**Overview of Community Engagement Activities for the
Consideration of School Facilities Use and Grade Configuration**

In May 2008, the school division entered into an agreement with the Virginia Department of Planning and Budget (DPB) to have an efficiency review conducted. The DPB awarded MGT of America, Inc. the contract to review current levels of efficiency in administrative and operational systems. This process was undertaken to identify best practices in the school division as well as opportunities for increased efficiency. As stewards of public funds, it was important to use available resources effectively and to ensure as much funding as possible goes to our core mission of instruction.

In exchange for a state subsidy of 75% of the total cost of the review, DPB requires that a school division implement a minimum of 50% of the recommendations in the final report. If the school division chooses not to implement the recommendations, they will be charged an additional 25% of the cost for a total of $60,000. It was noted that recommendations in the report may include cutting costs or increasing costs to improve efficiency.

The school division and community received the final report from MGT of America at the January 8, 2009 School Board meeting. It contained many commendations for exemplary practices as well as recommendations—among them, a recommendation to close an elementary school. This particular recommendation presented an opportunity to revisit the traditions and choices that influence programs and practices in our division. A schedule of staff meetings and public discussions was developed so that all stakeholders had a chance to learn, ask questions, and give feedback about what adjustments need to be made to sustain a school environment that fosters high quality learning and 21st century skills. Four options were proposed along with a fifth category allowing for other grade configurations or considerations.

In addition to staff discussions, three community engagement workshops were held at CHS, as well as two panel discussions featuring University of Virginia faculty members, a meeting with PTO presidents, and meetings at Westhaven, Friendship Court, and South First Street community centers. An online submission form allowed the public to submit questions for the panel discussion and to provide feedback regarding the four proposed options. Invitations to attend were mailed directly to households, sent home as flyers, posted publicly through newspapers and community bulletin boards, the CCS List Serv, the *CCS Interlink* employee newsletter, and through Alert Now message broadcasting systems.

Throughout the year, input was cataloged and posted on the CCS web site, along with research and podcasts of the panels' discussions *(see attachment)*. At the October 27 meeting to narrow the proposed options from four to two, workshop participants unanimously endorsed keeping the school division as it is (Option 1) and Option 4, which calls for a pK-5 elementary school configuration and one 6-8 middle school. The superintendent will take the group's preferences into consideration as she presents two options to the School Board on November 5. These options will be fully explored through additional research as well as staff and community meetings. The Board is scheduled to select an option in January 2010.

Table of Contents for Attachments

Timeline of Discussions

Date	Group	Focus	Location & Time
April 20, 2009	Community Engagement Workshop 1	MGT recommendations	CHS, 6:00 p.m.
May 12, 2009	Administrative Leadership Team	The four options	B-Moran, 1:00 p.m.
May 18, 2009	Coordinators and Department Heads	The four options	CHS, 3:30 p.m.
May 18-29, 2009	All School Staff	The four options	Various locations
May 26, 2009	PTO Council & PTO Presidents	The four options	Mt. Zion Church, 11:30 a.m.
May 26, 2009	Community Engagement Workshop 2	The four options	CHS, 6:00 p.m.
June 1, 2009	TACC	The four options	B-Moran, 4:00 p.m.
June 8, 2009	Friendship Court Community	The four options	Friendship Court Community, 6:30 p.m.
June 10, 2009	Westhaven Community	The four options	Westhaven Community Center, 6:30 p.m.
June 10, 2009	South First Street Community	The four options	South 1st St. Community Ctr, 4:30 p.m.
June 12, 2009	City Council/School Board Luncheon	The four options	City Hall, 12:00 p.m.
June 18, 2009	Teachers	The four options	CHS, 2:00 p.m.
July 22, 2009	Community Engagement Workshop (Panel discussion)	Pedagogy & Learning Environments	CHS, 6:00 p.m.
Aug. 11, 2009	Principals	The four options	B-Moran, 8:30 a.m.
Sept 1, 2009	Community Engagement Workshop (Panel discussion w/ Dr. Cannaday)	Pedagogy & Learning Environments	CHS, 6:00 p.m.
Sept. 2-Oct. 23, 2009	Teachers (breakfast meetings)	The four options	TBD, 8:00 a. m.
Oct. 27, 2009	Community Engagement	Narrow the options	CHS, 6:00 p. m.
Nov. 5, 2009	School Board	Consider the options	CHS, 6:00 p. m.
Nov. 10, 2009	Principals	Discuss facilities	Burnley-Moran, 8:30 a. m.
Nov. 12, 2009	**PTO and Community**	**Discuss facilities**	**Buford, 3:30 p. m.**
Nov. 12, 2009	**PTO and Community**	**Discuss facilities**	**Walker, 6:00 p. m.**
Nov. 16-24, 2009	Teachers	Discuss facilities	TBD
Nov. 30, 2009	**Community Engagement**	**Discuss facilities**	**CHS, 6:00 p. m.**
January 2010	School Board	Select an option	CHS, 6:00 p.m.

If needed, additional meetings will be scheduled. Updated 10/26/09.

Notes From April 20 Community Engagement Workshop at CHS

Response to "The recommendation I would most like to discuss…."

LIKE GROUPS

Group 1: 5-8 Parents
1. Closing of elementary school – real options under consideration; more information for parents; confirm or deny rumors; is it a real option to leave things the way they are?
2. Decrease # of IAs/Increase class size.
3. End of leveling at CHS
4. 10 year plan comprehensive long-range facility master plan.

