

# Elementary Building Use Task Force

## Comparing the Options

The Elementary Building Use Task force have been reviewing each of the three proposed options for a new elementary grade school configuration in Wayland. These are:

- **K -5 Schools** – Each of the three buildings would house students in Grades K-5, within its geographic catchment area.
- **Lower Elementary** – Loker would house all K and Grade 1 students. Claypit Hill and Happy Hollow would each house Grades 2-5.
- **Upper Elementary** – Either Loker or Happy Hollow would house all the students in Grades 4-5. The remaining two buildings would each house students in Grades K-3.

This document takes a look at the pros and cons of the K-5, Lower Elementary, and Upper Elementary Models through the lens of each of the following variables:

- **Impact on the whole child**
- **Academic impact**
- **Staffing**
- **Class size**
- **Future flexibility**
- **Transportation**
- **Implications for transition to new model from current model**
- **Redistricting**
- **Space Use**
- **Annual additional costs ROUGHLY ESTIMATED (One-time costs still to be determined.)**

Options	Impact on the Whole Child
K - 5	<p><u>PRO</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This option limits the number of schools that a family could send its children to, therefore making it relatively easy for family logistics. Since students remain in the school for six years, a sense of community would be more readily formed and sustained, and families identify with their elementary school as "our school." Stable long-term relationships can be formed and maintained with peers, staff, and peers outside of grade level.</li> <li>The wider grade span creates more opportunities for inter-age interactions, modeling, and programs like reading buddies.</li> <li>This option requires the fewer transitions than the other two models, which research shows is more beneficial to students.</li> </ul> <p><u>CON</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This option is more disruptive in terms of reorganization and redistricting than the Lower Elementary, but less disruptive than the Upper Elementary Option.</li> <li>This model can result in larger differences in class size compared to the other two models.</li> <li>This model may have the most negative impact on the district's ability to offer both Full Day Kindergarten and Traditional classes, creating waiting lists.</li> <li>Relatively small grade level cohorts over six years may limit friendships more than the other models.</li> </ul>
Lower	<p><u>PRO</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This option allows the building to be structured with a more targeted focus on the developmental aspects of early elementary aged students.</li> <li>This option is the least disruptive in terms of reorganization and redistricting of the three models.</li> <li>Class size in Grade K and 1 is optimized, resulting in more equal class sizes in these grades.</li> <li>This model best supports the Full Day Kindergarten/Tradition Classroom split because all K classes are in the same building.</li> </ul> <p><u>CON</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This option requires an additional transition to a new school in comparison to the K-5 model.</li> <li>Students in this model are separated into two different schools between Grades 1 and 2, which may impact friendships negatively.</li> <li>The narrow grade span creates few opportunities for inter-age interactions, modeling, and programs like reading buddies in the K-1 building, although opportunities remain in the 2-5 buildings.</li> <li>Relative to the K-5 model, students are in each of the schools for fewer years, impacting the ability to build community.</li> </ul>
Upper	<p><u>PRO</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This option allows the building to be structured with a more targeted focus on the developmental aspects of upper elementary aged students and be designed to assist in the transition to the middle school model.</li> <li>Students in this model are brought together from two different schools in Grade 4, which may impact friendships positively.</li> <li>Class size in Grades 4 and 5 is optimized, resulting in more equal class sizes in these grades.</li> </ul> <p><u>CON</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The narrow grade span creates few opportunities for inter-age interactions, modeling, and programs like reading buddies in the 4-5 building, although opportunities remain in the K-3 buildings.</li> <li>This option is the most disruptive in terms of reorganization and redistricting of the three models.</li> <li>This option requires an additional transition to a new school in comparison to the K-5 model.</li> <li>This model may have some negative impact on the district's ability to offer both Full Day Kindergarten and Traditional classes, creating waiting lists -- although less of an impact than the K-5 model.</li> <li>Relative to the K-5 model, students are in each of the schools for fewer years, impacting the ability to build community.</li> </ul>

Options	Academic Impact
<b>K - 5</b>	<p>The following variables may have an impact on academic achievement, each of which is rated in relation to the other two models as high (1), moderate (2), or low (3) :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>horizontal alignment (3)</li> <li>vertical alignment (1)</li> <li>standardized testing (1)</li> <li>location and type of special education and ELL services (2)</li> <li>number of faculty at a grade level for collaboration (RTI, professional development, PLC's...) (3)</li> <li>age span (1)</li> </ul> <p>NOTE: We have not found research which helps determine which of the three models, as a whole, has the most positive impact on academic achievement.</p>
<b>Lower</b>	<p>The following variables may have an impact on academic achievement, each of which is rated in relation to the other two models as high (1), moderate (2), or low (3) :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>horizontal alignment (1)</li> <li>vertical alignment (3)</li> <li>standardized testing (3)</li> <li>location and type of special education and ELL services (2)</li> <li>number of faculty at a grade level for collaboration (RTI, professional development, PLC's...) (1)</li> <li>age span (3)</li> </ul> <p>NOTE: We have not found research which helps determine which of the three models, as a whole, has the most positive impact on academic achievement.</p>
<b>Upper</b>	<p>The following variables may have an impact on academic achievement, each of which is rated in relation to the other two models as high (1), moderate (2), or low (3) :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>horizontal alignment (1)</li> <li>vertical alignment (3)</li> <li>standardized testing (2)</li> <li>location and type of special education and ELL services (2)</li> <li>number of faculty at a grade level for collaboration (RTI, professional development, PLC's...) (1)</li> <li>age span (3)</li> </ul> <p>NOTE: We have not found research which helps determine which of the three models, as a whole, has the most positive impact on academic achievement.</p>

