enrollment	Utilization Rate	Score	Weighted Score
Elementary Schools				
Toyon ES	236	43.4%	2	10
Summerdale ES	305	49.7%	2	9
Brooktree ES	343	62.4%	2	8
Laneview ES	360	61.0%	2	6
Ruskin ES	360	51.0%	2	6
Noble ES	373	66.8%	2	5
Majestic Way ES	400	68.0%	2	4
Cherrywood ES	519	74.8%	1	3
Northwood ES	533	79.6%	1	2
Vinci Park ES	570	76.6%	1	1
Middle Schools				
Piedmont MS	611	61.3%	2	3
Sierramont MS	673	67.6%	2	2
Morrill MS	694	68.9%	2	1

**Berryessa Union School District
School Consolidation Advisory Committee**

Criterion 2	Score	Weighted Score
Demographically diverse population based on the unduplicated pupil percentage (within the range of 40%-60%)	Yes=1; No=2	Highest score goes to school with least diverse population (variance from 50%) (rank down)

	UPP	Variance from 50%	Score	Weighted Score
Elementary Schools				
Noble ES	35.27%	14.73%	2	10
Northwood ES	39.84%	10.16%	2	9
Ruskin ES	40.43%	9.57%	1	8
Majestic Way ES	42.83%	7.17%	1	7
Cherrywood ES	44.27%	5.73%	1	6
Laneview ES	54.26%	4.26%	1	5
Brooktree ES	54.17%	4.17%	1	4
Summerdale ES	51.76%	1.76%	1	3
Toyon ES	51.09%	1.09%	1	2
Vinci Park ES	50.06%	0.06%	1	1
Middle Schools				
Sierramont MS	32.79%	17.21%	2	3
Piedmont MS	42.98%	7.02%	1	2
Morrill MS	46.59%	3.41%	1	1

District UPP	44.28%
---------------------	--------

**Berryessa Union School District
School Consolidation Advisory Committee**

Criterion 3	Score	Weighted Score
Excess classroom capacity	Yes=2; No=1	Highest score goes to school with most excess capacity (rank down)

	Excess Capacity	Score	Weighted Score
Elementary Schools			
Ruskin ES	346	2	10
Summerdale ES	309	2	9
Toyon ES	308	2	8
Laneview ES	230	2	7
Brooktree ES	207	2	6
Majestic Way ES	188	2	5
Noble ES	185	2	4
Cherrywood ES	175	2	3
Vinci Park ES	174	2	2
Northwood ES	137	2	1
Middle Schools			
Piedmont MS	385	2	3
Sierramont MS	323	2	2
Morrill MS	314	2	1

**Berryessa Union School District
School Consolidation Advisory Committee**

Criterion 4	Score	Weighted Score
Proximity to schools with capacity to accommodate incoming students	Yes=2; No=1	Highest score goes to school with the closest three schools with the highest total available capacity (rank down)

	Brooktree ES	Cherrywood ES	Laneview ES	Majestic Way ES	Noble ES	Northwood ES	Ruskin ES	Summerdale ES	Toyon ES	Vinci Park ES
--	--------------	---------------	-------------	-----------------	----------	--------------	-----------	---------------	----------	---------------

Elementary Schools

Noble ES	3.2 miles	2.2 miles	3.0 miles	1.9 miles		4.0 miles	1.5 miles	1.3 miles	0.8 miles	2.8 miles
Cherrywood ES	1.2 miles		2.2 miles	2.0 miles	2.1 miles	1.8 miles	1.4 miles	1.2 miles	2.2 miles	2.1 miles
Toyon ES	3.8 miles	2.3 miles	3.1 miles	2.2 miles	0.8 miles	4.1 miles	1.7 miles	1.0 miles		2.8 miles
Summerdale ES	2.4 miles	1.4 miles	2.4 miles	2.1 miles	1.3 miles	3.1 miles	1.2 miles		1.0 miles	1.9 miles
Majestic Way ES	2.2 miles	1.9 miles	1.5 miles		1.9 miles	2.4 miles	1.3 miles	2.4 miles	2.4 miles	3.2 miles
Vinci Park ES	1.8 miles	1.9 miles	3.3 miles	3.1 miles	2.6 miles	3.2 miles	2.7 miles	1.9 miles	2.7 miles	
Ruskin ES	2.0 miles	1.5 miles	1.9 miles	1.3 miles	1.5 miles	2.6 miles		1.2 miles	1.7 miles	2.9 miles
Northwood ES	1.2 miles	1.7 miles	1.6 miles	2.5 miles	4.1 miles		2.5 miles	3.1 miles	4.3 miles	2.9 miles
Laneview ES	1.8 miles	2.1 miles		1.5 miles	3.1 miles	1.8 miles	1.9 miles	2.4 miles	3.3 miles	3.3 miles
Brooktree ES		1.3 miles	1.8 miles	2.5 miles	3.3 miles	1.2 miles	1.9 miles	2.4 miles	3.3 miles	1.7 miles

