School Board Work Session
Elementary School Planning Initiative
Phase 1 – Review of Initial Analysis

April 12, 2018
This presentation and the initial analysis are available online at:

www.apsva.us/elementary-school-boundary-change/

View the January 23, 2018 Work Session on Elementary Boundaries:

www.apsva.us/school-board-meetings/school-board-work-sessions-meetings/
Work Session Agenda

• Background on this initiative
• Phase 1 – Initial analysis of elementary school sites
• Next Steps
Background: Elementary School Planning Initiative
Rationale for Initiative

• Multiple elementary school openings and program moves are taking place:
  − Sept. 2019: Alice Fleet opens as neighborhood school
  − Sept. 2019: Elementary Montessori program moves from Drew to Henry site, and Drew opens as full neighborhood school
  − Sept. 2021: Reed opens as neighborhood school

• Boundary policy 30-2.2 calls for adjustments to boundaries when opening a new school

• School Board asked staff to propose a process that includes all schools planned through 2021
Rationale for Approach

• Continued growth in student enrollment
• Operating and administrative costs increase with the opening of new schools
• Opportunity to optimize limited resources
• Transportation demand today is a challenge
• Walking is a priority (Fall 2017 M.S. boundary process)
Neighborhood Schools

• Have attendance areas established by the School Board
• Every student is guaranteed admission to the elementary school serving the attendance area in which the student resides
Option Schools

• Offer specialized instructional programs
• Are county-wide with transportation provided by APS
• Admit students via lottery application process

Current elementary options include:
• Immersion at Claremont and Key
• Expeditionary Learning at Campbell
• Montessori within Drew
• Arlington Traditional School
Status of Activities

✓ Expand walk zones – community engagement process to safely expand elementary school walk zones

• Develop proposals on neighborhood/option school locations
  – One proposal: elementary schools stay in current locations
  – Second proposal: recommends changes to the location of some option and neighborhood schools, while maintaining the same number of elementary option and neighborhood schools

• Conduct community engagement on proposals that recommend the location of neighborhood and option schools

• Superintendent to recommend designation of option and neighborhood schools for School Board adoption on May 17
Scope of Any Potential Changes

• Any schools identified as potentially changing from a neighborhood to option school, or vice versa, would move entirely to the new location, including administration, faculty, and staff

• Moves would take place in the summer of 2020 and 2021

• This could include moving any special established amenities and resources to the new school location
Benefits of Considering School Location Changes

• Increase the overall proportion of walkers
• Decrease the need for transportation, given that 66% of K-5 students today are eligible for buses
• Allow for the growth of option schools using relocatables, while keeping enrollment consistent with levels across elementary schools
• Draw boundaries that are closer to schools and minimize bus ride times for students
• Allow focus in Phase 2 to be on the additional policy considerations
In September 2018, staff will:

• Propose neighborhood school boundaries starting with phase 1 decisions and layering in the other policy considerations:
  – Stability
  – Demographics
  – Alignment
  – Contiguity

• Conduct community engagement on proposed boundaries by October 2018

• Identify the planning units that could be assigned to either one of two school attendance zones, in preparation for when staff reassesses projections in Fall 2020

Superintendent will recommend boundary changes for School Board adoption by mid-November 2018. All boundaries will be final in time for Kindergarten Information Night in January 2019.
Walk Zone Review
Phase 1: Walk Zone Review

- Staff identified potential ways to safely expand elementary school walk zones

- School Task Groups helped gather community input:
  - Ambassadors and PTAs from every elementary school
  - 23 Civic Associations
  - ACTC/FAC members assisted

- Task Groups shared information, held neighborhood walking tours, and provided input on walk zones

- Staff held more than 20 sessions with community members (CCPTA, FAC, ACTC, Hispanic parent groups, Task Group Working Sessions, etc.)
Phase 1: Walk Zone & School Location Review

- Community input:
  - 2,000+ responses to questionnaires about walk zones and draft considerations for school location review
  - 350+ messages to engage@apsva.us

- Staff synthesized suggestions and ideas:
  - Expanded walk zones with planning units that are near schools and do not pose safety concerns
  - Identified areas to study for safety mitigation measures
  - Began to develop APS priorities for safety and infrastructure improvements
  - Refined draft considerations for school location review
Phase 1 - Initial Analysis of School Location Review
Lenses of Analysis

Provide an understanding of data used, considerations applied, and process for initial analysis

• Analysis framed by boundary policy considerations
• Rationale for excluding some sites from analysis
• Other considerations used in analysis of Location Review
## Analysis: Framed by Boundary Policy Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consideration</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>minimizing future capital and operating costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity</td>
<td>keeping students close to the schools so they can walk safely or bus ride times are minimized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stability</td>
<td>minimizing the number of times that boundary changes affect an individual student who has continued to reside in a particular attendance area, and minimizing the number of students moved to a different school, within a school level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment</td>
<td>minimizing separation of small groups of students from their classmates when moving between school levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographics</td>
<td>promoting demographic diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contiguity</td>
<td>maintaining attendance zones that are contiguous and contain the school to which students are assigned</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Phase 1 Policy considerations for strategic placement of neighborhood and option elementary schools