Options	Staffing
<b>K - 5</b>	<p>This model requires additional staff relative to the current staffing. These are ESTIMATED as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>.7 Principal</li> <li>1.5 Building Subs</li> <li>1.0 Secretary</li> <li>1.0 Custodian</li> <li>1.0 Classroom teacher</li> <li>.4 Librarian</li> <li>.8 specialist increase: .2 in PE, Music, Art, Technology</li> <li>3.0 Special education</li> <li>.5 Guidance</li> <li>.2 Speech</li> <li>1.0 ELL staff</li> </ul>
<b>Lower</b>	<p>This model requires additional staff relative to the current staffing. These are ESTIMATED as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>.7 Principal</li> <li>1.5 Building Subs</li> <li>1.0 Secretary</li> <li>1.0 Custodian</li> <li>0 Classroom teachers</li> <li>.4 Librarian</li> <li>.4 specialist increase: .2 in PE, Music, Art, Technology</li> <li>1.5 Special education</li> <li>.3 Guidance</li> <li>.2 Speech</li> <li>.3 ELL staff</li> </ul>
<b>Upper</b>	<p>This model requires additional staff relative to the current staffing. These are ESTIMATED as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>.7 Principal</li> <li>1.5 Building Subs</li> <li>1.0 Secretary</li> <li>1.0 Custodian</li> <li>-2 classroom teachers</li> <li>.4 Librarian</li> <li>.4 specialist increase: .2 in PE, Music, Art, Technology</li> <li>2.5 Special education</li> <li>.5 Guidance</li> <li>.2 Speech</li> <li>1.0 ELL staff</li> </ul>

Options	Class Size
<b>K - 5</b>	<p>Class sizes will show the greatest variance amongst the schools.</p> <p>Class sizes will be contingent on the particular demographics of a catchment area each year. Relative to the other models, this may result in outlier grade levels at individual schools that have either relatively larger or smaller class sizes than their counterparts.</p>
<b>Lower</b>	<p>Class sizes will show less variance than the K-5 model.</p> <p>Class size in Grades K and 1 is optimized, resulting in more equal class sizes in these grades.</p> <p>Class sizes in Grades 3-5 will be contingent on the particular demographics of a catchment area each year. Relative to the K-5 model, this may result in fewer outlier in these grade levels.</p>
<b>Upper</b>	<p>Class sizes will show less variance than the K-5 model.</p> <p>Class size in Grades 4 and 5 is optimized, resulting in more equal class sizes in these grades.</p> <p>Class sizes in Grades K-3 will be contingent on the particular demographics of a catchment area each year. Relative to the K-5 model, this may result in fewer outlier in these grade levels.</p>

Options	Future Flexibility
<b>K - 5</b>	<p>Future flexibility is dependent on districting and planned school enrollment.</p> <p>Claypit Hill has the most flexibility in this model because with more sections, they can more readily absorb fluctuations in enrollment. They also have the ability to expand the number of classrooms by at least two sections while maintaining space for specialists and other programs. Loker and Happy Hollow have less flexibility when compared to Claypit Hill. Loker will have slightly more flexibility than Happy Hollow, especially if they are assigned fewer class sections per grade level.</p>
<b>Lower</b>	<p>Happy Hollow and Claypit Hill jointly have the most flexibility in this model, depending on districting and the number of sections per grade in each building. They also have the ability to expand the number of classrooms by at least two to four sections in each of these buildings while maintaining space for specialists and other programs. Loker will have less flexibility. (Loker is assumed to be the K-1 school in this model.)</p>
<b>Upper</b>	<p>Claypit Hill and the other K-3 building will jointly have the most flexibility in this model, depending on districting and the number of sections per grade in each building. They also have the ability to expand the number of classrooms by at least two to four sections in each of these buildings while maintaining space for specialists and other programs. The 4-5 building will have less flexibility.</p>