Total Excess Capacity	Score	Weighted Score
-----------------------	-------	----------------

963	2	10
862	2	9
840	2	8
839	2	7
761	2	6
691	2	5
682	2	4
612	2	3
532	2	2
486	2	1

Middle Schools

	Morrill MS	Piedmont MS	Sierramont MS
Morrill MS		2.7 miles	1.4 miles
Sierramont MS	1.4 miles	1.4 miles	
Piedmont MS	2.6 miles		1.4 miles

Total Excess Capacity	Score	Weighted score
708	2	3
699	2	2
637	2	1

Shaded cells represent the three nearest schools

**Berryessa Union School District
School Consolidation Advisory Committee**

Criterion 5	Score	Weighted Score
Facilities are in good condition (based on cost of facility needs and proposed modernization/construction projects)	Good=1; Fair=2; Poor=3	Highest score goes to school with most expensive needs (rank down)

	Total Costs	Condition	Score	Weighted Score
Elementary Schools				
Cherrywood ES	\$18,821,461	Good	1	10
Vinci Park ES	\$17,898,507	Good	1	9
Brooktree ES	\$17,425,288	Good	1	8
Summerdale ES	\$15,867,064	Good	1	7
Majestic Way ES	\$15,826,087	Good	1	6
Toyon ES	\$15,093,756	Good	1	5
Ruskin ES	\$15,070,977	Good	1	4
Northwood ES	\$14,822,705	Good	1	3
Laneview ES	\$13,920,336	Good	1	2
Noble ES	\$13,366,343	Good	1	1
Middle Schools				
Sierramont MS	\$21,225,874	Good	1	3
Morrill MS	\$18,598,546	Good	1	2
Piedmont MS	\$15,972,477	Good	1	1

School Facility Conditions and Planned Improvements¹

Systems: Gas leaks, mechanical/HVAC, sewer

Interior: Interior surfaces

Cleanliness: Overall cleanliness, pest/vermin infestation

Electrical

Restrooms/fountains: restrooms, sinks/fountains

Safety: Fire safety/hazardous materials

Structural: Structural damage, roofs

External: Playground/school grounds, windows/doors/gates/fences

¹2023 School Accountability Report Card

**Berryessa Union School District
School Consolidation Advisory Committee**

Criterion 6	Score	Weighted Score	
Modernization, construction or other projects (e.g., technology upgrades) recently completed	Yes=1; No=2	Highest score goes to school with least expensive projects	
	Recently Completed Projects	Score	Weighted Score
Elementary Schools			
Vinci Park ES	\$556,175	1	10
Cherrywood ES	\$861,553	1	9
Ruskin ES	\$924,201	1	8
Toyon ES	\$1,107,720	1	7
Laneview ES	\$1,201,473	1	6
Summerdale ES	\$1,272,291	1	5
Brooktree ES	\$1,493,731	1	4
Noble ES	\$1,607,856	1	3
Majestic Way ES	\$1,639,079	1	2
Northwood ES	\$2,115,836	1	1
Middle Schools			
Sierramont MS	\$1,005,380	1	3
Morrill MS	\$2,808,396	1	2
Piedmont MS	\$14,010,850	1	1

**Berryessa Union School District
School Consolidation Advisory Committee**

Criterion 7	Score	Weighted Score
Total historical investments in facilities at the school site	Yes=2; No=1	Highest score goes to school with highest total historical investments in facilities (rank down)

	Completed	Score	Weighted Score
Elementary Schools			
Cherrywood ES	\$4,201,993	2	10
Summerdale ES	\$3,224,537	2	9
Ruskin ES	\$3,132,330	2	8
Vinci Park ES	\$3,101,192	2	7
Toyon ES	\$2,913,815	2	6
Noble ES	\$2,703,324	2	5
Laneview ES	\$2,636,487	2	4
Northwood ES	\$2,585,236	2	3
Brooktree ES	\$2,428,254	2	2
Majestic Way ES	\$2,410,582	2	1
Middle Schools			
Sierramont MS	\$5,764,447	2	3
Morrill MS	\$5,367,478	2	2
Piedmont MS	\$4,400,240	2	1

**Berryessa Union School District
School Consolidation Advisory Committee**

Criterion 9	Score
Support spaces (e.g., cafeteria, multi-purpose room, playgrounds, etc.) have sufficient capacity to meet current and projected enrollment	Yes=1; No=2

Support Facilities Needs		Score
Elementary Schools		
Brooktree ES	n/a	1
Cherrywood ES	Need larger kitchen and reconfigured entry	2
Laneview ES	n/a	1
Majestic Way ES	n/a	1
Noble ES	n/a	1
Northwood ES	n/a	1
Ruskin ES	Need reconfigured/larger office	2
Summerdale ES	n/a	1
Toyon ES	n/a	1
Vinci Park ES	Need reconfigured entry	2
Middle Schools		
Morrill MS	n/a	1
Piedmont MS	n/a	1
Sierramont MS	n/a	1