- Efficiency: Optimize resources & balance enrollment
- Proximity: Place neighborhood schools where more students live

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consideration</th>
<th>Phase 1 Spring 2018</th>
<th>Phase 2 Fall 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stability</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographics</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contiguity</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sites Excluded from Analysis

Rationale:

• Recent School Board decisions
• Potential walkers in expanded zones at two neighborhood schools exceed permanent seat capacity
• Geographic considerations
## Analysis:
### Recent School Board Decisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sites</th>
<th>Designation and the rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drew Model</td>
<td>Neighborhood School&lt;br&gt;• Drew Model a neighborhood school with a STEM focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleet</td>
<td>Neighborhood School&lt;br&gt;• Move Henry neighborhood school into new Fleet building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry (Montessori)</td>
<td>Option School&lt;br&gt;• Move Montessori program from Drew Model into the Henry building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reed</td>
<td>Neighborhood School&lt;br&gt;• Charge to Reed BLPC designates Reed as a neighborhood school</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All schools were included in the walk zone review. These schools were not included in the location review.
Analysis: Potential Walkers Exceed Site Capacity

- Glebe and Randolph are neighborhood schools
- Both can fill school with walkers
- Recommend keeping both as neighborhood schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sites</th>
<th>Designation 2017-18</th>
<th>% of Capacity Filled by Students in the Walk Zone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glebe</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>116%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randolph</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>110%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All schools were included in the walk zone review. These schools were not included in the location review.
Analysis:
Geographic Considerations

• Most locations have multiple possibilities for neighborhood schools
• Students in the outer corners have limited possibilities
• Boundary policy identifies contiguity
• Staff recommend Abingdon, Jamestown, Oakridge, and Tuckahoe remain neighborhood schools

All schools were included in the walk zone review. These schools were not included in the location review.
Schools in the Location Analysis

- Arl. Science Focus
- Arlington Traditional
- Ashlawn
- Barcroft
- Barrett
- Campbell
- Carlin Springs
- Claremont
- Discovery
- Hoffman-Boston
- Key
- Long Branch
- McKinley
- Nottingham
- Taylor
Analysis: Other Considerations used in Location Review

- Impact on teaching and learning
- Potential walkers (proximity)
- Number of buses per school (efficiency)
- Site growth using relocatables
- Option schools demand
- Geographic challenges

Will allow process to focus on policy considerations of demographics, contiguity, stability, and alignment in Phase 2 (Fall 2018)
Analysis: Impact on Teaching and Learning

- Students flourish in healthy, safe and academically challenging learning environments
- APS learning environments are adaptable and agile
- Any elementary school can thrive at any APS elementary school site
- Future proposal comparing options and sites will address program requirements

Analysis of sites:
- No difference among sites
- Program preferences will be considered when staff proposes locations
Analysis: Potential Walkers

- Policy consideration - *proximity encourages the relationship between schools and community, allows walking, and minimizes bus rides*
- Neighborhood schools should be located where large number of students live and can walk to school
- APS Whole Child framework promotes health and well-being
- Arlington County is promoted as a *Walk Friendly Community*, recognizing safety, mobility, access and comfort
## Analysis:
Potential Walkers as Percentage of Capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Five Highest Neighborhood</th>
<th>Five Lowest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Campbell</td>
<td>Arlington Traditional 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrett</td>
<td>Carlin Springs 14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barcroft</td>
<td>Arl. Science Focus 19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key</td>
<td>Long Branch 23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottingham*</td>
<td>Taylor 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>82%, 57%</strong> removing students in overlapping walk zone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Discovery and Tuckahoe expanded walk zones overlap with Nottingham’s walk zone*
Analysis:
Potential Walkers in Overlapping Walk Zones

Discovery and Tuckahoe expanded walk zones overlap with Nottingham’s walk zone:

- Tuckahoe: 105 students
- Discovery: 28 students

Proximity of these schools create a challenge to developing boundaries
### Analysis: Potential Candidates for Change based on Expanded Walk Zones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option sites that are potential candidates for neighborhood sites</th>
<th>Sites that are potential candidates for option sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Campbell</td>
<td>Arlington Traditional: 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key</td>
<td>Carlin Springs: 14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claremont</td>
<td>Arl. Science Focus: 19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nottingham*: 57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proximity to Tuckahoe and Discovery create a challenge in developing boundaries.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eight remaining schools meet criteria for neighborhood schools based on potential walkers.
Analysis:
Number of Buses Per School