Group 2: 9-12 Parents
1. Increase class size – not endorsing this.
2. Teaching staff, teaching retentions
   - anonymous evaluations, pay scale, salary issues
3. Closing vs. reconfiguring whole system including Walker.

Group 3: Community, Faith Based, Other
1. Develop a process to gather more accurate information on the causes of employee attrition.
2. 10 year comprehensive long-range facility master plan (alternative education center).
3. Evaluation of the effectiveness of intervention programs.
4. Continue to integrate disability-related learning strategies for students with disabilities.

Group 4: PK-4 Parents
1. Concerned about (possibly do not close) close an elementary school because of far-reaching impact on students, neighborhoods, community. Interstested in issue of reconfiguring 5-8. (4 votes)
2. Do not overdo the delevelling" of classes at CHS or Buford or any school. Concerned about a lack of tracking practices. Parents want to know about each schools practices. Do not discount of high achieving students. (3 votes)
3. Concerned about increased class size, because many are already at optimal limit. Smaller class size is a value choice of our community and related concern – collapsing of levels. (2 votes)

Group 5: PK-4 Parents
1. Instructional assistants/reduction at all levels.
2. Closing an elementary school
   -avoid NIMBY approval conflict
   -inclusion of all school levels.
3. Class size
4. Ensure communication

Group 6: Staff
1. Continuing to narrow the achievement gap. (7 votes)
2. Closing an elementary school. (6 votes)
3. Facility use & staffing all programs. Increase opportunities for alternative learning. (6 votes)

Group 7: Staff

1. Closing an elementary school (17 votes)
   - Walker?
   - K-4?
     - grade configurations
2. Increase class size (8 votes)
   - context of how recommendation was made?
3. De-tracking – done thoughtfully, with planning, training (PD), and co-teaching (PD) (8 votes)
4. AP positions – do not reduce (8 votes)

Group 8: Students

1. Do not close an elementary school
2. Do not increase class size - student like being able to have one-on-one interactions with their teachers.
3. Have students complete surveys so you get their feedback. For example: Ask us what foods we want for lunch.

MIXED GROUPS: Staff, parents, students, community leaders, etc.

Group A:

1. Narrowing the achievement gap
   - not just a school issue/community issue
   - offering alternative/potentially included 4-9
2. Leveling classes at CHS
   - concerns about implementation
   - need well trained capable teachers
3. Effective communication
   - ensure voice & understanding of decisions & options
   - ensuring student feedback
4. Closing an elementary school
   - need to feel like an improvement to the school system

Group B:

4. Appropriate staffing – increase class size, de-tracking, IA's, Assistant Principals.
5. Supporting Staff – professional development, retention, exit interviews.
6. Grade configurations of CCS – best practices, research, appropriate, comparisons, ie. city size, demographics.

Group C:

5. 10 year comprehensive long-range facility master plan
   - includes many issues (elementary school closing, consider combining Walker & Buford instead)
6. Continuing to narrow the achievement gap so all children succeed.
7. Evaluating program effectiveness – make sure money is spent wisely & working for all students.

Group D:
4. School closing
   - lack of information, repercussions, what are the options?
5. Reducing APs
   - affects discipline which effects instruction
   - clarify ICAP=AP
6. End of leveling at CHS or reduction
   - not sure all teachers can differitate to do this
   - can effect all levels/grades (kids on both ends will suffer)
7. Class size
   - already large at elementary level
   - exceeds ideal now
   - community needs more info; who does it apply to
   - look at purpose of class sizes
8. Don't consider elements in isolation.
   - combination of several concerns were taken together
   - class size, de-leveling, fewer IA's, inclusion/classroom diversity
   - Don't consider elements in isolation!
   - Need more details.

Group E:
5. School Configuration including 10 year facilities management plan.
6. Reconfiguration of staffing – IA, APs, class size
7. Differentiation of Instruction
   - Tracking/Leveling
   - Intervention program evaluation

Group F:
4. Closing an elementary school.
5. Direct student impact not on chopping block
6. Under represented voice

Exit Pass Compilation: School Staff
May 2009

The table below shows the compilation of recommendations received to date from the Administrative Leadership Team meeting, Program Coordinators/Managers, and the staff of three schools.

Option	Select	Eliminate	None of the above/No vote
1. Stay the Same	43	45	
2. Close 1 Elementary	21	64	
3. PK – 5 Elem & 2 Middle	35	50	
4. PK – 5 Elem & 1 Middle	76	28	
5. Other	23	0	
	0	0	8
Total Responses to date	198	187	8

Note: All groups have until May 29 to complete the grade configuration discussions.

Grade-Level Configuration Discussion: May 26
May 26, 2009

Facilitator: _____   Room: _____

Thank you for agreeing to facilitate a group session at our **Community Engagement Workshop 2**. Your participation will help make this process run smoothly and effectively.

