

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 (Addt'l):	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		1		Mandarin Immersion Program	1	
	SEAL		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 Budet Excluding Staff:	\$304,954			\$310,430		
(h)/(a)	Cost/Student (Enrollment):	\$889			\$598		
(h)/(b)	Cost/Student (Capacity):	\$554			\$447		
TOTAL			27	38		27	56

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		
School 2:		Majestic Way ES	188			Noble ES	185		
School 3:		Northwood ES	137			Ruskin ES	346		
			532	2	2		761		
School 1 (Perm):		Brooktree ES	27	-308		Laneview ES	80		
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		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:		\$859,643	2	8	\$805,198	2	4
(g)	Total Unrestricted Budget:	\$2,971,762		7	\$3,514,034		3
(h)	Unrestricted Budet Excluding Staff:	\$248,176			\$229,971		
(h)/(a)	Cost/Student (Enrollment):	\$689			\$575		
(h)/(b)	Cost/Student (Capacity):	\$421			\$391		
TOTAL			28	43		29	35

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 (Addt'l):	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 Abensteeism	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 Budet Excluding Staff:	\$188,271			\$231,942		
(h)/(a)	Cost/Student (Enrollment):	\$505			\$435		
(h)/(b)	Cost/Student (Capacity):	\$337			\$346		
TOTAL			28	40		29	30

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 (Addt'l):	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 Budet Excluding Staff:	\$225,299			\$210,473		
(h)/(a)	Cost/Student (Enrollment):	\$626			\$690		
(h)/(b)	Cost/Student (Capacity):	\$319			\$343		
TOTAL			32	57		27	51



Berryessa Union School District  
School Consolidation Advisory Committee

Criteria		Scoring methodology	Weighted methodology			Toyon ES			Vinci Park ES				
						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:	236	2	10	570	1	1		
				(b)	Capacity:	544			744				
				(a)/(b)	Utilization Rate:	43.4%			76.6%				
				(c)	Capacity (Perm):	424			594				
				(a)/(c)	Utilization Rate:	55.7%			96.0%				
					Capacity (Addt'l):	56			84				
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:		51.09%	1	2	50.06%	1	1		
3.	Excess classroom capacity	Yes=2; No=1	Highest score goes to school with most excess capacity (rank down)	(b)-(a)	Excess Capacity:	308	2	8	174	2	2		
				(c)-(a)	Excess Capacity (Perm):	188			24				
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:		Noble ES	185	604	28.1%	Brooktree ES	207	121	82.5%
				School 2:		Ruskin ES	346			Cherrywood ES	175		
				School 3:		Summerdale ES	309			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			Cherrywood ES	-65		
				School 3 (Perm):		Summerdale ES	129			Summerdale ES	129		
							385				91		
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:		1956	1	5	1974	1	9		
				(d) Mod/Maint. Costs:		\$15,093,756			\$17,898,507				
				(d)/(b) Cost/Student (Capacity):		\$27,746			\$24,057				
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:	\$1,107,720	1	7	\$556,175	1	10		
				(e)/(b)	Cost/Student (Capacity):	\$2,036			\$748				
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:	\$2,913,815	2	6	\$3,101,192	2	7		
				(f)/(b)	Cost/Student (Capacity):	\$5,356			\$4,168				
				(e)+(f)	Total Investment:	\$4,021,535			\$3,657,367				
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		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 2		SEAL	1 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		10	\$4,448,241		4
(h)	Unrestricted Budet Excluding Staff:	\$256,751			\$340,393		
(h)/(a)	Cost/Student (Enrollment):	\$1,088			\$597		
(h)/(b)	Cost/Student (Capacity):	\$472			\$458		
TOTAL			28	52		27	45

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:	1,064			996				
				(a)/(b)	Utilization Rate:	65.2%			61.3%				
				(c)	Capacity (Perm):	1,000			836				
				(a)/(c)	Utilization Rate:	69.4%			73.1%				
					Capacity (Addt'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:	370	2	2	385	2	3		
				(c)-(a)	Excess Capacity (Perm):	306			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	370	82	88.2%
				School 2:		Sierramont MS	323			Sierramont MS	323		
				School 3:									
						708	2	2		693	2	1	
				School 1 (Perm):		Piedmont MS	225	-306		Morrill MS	306	-142	
				School 2 (Perm):		Sierramont MS	163			Sierramont MS	163		
				School 3 (Perm):									
							388				469		
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):		\$17,480			\$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):	\$2,639			\$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):	\$5,045			\$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		2	\$5,071,618		3
(h)	Unrestricted Budet Excluding Staff:	\$334,628			\$301,647		
(h)/(a)	Cost/Student (Enrollment):	\$482			\$494		
(h)/(b)	Cost/Student (Capacity):	\$315		\$303			
TOTAL			27	14		28	17

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	1
(c)-(a)	Excess Capacity (Perm):	163			
School 1:		Morril MS	370	82	89.1%
School 2:		Piedmont MS	385		
School 3:					
			755	2	3
School 1 (Perm):		Morril MS	306	-142	
School 2 (Perm):		Piedmont MS	225		
School 3 (Perm):					
			531		
		Facilities			
Year Built:		1975		1	3
(d)	Mod/Maint. Costs:	\$21,225,874			
(d)/(b)	Cost/Student (Capacity):	\$21,311			
(e)	Completed/Encumbered Bond Projects:	\$1,005,380		1	3
(e)/(b)	Cost/Student (Capacity):	\$1,009			
(f)	Historical Investments:	\$5,764,447		2	3
(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 Budet Excluding Staff:	\$305,225		
(h)/(a)	Cost/Student (Enrollment):	\$454		
(h)/(b)	Cost/Student (Capacity):	\$306		
TOTAL			28	20