**Berryessa Union School District
School Consolidation Advisory Committee**

Criterion 12	Score	Weighted Score
School does not meet performance in two or more state priorities	Yes=2; No=1	1 point for each indicator with an orange or red performance level

School Name	Chronic Absenteeism	Suspension Rate	English Learner Progress	ELA	Math	Score	Weighted Score
Elementary Schools							
Brooktree ES	Yellow	Blue	Green	Green	Green	1	0
Cherrywood ES	Yellow	Blue	Green	Blue	Blue	1	0
Laneview ES	Red	Orange	Red	Green	Green	2	3
Majestic Way ES	Yellow	Blue	Green	Blue	Blue	1	0
Noble ES	Orange	Blue	Green	Green	Blue	1	1
Northwood ES	Yellow	Yellow	Orange	Green	Blue	1	1
Ruskin ES	Yellow	Blue	Green	Blue	Blue	1	0
Summerdale ES	Yellow	Blue	Green	Green	Green	1	0
Toyon ES	Yellow	Blue	Orange	Orange	Orange	2	3
Vinci Park ES	Yellow	Blue	Green	Green	Green	1	0
Middle Schools							
Morrill MS	Yellow	Green	Green	Green	Green	1	0
Piedmont MS	Yellow	Orange	Blue	Yellow	Orange	2	2
Sierramont MS	Yellow	Orange	Blue	Green	Green	1	1
District-wide	Yellow	Orange	Green	Green	Green		
State-wide	Yellow	Orange	Yellow	Orange	Orange		

Source: 2023 California School Dashboard



**Berryessa Union School District
School Consolidation Advisory Committee**

Criterion 13	Score
District-wide/special programs would need to be relocated	Yes=1; No=2

Criterion 14	Score
District-wide/special programs can be relocated	Yes=2; No=1; N/A=3

	District-Wide/Special Programs	Score	Score
Elementary Schools			
Brooktree ES	Advancement Via Individual Determination (AVID) Sobrato Early Academic Language (SEAL)	1	2
Cherrywood ES	Mandarin Immersion Program SEAL	1	2
Laneview ES	AVID SEAL	1	2
Majestic Way ES	n/a	2	3
Noble ES	Parent Participation Program	1	2
Northwood ES	n/a	2	3
Ruskin ES	n/a	2	3
Summerdale ES	AVID SEAL	1	2
Toyon ES	SEAL	1	2
Vinci Park ES	SEAL	1	2
Middle Schools			
Morrill MS	AVID	1	2
Piedmont MS	AVID	1	2
Sierramont MS	AVID Mandarin Immersion Program	1	2

**Berryessa Union School District
School Consolidation Advisory Committee**

Criterion 19	Score	Weighted Score
District would benefit from net savings if closed	Yes=2; No=1	Highest score goes to school with most savings (rank down)

	Net Cost Savings	Score	Weighted Score
Elementary Schools			
Vinci Park ES	\$895,785	2	10
Ruskin ES	\$872,505	2	9
Laneview ES	\$859,643	2	8
Northwood ES	\$853,386	2	7
Cherrywood ES	\$844,420	2	6
Brooktree ES	\$835,548	2	5
Majestic Way ES	\$805,198	2	4
Toyon ES	\$802,851	2	3
Summerdale ES	\$764,794	2	2
Noble ES	\$728,701	2	1
Middle Schools			
Piedmont MS	\$1,254,691	2	3
Morrill MS	\$1,236,995	2	2
Sierramont MS	\$1,151,507	2	1

**Berryessa Union School District
School Consolidation Advisory Committee**

Criterion 20	Score	Weighted Score
Per-student operating costs, excluding staff	n/a	Highest score goes to school with the highest per-student operating cost (rank down)

	Total Unrestricted Budget	Budget Excluding Staff	Cost/Student ¹	Weighted Score
Elementary Schools				
Toyon ES	\$2,312,277	\$256,751	\$1,088	10
Brooktree ES	\$3,358,825	\$304,954	\$889	9
Summerdale ES	\$2,622,071	\$210,473	\$690	8
Laneview ES	\$2,971,762	\$248,176	\$689	7
Ruskin ES	\$3,464,077	\$225,299	\$626	6
Cherrywood ES	\$4,256,057	\$310,430	\$598	5
Vinci Park ES	\$4,448,241	\$340,393	\$597	4
Majestic Way ES	\$3,514,034	\$229,971	\$575	3
Noble ES	\$2,931,702	\$188,271	\$505	2
Northwood ES	\$4,063,694	\$231,942	\$435	1
Middle Schools				
Piedmont MS	\$1,236,995	\$301,647	\$494	3
Morrill MS	\$1,254,691	\$334,628	\$482	2
Sierramont MS	\$1,151,507	\$305,225	\$454	1

¹Excludes staffing costs