Purpose:
Your primary responsibility is to assist the group in accomplishing its task. The facilitator does not get involved in the discussion. You can improve the quality of the process by:
- Asking clarifying questions
- Paraphrasing
- Redirecting the group if the discussion goes off-track
- Summarizing

Time	Process	Materials
3 min	**Greet group. Tell a little about yourself.** **Have group members briefly introduce themselves.** **Select recorder, timekeeper, reader, and speaker from the group. The speaker will report your *Reflect and Respond* items to the large group.** **Discuss group guidelines.** **Actively participate.** **Optimize our time.** **Focus on the future.** **Be respectful.** **Focus on ideas, not people.** If a group member fails to follow the guideline, and it seems appropriate to intervene, try this approach: - Indicate gently that in your opinion, the group member is not following one of the guidelines – be specific. - Reiterate the importance of the guidelines.	Envelope with post-it notes, *Reflect and Respond sheets*
	Present Options — Option 1: Stay the Same Option 2: Close 1 elementary Option 3: 6 Elem (pK-5), 2 MS (6-8), 1 HS (9-12) Option 4: 6 Elem (pK-5), 1 MS (6-8), 1 HS (9-12) Option 5: Other configuration possibilities? ***Note: These were the options presented by Dr. Atkins to the community on April 20, 2009.***	Chart paper – 5 PROS/CONS "T Charts" with Options at top Markers

27 min	**Complete PROS/CONS "T Charts" —** • Ask participants to write pros and cons for the different options on post-it notes, one pro or con per post-it. • When ready, participants place their post-its on the corresponding T Charts. • There are no rules for how many pros or cons each person can submit; participants do not have to react to all options • When it is clear that most persons have posted their pros and cons, have the reader read the pros/cons from each chart	Post-It Notes, Pens/Pencils

20 min	**Group Reflection**
	• Provide participants with *Reflect and Respond* handout and ask them to discuss and respond to the following questions:
	   o What does this information (on the Pro/Con charts in your group) show?
	   o As the four main options are considered, what additional information is needed?
	   o The most significant topic(s) of discussion in our group was…
	The group needs to come to consensus about what will be reported out for the group.
	Collect all individual *Reflect and Respond* sheets for your group.
		Handout: *Reflect and Respond*
		Pens/Pencils

	Thank the group for their participation. Get back to large group room on time. Place your Reflect and Respond sheets in the envelope provided and give to the persons at the registration desk at the end of the session.	Envelope with completed Reflect and Respond sheets

Dr. Faye Giglio

30 min	**Report Out —** • Ask each group to share their responses to the *Reflect and Respond* questions with the whole group • Collect responses	

Community Centers Meeting Agenda
June 2009
Community Centers

Welcome

Opening Remarks—Dr. Rosa S. Atkins, Division *Superintendent*
- Background Information
- MGT Recommendations
- Opportunity to Discuss Facilities

Research—Gertrude A. Ivory, *Associate Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction*
- Grade Configuration
- Opportunities to Create a New Context for Learning in the 21st Century

Group Process/Discussion—Dr. Beth J. Baptist, *Director of Special Education and Student Services*
- Pros and Cons of Options

Summary of comments

Closing Remarks—Dr. Rosa S. Atkins

Agenda for Panel Discussions

(1 minute) Welcome – Dr. Diane Behrens, Moderator

(10 minutes) Opening Remarks – Dr. Rosa S. Atkins, Superintendent

(2 minutes) Introduction of Panelists – Dr. Behrens will briefly introduce each panelist, discuss the purpose of the panel discussion and give a quick overview of process for the evening. (Rebecca needs to send brief bios by Wednesday morning.)

(15 minutes) Panelists Opening Remarks – Each panelist will take 2-3 minutes to discuss his/her work and research as it relates to the questions below and discussions we have been having regarding grade configuration, transitions, school size, learning environments, best instructional practices, 21st century skills and other relevant areas.

(90 minutes) Panelists' Response to Community/Audience Questions – Dr. Behrens will alternate asking one of the questions submitted earlier of the panel, then take one or two questions from the audience, continuing this pattern until our time is up. We will take about 10 minutes per question. Any panelists can respond first with other panelists offering brief responses to supplement the original responder. Please consider the following when responding:

- o Participate flexibly and informally, with spontaneity and enthusiasm.
- o Express your views and ideas vigorously, clearly, and concisely.
- o Be careful not to dominate the discussion. Speak no longer than two to three minutes at a time, being careful not to overstate or repeat comments. Help the moderator involve other members of the panel.
- o Be sensitive to the appropriate moment to present a point of view.
- o Stick to the topic.

(10 minutes) Closing Remarks and Next Steps – Dr. Atkins

ও ৪০

July 22 Panelists (Moderator: Dr. Diane Behrens, Health and Family Life Coordinator)
- Robert Berry--Assistant Professor of Mathematics Education at the Curry School of Education.
- Dan Duke--Professor of Education in the Department of Leadership, Foundations, and Policy at the Curry School of Education at the University of Virginia.
- Joe Garofalo --Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, Associate Professor of Mathematics Education, and Co-director of the Center for Technology and Teacher Education at the Curry School of Education.
- Susan Mintz--Associate Professor of Curriculum and Instruction at the Curry School of Education.
- Pam Roland--Assistant Professor for K-12 Education, School of Continuing and Professional Studies at the University of Virginia.

September 1 Panelists (Moderator: Dr. Billy Cannaday, Jr., Dean, UVA Continuing and Prof. Studies)
- Robert Berry--Assistant Professor of Mathematics Education at the Curry School of Education.
- Pam Roland--Assistant Professor for K-12 Education, School of Continuing and Professional Studies at the University of Virginia.
- Susan Mintz--Associate Professor of Curriculum and Instruction at the Curry School of Education.
- Nancy Deutsch-- Assistant Professor of Research, Statistics, Evaluation/Applied Developmental Science at the Curry School of Education.

EDITED Questions for Panelists from Community

1. What does research indicate are the advantages for students, especially populations on free or reduced lunch, in a school with grades 6-8 and its continuity with that of being in two schools, one for grades 5-6 and the other grades 7-8? What are the disadvantages?