- Efficiency minimizes future capital and operating costs
- Making the most of transportation resources helps keep more funds in the classroom
- Bus drivers are difficult positions to recruit and retain
- Using walk zones to help identify neighborhood school sites and reduce the number of buses
Analysis:
Number of Buses Per School

- Assumes the following:
  - All schools are neighborhood schools
  - Boundaries fill schools to 100% of permanent capacity
- Capacity minus number of students in the expanded walk zone
- Difference is divided by 60 (students per bus) and rounded up to next whole number

Example.  
Capacity = 500  
Students in Expanded Walk Zone = 250  

500 - 250 = 250  
250/60 = 4.1, rounded up to 5 buses
## Analysis: Option Site Candidates per the most number of buses needed by site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Buses in 2017-18</th>
<th>Estimated buses with expanded walk zones, new boundaries</th>
<th>Change in number of buses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carlin Springs</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arl. Science Focus</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claremont</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashlawn</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKinley</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlington Traditional</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoffman-Boston</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Option schools are a vital tool for managing capacity needs.

• We believe that families recognize that relocatables are effective to grow the programs that are a good fit for their students’ needs.

• Staff identify sites that provide flexibility in expanding to 750 students when needed to align with overall district enrollment.
Analysis: Site Growth Potential Using Relocatables

• Analysis begins with permanent capacity at current class size level.
• Site must allow growth to 750 students using preferred maximum from Facilities Optimization study.
• Number of students in relocatables is calculated as percentage of 750 minus student capacity.

Example: Capacity = 500
Can grow to 750 with relocatables? YES

750-500 = 250
250/750 = 33% of students in relocatables
The following sites meet this consideration: 20% or more of their potential 750-student capacity is possible through the use of relocatable classrooms.

- Arl. Science Focus
- Arlington Traditional
- Barcroft
- Barrett
- Carlin Springs
- Claremont
- Hoffman-Boston
- Nottingham
Analysis: Option School Demand

- Option schools help APS balance enrollment across district.
- Demand for option schools is high: applications & waitlist.
- It’s too soon to tell if current option school sites can meet demand.

Analysis of sites:
- Application deadline April 16
- Analysis will follow
Analysis:
Geographic Challenges

• Multiple school sites in some areas provide the opportunity to identify potential option school sites.

• It is challenging to define boundaries if all current neighborhood schools continue to be neighborhood schools.

Analysis examines sites by the number of schools in a one-mile radius.
# Analysis: Candidates for option sites based on Geographic Challenges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sites</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Top Five Sites within 1-mile radius</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barcroft</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Barrett, Fleet, Randolph, Claremont, Campbell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlington Traditional</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Glebe, Ashlawn, Barrett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashlawn</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>McKinley, Arlington Traditional, Carlin Springs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrett</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Arlington Traditional, Barcroft, Fleet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claremont</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Barcroft, Randolph, Abingdon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Initial Draft Site Suitability for Option School Sites - Four Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sites</th>
<th>Walkers</th>
<th>Buses</th>
<th>Growth</th>
<th>Geography</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arl. Science Focus</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlington Traditional</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashlawn</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barcroft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlin Springs</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claremont</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discovery</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoffman-Boston</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Branch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKinley</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottingham</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Preliminary Analysis of Sites

- Five sites identified as potential option sites, in addition to Henry
- Will engage with instructional leaders to consider a combination of neighborhood and option school sites
Benefits of Considering Change

• Increase the overall proportion of walkers
• Decrease the proportion of students eligible for transportation
  – Currently 66% of K-5 students
  – Rough estimate suggests 50%
• Allow for the growth of option schools using relocatables, while keeping enrollment consistent with levels across elementary schools
• Draw boundaries that are closer to schools and minimize bus ride times for students
• Allow for focus in Phase 2 to be on the additional policy considerations
Next Steps

• Gather additional data, if needed
• Work with principals and other instructional leaders to develop recommendations, identify option sites
• Post draft recommendations for neighborhood and option school designations by April 30
• Continue community engagement
Upcoming Community Engagement

• Bring questions to “Staff Open Office Hours”:
  – Monday, April 16: 7-8:30 p.m., Wakefield H.S.
  – Friday, April 20: 7:30-9 a.m., Education Center
  – Saturday, April 21: 9:30-11 a.m., Kenmore M.S.
  
  Note: Spanish-speaking staff available at each session

• Questionnaire on draft neighborhood and option school recommendations—April 30 to May 10: www.apsva.us/engage

• Community Meeting at 7 p.m. on May 9
  – Syphax Education Center (2110 Washington Blvd.)
  – Live-streamed, with simultaneous interpretation

• Write to engage@apsva.us
Are there additional considerations you want added to the analysis?

Other suggestions?
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