Options	Transportation
<b>K - 5</b>	<p>This option provides the most efficient transportation because it requires less busing, less driver time, and less mileage -- and more walking.</p>
<b>Lower</b>	<p>Long bus rides for younger students, resulting in a significant impact given twice as many students would be coming to Loker from North Wayland. There would be more buses, more mileage, and more driver time. This potentially would require 3-4 more buses at a cost of \$150,000 - \$200,000.</p>
<b>Upper</b>	<p>Long bus rides for older students, similar to the Lower Elementary option. This would potentially require 3-4 more buses, at a cost of \$150,000 - 200,000. This may change depending on which school houses Grades 4 and 5.</p>

Options	Implications for Transition to New Model from Current Model
<b>K - 5</b>	<p>Transition to this model, if done all at once, would be highly disruptive to incoming Grades 2 to 5, especially for students (and their families) in these grades who would attend Loker. Incoming Grades K and 1 would have minimal relative impact. This model would be highly disruptive to staff.</p> <p>There is no easy way to gradually phase in this model given space considerations, although we could work out a plan that would grandfather the incoming Grade 4 and/or 5 students.</p>
<b>Lower</b>	Transition to this model, if done all at once, would be least disruptive to all Grades. This model would be most disruptive to Grade 1 staff. This is no need to phase this transition given the ease of switching to a Lower Elementary model.
<b>Upper</b>	<p>Transition to this model, if done all at once, would be highly disruptive to incoming Grades 4 to 5 if Loker is the Upper Elementary School. It would be highly disruptive to Grades 1 to 5, except for 4th and 5th Graders at Happy Hollow (although it is disruptive to them in a different way) if the the Upper Elementary School is at Happy Hollow. This model would be highly disruptive to staff.</p> <p>A gradual transition to this model would require Grade 4 students to be alone in a building for a year, which is not ideal.</p>

Options	Redistricting
<b>K - 5</b>	This requires redistricting. However, to maximize future flexibility, district lines may be drawn differently than past catchment area lines. It is also dependent on the targeted school population size for each building. It may require the use of buffer zones.
<b>Lower</b>	Redistricting would be minimal in this model, and mostly be undertaken in order to balance school enrollment given targeted school population size.
<b>Upper</b>	If the Upper Elementary was Loker, there would not be any need for redistricting (beyond efforts to meet enrollment targets). If the Upper Elementary was Happy Hollow, redistricting would be required.

Options	Space Use
<b>K - 5</b>	<p>If enrollment necessitates having 9 sections amongst the buildings, there are two scenarios:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-- A division of 4, 3, and 2 classes per grade level.</li> <li>-- A division of 3, 3, and 3 classes per grade level.</li> </ul> <p>In this model, there is adequate space in each building. However, there will be underutilized space in either Loker or Claypit Hill, depending on the division.</p>
<b>Lower</b>	In this model, Loker will be at capacity. Happy Hollow will be able to gain space and resolve some of its common space issues. Claypit will be underutilized unless other programs/offices are brought into the building.
<b>Upper</b>	In this model, the Upper Elementary School will be at capacity. Happy Hollow will be able to gain space and resolve some of its common space issues if Loker would be the Upper Elementary School. Alternately, Loker would have adequate space if Happy Hollow were the Upper Elementary School. Claypit will be underutilized unless other programs/offices are brought into the building.

Options	Annual Additional Costs ROUGHLY ESTIMATED (One-time costs still to be determined.)							
<b>K - 5</b>	Classroom Teachers	1	\$	63,245	Principal	0.7	\$	77,600
	Librarian	0.4	\$	25,298	Building Sub	1.5	\$	36,465
	Specialist	0.8	\$	73,382	Secretary	1	\$	24,310
	Special Education	3	\$	189,735	Custodian	1	\$	43,800
	Guidance	0.5	\$	31,623				
	Speech	0.2	\$	12,649				
	ELL	1	\$	63,245				
	Busing	0	\$	-				
						<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$ 641,352</b>
<b>Lower</b>	Classroom Teachers	0	\$	-	Principal	0.7	\$	77,600
	Librarian	0.4	\$	25,298	Building Sub	1.5	\$	36,465
	Specialist	0.4	\$	36,691	Secretary	1	\$	24,310
	Special Education	1.5	\$	94,868	Custodian	1	\$	43,800
	Guidance	0.3	\$	18,974				
	Speech	0.2	\$	12,649				
	ELL	0.3	\$	18,974				
	Busing	1	\$	50,000				
						<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$ 439,628</b>
<b>Upper</b>	Classroom Teachers	-2	\$	(126,490)	Principal	0.7	\$	77,600
	Librarian	0.4	\$	25,298	Building Sub	1.5	\$	36,465
	Specialist	0.4	\$	36,691	Secretary	1	\$	24,310
	Special Education	2.5	\$	158,113	Custodian	1	\$	43,800
	Guidance	0.5	\$	31,623				
	Speech	0.2	\$	12,649				
	ELL	1	\$	63,245				
	Busing	1	\$	50,000				
						<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$ 433,303</b>