2. What factors should be considered in offering a comprehensive fine arts curriculum and facility for middle grade students?

3. Why is it not advisable to move towards a k-8 model?

4. How can a school maintain a positive social climate outside of classrooms when large groups congregate at lunch, during assemblies, or other such activities? Are there middle school models of good social networking or buddy programs which are effective in building friendships for disabled and non-disabled students?

5. What are the best practices in creating vocational training and on-the-job experience for students with significant intellectual disabilities and students on the autism spectrum?

Questions from Staff Readings

1. Is there an ideal grade configuration? What are the advantages and disadvantages of certain grade configurations? Does one grade level configuration allow us to implement programs more effectively and efficiently?

2. What are the impacts of different configuration options on teachers' ability to collaborate?

3. What would be most ideal for CCS from an organizational perspective for maximizing our organizational efficiency?

4. What gender differences should be considered when discussing configuration options?

5. What are the panel's thoughts on small schools versus decreasing the number of transitions? What does the research say about school size and about transitions?

6. If we had two middle schools, would it be possible for them to be "equal"?

7. What is your vision of the perfect school? Is there an option we should add?

8. Given the Balfanz study's perspective that 6th grade is a make-or-break year for high school graduation, how important is it to keep middle grades students in the same school while interventions are initiated? Does the transition to a new school in 7th grade create another source of stress?

9. Balfanz talks about students who are on track to graduate or off track, due to certain difficulties. What effect does pairing "on track" and "off track" students together in classes have on overall achievement? In other words, how should classes be designed to bring out the best of both?

Community Engagement Workshop Handouts
Updated October 28, 2009

BACKGROUND: The Efficiency Review report presented by MGT of America in January included a recommendation to close an elementary school. While the school division is not obligated to follow the recommendation, it does present an opportunity to explore new possibilities. There have been dozens of subsequent meetings involving division staff, parents, and other community members to review the options and research regarding the needs of students in grades 5-8.

On October 27, approximately 50 workshop participants from staff and the community selected Option 1 and Option 4 as their preferences in narrowing options to two. Suggestions for other configurations—such as same gender grouping—may be incorporated into any option that is selected. The Superintendent will present two options to the School Board November 5 for further consideration. More discussions will follow with staff and community. The Board is expected to select an option in January.

Option 1:   Leave City school division as is: 6 elementary schools (PK-4), 1 upper elementary (5-6), 1 middle school (7-8), 1 high school (9-12)

Option 2:   Close 1 elementary school.

Option 3:   6 elementary schools (PK-5), 2 middle schools (6-8), 1 high school (9-12)

Option 4:   6 elementary schools (PK-5), 1 middle school (6-8), 1 high school (9-12)

Option 5:   Other reconfiguration possibilities?

Future Options for Charlottesville City Schools: What Are The Facts?

Area of Impact	Option 1: School configurations remain the same	Option 2: Close one elementary school	Option 3: Six elementary schools, PK–5,Two middle schools, 6–8	Option 4: Six elementary schools, PK–5 One middle school, 6–8
Timeline	Maintains status quo	Implements change in 2011–2012	Implements change in 2011–2012	Implements change in 2012–2013
Operational & Cost Implications	Has no operational cost savings	Has operational cost savings (See attachment A)	Has operational cost savings (See attachment A)	Has operational cost savings (See attachment A)
	Has no impact on attendance zones	Creates need to realign attendance zones	Creates need for new attendance zones .(Splits each elementary school's 5th grade)	Has no impact on attendance zones
	Has no impact on professional learning communities and collaboration	Has no impact on professional learning communities and collaboration	Reduces opportunity for content-area professional learning communities and collaboration	Increases opportunity for content-area professional learning communities and collaboration
			Duplicates middle school services. Invites comparison of middle schools	
Developmental & Pedagogical Implications	Limits expansion of alternative learning options (i.e. Nontraditional High School)	Creates space to expand alternative learning options (i.e. Nontraditional High School)	Limits expansion of alternative learning options (i.e. Nontraditional High School)	Creates space to expand alternative learning options (i.e. Nontraditional High School)
	Continues 4 transitions (Grades Pre-K–4, 5–6, 7–8, and 9–12)	Continues 4 transitions (Grades Pre-K –4, 5–6, 7–8, and 9–12)	Reduces transitions from 4 to 3 (Grades Pre-K –5, 6–8, and 9–12)	Reduces transitions from 4 to 3 (Grades Pre-K –5, 6–8, and 9–12)
	Is not closely aligned with VDOE middle school standards	Is not closely aligned with VDOE middle school standards	Aligns more closely with VDOE middle school standards	Aligns more closely with VDOE middle school standards
	Maintains current school sizes	Increases elementary school size Has no impact on grades 5–12	Increases elementary school size Decreases current middle school size to approx. 400 students	Increases elementary school size Increases current middle school size to approx. 800 students
Physical Space Implications	Continues need to lease space for Henry Avenue Learning Center and Adult Education Program	Creates space for Henry Avenue Learning Center and Adult Education Program	Continues need to lease space for Henry Avenue Learning Center and Adult Education Program	Creates space for Henry Avenue Learning Center and Adult Education Program
	Continues division administrative space issues including the need for a Professional Development center	Creates opportunity to resolve division administrative space issues and have a Professional Development center	Continues division administrative space issues including the need for a Professional Development center	Creates opportunity to resolve division administrative space issues and have a Professional Development center
	Maintains current school sizes	Increases elementary school size Has no impact on grades 5–12	Increases elementary school size Decreases current middle school size to approx. 400 students	Increases elementary school size Increases current middle school size to approx. 800 students
	Maintains excess student capacity in all schools	Impacts space for attendance growth at the elementary level	Impacts space for attendance growth at the elementary level	Impacts space for attendance growth at the elementary level
	Requires no renovation	Requires renovation	Requires renovation	Requires renovation/expansion

Future Options for Charlottesville City Schools
What Are The Potential Operational Savings?

OPTION 1: School configurations remain the same	Estimated Annual Savings
	None
OPTION 2: Close one elementary school	**Estimated Annual Savings**
Eliminate One Elementary School Principal Position	$ 106,400
Eliminate One Elementary Instructional Coordinator Position	85,120
Eliminate One LPN Nurse Position	33,250
Eliminate One Guidance Position	57,190
Eliminate One Librarian Position	57,190
Eliminate One Administrative Technician Position	39,900
Eliminate One Child Nutrition Manager Position	21,280
Eliminate One Book Buddies Position	26,600
Eliminate Two Child Nutrition Workers Positions	18,620
Eliminate One Librarian Assistant Position	21,280
Facilities leasing costs (Adult Education & Alternative Learning)	153,531
Total Estimated Annual Savings	**$ 620,361**
OPTION 3: Six elementary schools, PK–5; two middle schools, 6–8	**Estimated Annual Savings**
Eliminate Two Assistant Principal Positions	$ 178,220
Eliminate Two Clerical Support Positions	79,800
Eliminate Two Child Nutrition Workers Positions	18,620
Eliminate One Instructional Assistant (IA) Position (Media)	23,940
Total Estimated Annual Savings	**$ 300,580**
OPTION 4: Six elementary schools, PK–5; one middle school, 6–8	**Estimated Annual Savings**
Eliminate One Principal Position	$ 106,400
Eliminate One Instructional Coordinator Position	85,120
Eliminate Two Assistant Principal Positions	178,220
Eliminate One Guidance Position	57,190
Eliminate One Librarian Position	57,190
Eliminate Two Clerical Support Positions	79,800
Eliminate One LPN Position	33,250
Eliminate One ISBI Position	57,190
Eliminate Two Child Nutrition Workers Positions	18,620
Eliminate One Child Nutrition Manager Position	21,280
Eliminate One Instructional Assistant (IA) Position (Media)	23,940
Facilities leasing costs (Adult Education & Alternative Learning)	153,531
Total Estimated Annual Savings	**$ 871,731**

Overview of School Facilities
2008–2009

	Grade Configuration	Acres	State Required Number of Acres	Square feet	Original Completion	Student Enrollment	Functional Capacity
CHS	9–12	43.5	22	285.700	1974	1216	1305
Buford	7–8	18.87	17	101,500	1965	539	703
Walker	5–6	15.33	11	94,693	1965	537	685
Burnley-Moran	PK–4	10.6	8	51,158	1955	325	448
Clark	PK–4	3	8	54,021	1930	242	447
Greenbrier	PK–4	10.34	8	46,750	1962	284	472
Jackson-Via	PK–4	20.36	8	66,595	1969	316	490
Johnson	PK–4	17.4	8	54,655	1955	258	378
Venable	PK–4	9	8	61,720	1925	326	480

Enrollment Data for 3 Yr Olds Through Grade 8
(as of May 15, 2009)

SCHOOL	3 Yr	4 Yr	KG	Gr1	Gr2	Gr3	Gr4	Gr5	Gr6	Gr7	Gr8	Total
Buford										266	273	**539**
Walker								265	272			**537**
Burnley-Moran		26	61	73	54	51	60					**325**
Clark	12	29	40	46	36	42	37					**242**
Greenbrier		16	62	48	52	53	53					**284**
Jackson-Via		32	76	55	48	59	46					**316**
Johnson		36	47	52	39	39	45					**258**
Venable		26	57	57	63	58	65					**326**
TOTAL	**12**	**165**	**343**	**331**	**292**	**302**	**306**	**265**	**272**	**266**	**273**	**2827**

CHARLOTTESVILLE CITY SCHOOLS

9-Year Enrollment History

Live Births — Charlottesville Residents (Virginia Department of Health

Birth Year	2007	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002	2001	2000	1999	1998	1997	1996	1995
Total Births	546	498	525	472	531	491	494	550	489	471	488	495	485

4-Year Enrollment Forecast

K–12 Enrollment — Projected and Actual

School Year	2012—13	2011–12	2010–11	2009–10	2008–09	2007–08	2006–07	2005–06	2004–05	2003–04	2002–03	2001–02	2000–01
					ACTUAL								
Total Enrollment	3,900	3,880	3,890	3,880	3,861	3,918	4,063	4,166	4,224	4,273	4,264	4,256	4,305
			PROJECTED										

National and State Grade Configurations
Grades Pre-K through 8

	Grades Pre-K, K or 1 to Grades 3 or 4	Grades Pre-K, K or 1 to Grade 5	Grades Pre-K, K or 1 to Grade 6	Grades Pre-K, K or 1 to Grade 8	Grades 4, 5, or 6 to Grades 7 or 8	Other Grade Configurations	TOTAL
Number of Schools in U.S.[1]	4,910	20,570	15,578	4,543	10,499	5,705	61,805
Percentage of Schools in U.S.	7.9%	33.2%	25.2%	7.4%	17.0%	9.2%	99.9%
Number of Schools in Virginia[2]	94	828	147	7	201	142	1,419
Percentage of Schools in Virginia	6.6%	58.4%	10.3%	0.5%	14.2%	10%	100%

[1] *Digest of Education Statistics, 1998.*
[2] Virginia Department of Education

Grade Configuration Discussions Compilation: Pro and Con
10/20009

The comments below reflect the information collected to date from the administrative leadership team, program coordinators/managers, teachers and staff, and other stakeholders who attended Community Engagement Workshops.

Option 1: Leave City school division as is	
Pros	**Cons**
• Reflects developmentally appropriate needs for kids • $5^{th}/6^{th}$ graders have different needs than $7^{th}/8^{th}$ graders • Community is comfortable (generally) with familiarity • Allow us to focus on our current initiatives/efforts to improve CCS. • We have experienced some success with this model • Change is hard, staying the same would please many who do not want any change (some asked this at forum: "Do we have to change?" • Doesn't rock the boat • Room for growth	• Change is the catalyst to move an organization forward • Poor utilization of space • Opportunity lost • This (is) our opportunity to make a change that will benefit our schools and our community. Some of our schools are too small. • You either get better or worse you never stay the same • Inefficient • Will run ourselves out of business, cannot sustain all facilities. • Not efficient. Does not allow for {?} high school and consolidation of CO1 and CO2.
• Room to grow • No extra cost (2) • Flexibility to expand for new students and programs using unused space	• Public perception CCS not cost effective • Too many school changes for a child not enough continuity • Not effective use of buildings • Expenses remain high to support current structures

Option 1:
Leave City school division as is

Pros	Cons
- Comfortable - Easy - Smaller elementary schools better, stronger focus on students in most formative years. - We know it works - Opportunity to improve what we have - Not disruptive - I like that 5th is with 6th and not with K; 6th doesn't seem to belong with K - Small class sizes - Once kids get to walker they become a tight knit class, nice to go through from 5th to 12th - Walker has evolved and steadily improved in so many areas. We are just beginning to approach "efficiency" in this building not the time to abandon ship. - Some kids do better with the slower transition from elementary to middle school - Maintain status quo – no boat rocking - Cost efficient - No upset to "neighborhood schools" - Small class sizes - The set up we have is a great stepping stone for the kids, great transition - Less intrusive - Cheaper? - Community neighborhood schools	- Unhealthy development environment. 5th and 6th grade **so** different. - Wasted space 5th grade science and 6th grade science don't' work together toward common SOL goals whereas 6-8 does. - Inefficient? But is efficient what we want our schools to be? - Too many transitions 5th and 6th graders are completely different maturity wise – might be better to be in a different building - Not using space efficiently 5th and 6th graders are completely different maturity levels. The school is split on discipline issues b/c 5th/6th grade need different levels of consequences. - If nothing changes, nothing changes - Ineffective (still struggling with accreditation). No ownership (only here two years). Too many transitions. Parent support is not there Not a good mix 5/6. Not a common configuration. - Less energy efficient. - Some space/use issues - Too many transitions for kids.

Option 2: Close one elementary school	
Pros	Cons
- Efficient use of buildings - Students can be absorbed by other 5 elementary - Cost savings? - Opportunity to create better distribution for diversity	- Disruptive to one neighborhood – no matter which school we close, parents in that community might feel betrayed. - Neighborhood schools – How do you choose which "child" to get rid of? - Community chaos in selecting the school - Change is difficult - Which elementary do we close? - Community impact Redistricting (2)
- Facilities money would be saved over time - Consolidate and appropriate administrative space - More efficient allocation of resources (teachers, equipment, etc) - Opportunity to provide/include program to support community agency (Region 10/DSS/community attention) - Opportunity to develop program for non-traditional programs for at-risk or challenging learners - If close 1 elementary, use that building for CO/COII/alternative programming - More efficient use of buildings - Lower achieving school would be diluted into other schools	- Public perception of equity - Would lose funding tied to # of buildings - Bigger class size "community school"

Option 2: Close one elementary school	
Pros	**Cons**
• Cost efficient (6) • Seems most efficient with respect to $ and time • More efficient use of space (3) • Would solve other problems and free up a building to do some other shuffling • Allows the alt program to be held in a more conducive to learning than in a "make-shift" building • Affect less people (students, staff, people, schools) (4) • Walker/Buford can stay more or less the same • Only riles up a small part of the community • New psace for adult ed, alt. ed, central office • Simplest solution • Most easily reversible • Makes common sense • Closing 1 K-4 will save money for the school system and free up a building for alt ed. • Redistribute students to 5 buildings and enable the school system to offer more programs in fewer places • 2 transitions elem to middle to CHS as opposed to current 3 • Save money on leases • Not as much disruption as closing a larger school • Opens up space for programming	• Teacher displacement • Transportation issues • Loose small class sizes • Neighborhood community rage – petitions, signs in yards, bumper stickers = bad publicity for CCS. • Rezoning divides the community • Rezoning challenges • Will the extra space be used to implement programs for those left behind in elementary and middle school? • One neighborhood without a school • Disrupt neighborhood feel • Larger elementary schools less focus on each student in most formative years • How do you choose which one to close? • Certainly painless but does it allow us to institute better programs? • Larger classes • Parents/community will probably be upset over rezoning/staffing ? • Difficult rezoning decisions • Job loss, overcrowding, rezoning • Political suicide • Community would not support it • Can other elementary schools absorb the students from the school closing? • Job losses for employees
• What is the feasibility of offering "school choice" for those students in the school chosen to close?	

Option 3: 6 PK-5 elementary schools and two 6-8 middle schools	
Pros	Cons
- Option to use extra space differently in Walker and Buford - More efficient use of elementary schools - Moving from small to larger to large CHS - Small manageable middle school (less discipline) Small middle schools (2)	- Less efficient use of personnel - Doesn't solve efficiency issue unless you add "Central moves to open space" - Two MS cause decrease in programs and unity - Hard to maintain services at 2 MS (fine arts, CTE, etc.) - Reconfiguring effective program/service delivery models (interventions, EDGE, Music) - Competition between the 2 middle schools - Divides teachers and resources across sites; seems less efficient. - Potential for segregation (2) - Seems like change for no advantage (financially) - Perhaps loss of programming - Hard to make both middle schools be equal quality either in reality or in people's perceptions - Teacher would have to split between buildings - Can we continue to offer the same level of services in small middle schools - Very small numbers of students (space not efficiently used) - Enrollment in each middle school would be too small to meet students' academic and social needs. - Historical issues may resurface. - Less efficient - When there are 2 of the "same" can lend to A/B comparisons (as perceived by community)

Option 3: 6 PK-5 elementary schools and two 6-8 middle schools

Pros	Cons
• Smaller middle schools- less changes • Reduce class size • Allowing 5th graders 1 more year at elementary level • Provides possible space to house admin offices • Assignment of support staff may be more efficient with less bouncing from school - school • 5th graders get another year of nurturing with less transition - positive for instruction, testing smaller classes (possibly)	• Require expansion of two schools • Students going across town for school • Involves too much change for 2 grade levels creating logistical concerns • Coordinating curriculum between two buildings.
• Kids will like development group and most challenging group made smaller thus easier to teach and manage • 5th graders would be place appropriately based in their immaturity • 6th graders better fit with 7-8th graders having worked in ms settings prior to coming to C-ville • 5th and 6th grade should not be together because they are so different emotionally, academically • Would the behavior of 5th graders improve (or get worse) if sent kids back to the elementary schools? • Allows for less transitions (2) • Less transition might improve 5th grade test scores • Kids will like development group and most challenging group made smaller thus easier to teach and manage	• No space saving. SES division. Race divisions. Same problems which led to 5/6 and 7/8 configurations (9) • Loss of cohesive 5th gr. Instrumental music program. We lose ground when we split up. • Would divide up the 5th grade content teams • Teacher transition • Rezoning issues • Zoning? How would you spread out the kids between 2 middle schools • Brings two sets of students together in high schools, potentially volatile not conducive to learning. • Doesn't help with being more efficient • Two middle schools breaks up cohesiveness/collaboration & secondly creates a rivalry type of atmosphere with leads to negative attitudes among students

Option 3: 6 PK-5 elementary schools and two 6-8 middle schools	
Pros	Cons
• 5th graders would be place appropriately based in their immaturity • 6th graders better fit with 7-8th graders having worked in ms settings prior to coming to C-ville • 5th and 6th grade should not be together because they are so different emotionally, academically • Would the behavior of 5th graders improve (or get worse) if sent kids back to the elementary schools? • Allows for less transitions (2) • Less transition might improve 5th grade test scores • Allow for 2 middle schools each with different academic focus • 2 middle schools each with 400 students. Each would be ideal. • Allows for competition/activities at ms level. • Makes more cohesive btwn 4/5 science curriculum • Schools stay small • 5th graders will do well at elementary school. More appropriate for them. • 5th grade moved back • Parents/community will support it. Better configuration for students (research supports it) no major losses in staff • No job loss. More opportunity for individual attn and neighborhood/community involvement • Could give one ms arts focus and one math/science • Allows to be cross grade level comparison within 6-8 contents • Allows science teachers to work together for the 8th grade SOL.	• Split kids and then bring them back for high school? • Age differences between 6th and 8th grade • Changing division lines

Option 4: 6 PK-5 elementary schools and one 6-8 middle school	
Pros	Cons
- Opportunity to have a unified 21st Century School. 5th grade students return to an elementary setting - True middle school facility - Address middle school behaviors – facilitate growth over a 3-year period. - The needs of 5th graders can be better met at the elementary school. I also think it would help 4th graders. - Fewer transitions (7) - Makers CO Configuration make sense - Easier transition to H.S. - Consistent with other divisions in the Commonwealth. - Opportunity to "reinvent" CCS middle school - State of the Art middle school - CO2 and CO2 need to be together in one space. We also need space for PD for groups of up to 50 teachers when school is in session - Allow creative thinking in renovating and 6-8 middle school that focuses on 21st Century - Consolidate CO2 and CO1 - Makes HALC/ALC out of leased buildings. - Frees space (2) - Provides an opportunity to …a…high school at CHS - Having all upper elementary (3, 4, 5) under one roof. - More consistency for curriculum and instruction and testing.	- Elementary crowding possibility - Space at elementary schools - Reconfiguring effective program/service delivery models. - Loss of programming - Even though students would "fit" – believe behavior management may be **more difficult** - Larger middle school - Will require minor renovation (good and bad)

Option 4: 6 PK-5 elementary schools and one 6-8 middle school	
Pros	Cons
- Anticipated stronger teachers and classroom instruction due to collaboration. - Better academic environments created (5th testing) 5th grade makes sense to be in elementary (lower) - Efficiency (4)	
- Address site security concerns at 6-8 school - Closed middle school could be an alt ed school land 9 grade academy - Use of space in extra building - Less transitions - Allowing 5th graders 1 more year at elementary level - Consistency of curriculum - Assignment of support staff may be more efficient with less bouncing from school - school 5th graders get another year of nurturing with less transition - positive for instruction, testing smaller classes (possibly)	6th graders may not socialize well with 7th and 8th graders - Space requirements unknown - Centralized programs at emptied school leave wasted space - Too large for middle school in C-ville - Larger number of students in building - Renovation must be carefully planned

Option 4: 6 PK-5 elementary schools and one 6-8 middle school

Pros	Cons
- Less transition for kids (3) - One unified MS - Efficient use of PK – 5 space - Teachers that teach science can work together in helping students be successful on 8th grade SOL - What is the possibility of opening a quality arts or alternative school in the closed school? - What kind of alternative school? Ideas for CO2? - We need an alternative school not an alternative program (A true non-traditional school like Murray HS) - Opportunity to create an "ideal" middle school that promotes "STEM" and "21st Century Learning" - Efficient? - 5/6 is not a good mix - Allows us to focus our resources on children and not buildings - Maintains cohesion of all 6-12 grade classes (not split by zones) - More coherent curriculum - Close Walker Put CO, CO2, Alt. Ed – Close to high school - Keep Buford - new boys and girls club opening - Small elementary school more appropriate for 5th graders	- Large class sizes - Too many children in one building (4) - Not enough room as is - Are 800 middle schoolers in 1 building really an optimal learning environment? - Teacher transition - Job loss - Space! If we are trying to save money, how do we afford renovations - Parents may not like having their small elementary schools become larger - What will happen to band and orchestra offerings in 5th If they go back to elementary? (2) - Expensive renovations/additions necessary - Parents like the fact that 6th graders are now not exposed to older, bigger students in 7th and 8th grade. Keeps them young and innocent a little longer - Worried about simply adding 6th grade in to existing Buford - One middle school does not leave room for growth. - Too crowded. Discipline nightmare (2) - What will happen to EA and PE staff if there's only 1 middle school? - Redistricting one less move transition - Walker/Buford have very different "feels" to each building, staff, etc. Won't be an easy marriage. Debate who will be principal of this new school?

Option 5: Other Reconfiguration Possibilities

- K – 8 Schools
- Boys at one site; girls at another
- PK – 4; (2) 5 - 8 middle schools
- One magnet middle school
- Create 5 magnet schools for elementary
- Regardless of decision, protect historical schools.
- Under representation of minority, social economic, and other subgroups who may not have a way to voice concerns

- Implement option 2 and 2 middle schools

- Theme-based middle schools or academies
- Ideas that reflect community values
- School within schools concept could open up endless possibilities
- Some sort of 21st Century learning center?
- Add on to the back of CO1 and bring over CO2 so that space would be available for Alt Ed
- Let's think outside the box - Green school, technology, science, math - specialty school
- 9th grade have different needs than 10-12th
- 6-8th boys school/girls school (3)
- Gender separated middle schools
- Uniforms PK-12
- Increase space and use of Alt Ed
- 9th grade campus
- 7-12 school

Narrowing the Options: October 27 Agenda
6-8:30 pm at Charlottesville High School

1. Welcome, Purpose, Format: Bob Garrity, Facilitator

2. Agenda Overview: Bob Garrity

3. Review of community engagement process: Dr. Rosa Atkins, Superintendent

    a. Steps we've taken
    b. Steps to be taken

4. Review of information: Small groups

    a. Review materials

    b. List questions for each option

5. Whole group discussion/Questions addressed

6. What matters to you in each option?

    a. Walk around exercise
    b. Finding themes

7. General discussion and summary of themes

8. Narrowing the options

9. Closing: Dr. Rosa Atkins

THANK YOU FOR PARTICIPATING!

Comments on Selected Options from Oct 27 Workshop

OPTION 1: Leave division as it is.
Allows us to focus on the REAL problems!! (x2)
Keep community elementary schools
No painful redistricting
Transitions good for reinvention
Coming together at 5th grade
Are we headed in the right direction now? If so, are we threatening progress?
Does not minimize transitions
Keeps excellence in 5th grade intact
Avoids distraction of major change
Effect of transitions on children (2 yr model)
Doesn't address finding issues
How do we overcome families "jumping ship" at 7th grade?
Focus on improving Buford: enrichment/community
It's working

Option 4: 6 pK schools, 1 6-8 middle school
Opportunity to create new facility
Avoids the 2 middle school problem & closing elem school
Concerns re. loss of 5th grade enrichment, esp. music, and jump in academic rigor in 5th grade
Need more clarity re. costs
How will you choose which to keep?
Concerned about 6th graders w/ 7th & 8th
Likely largest capital outlay
Disruptive for students during construction
Can we really have the same level of programs for 5th graders?

Other:
Some great suggestions that could be part of other options:
      Same sex grouping/Gender tracking within school
      Option of moving back & forth between middle schools
Renovate Central Office for more space at CHS

Themes/Issues

Commonalities:
Concern about 5th grade—high satisfaction with current program, EDGE, music, etc.
Dealing with Buford—are we avoiding it? Are we looking at the *real* issues/options?
Strength of community in small neighborhood schools & coming together after that
Unity & Equity
Focus on what happens in classrooms

Contrast
Effect of history varies for individuals

Other:
Some confusion over the need for "efficiency" vs. other academic considerations
Elements of any option can be incorporated into whatever is decided