

**Survey Results from Grade Configuration Survey from 196 Cleveland Heights Teachers**  
December 2012

**The District has taken the position that our students have trouble in school after a transition between buildings (6th and 9th grades). Therefore, the number of transitions should be kept to a minimum. Do you agree with this position?**

116	64% Yes
64	36% No

**Your further comments on transitions.**

- While more than 2 transitions would be undesirable it is still advantageous to keep elementary and middle school age students in separate facilities.
- NOT SURE IF THIS IS THE MOST IMPORTANT ISSUE.  
A GREAT SYSTEM WILL FLOURISH NO MATTER WHAT. SPLITS CAN BE HELPFUL TOO.
- At the elementary level students often have difficulty with transitions throughout the day. The children who are the most affected have little structure in their lives and rarely feel settled. So, it comes as no surprise that students have a difficult time when they move to a new building. Data that should be looked at is how many of the students having difficulty have had repeated moves during their elementary years. We do have a very transient population and research shows that it does take its toll on a child. I believe that our buildings need to be age appropriate to best meet the developmental needs of our students.
- Changing to Pre-K to 3rd, 4th - 8th and the high school is still the same number of transitions. It only changes the grade level at which transitions occur from 6th and 9th grades to 4th and 9th grades.
- The problem may relate more to communication between teachers and staff at the time of the transition. Perhaps the district needs to engage in more vertical planning between grades, i.e. vertical planning between grade 5 and grade 6 teachers, to help with the transition. Working at both elementary and middle school level during my career, I note a significant DECREASE in academic rigor and expectations for middle school students as opposed to what types of instructional materials and thinking they are challenged with in elementary school. I also have worked in both preschool and kindergarten settings, and note that the age appropriate, play based, language rich atmosphere of a preschool classroom virtually disappears in kindergarten.
- I would like to keep traditional grade transitions.
- I can't see how a plan would have less than 2 transitions. 2 transitions is pretty typical. It seems like the conversation is not going to be about the number of transitions, but the timing of them.
- Should we have a 1-12 building?
- It's a new environment and set of expectations to learn at a difficult developmental age.
- Transitions have minimal impact upon student learning unless the student is moving to a new school because of some trauma/issue that has necessitated the move. And even then, the real issue is the issue in that young person's life that is really making the waves educationally, not a transition. For many students, moving to a new school actually has a positive impact upon the student because they see themselves as moving up and growing up.

- The plan still calls for the same number of transitions.
- Perhaps there are problems because of the big differences in the change.  
Smaller configurations - less of major changes
- Will the transitions still be 3 with the plan offered by Talbert just at a different grade level?
- I think this is a weak argument to defend spending taxpayer money on new buildings during a time of economic crisis. High performing districts have as many if not more transitions such as Shaker, North Royalton, etc.
- Transition from one building to the next can be difficult at any age.
- I believe the negative effects of primary students being in the same learning environment with students above grade 5 are far greater than the negative social and emotional effects of students transitioning more than once in their educational careers.
- The grade level of transition is the issue, not the number of times. I believe in the following configuration: k-3, 4-8 with a divided 5-6 & 7-8, 7-9, 9-12.
- I think there is a short adjustment period but not with long term issues. I think it is better to divide out a 7-8 building.
- There are too many transitions within the admin. & faculty! There are too many factors to determine exactly which issue is the culprit of our students problems!
- I agree with this on some level. I'm not a proponent of k-8 buildings but do believe the transitions can be farther apart. For example, after 4th and 8th.
- I believe transitions are hard - but not the need to minimize. They do need to be addressed.
- 2 transitions in 13 years seems reasonable given the alternatives.
- Do not agree with this district much but I do on this.
- I think with proper preparation, support and forethought, our students can transition successfully.
- The district needs to do more to help students with the transition.
- If the district had more uniform expectations of students, the transitions would be much less troublesome.

Let's stop making excuses for bad policy.

- I believe the students have too many transitions within the school day that gets the students in trouble.
- There could be some things put in place to assist students in making the transition. I don't think it's just a 6th and 9th grade thing. I think it's a puberty thing and maybe we need to address how students are behaving and the culture of the students rather than just the building shifts.
- I think the number of transitions do not matter, however WHEN the transition occurs does.
- There are currently two transitions. There will still be two (k-3, 4-8, 9-12) unless the change is to k-8, 9-12. Having taught 6th grade for many years, the year things started to fall was always 7th grade. If done well, transitions can actually have a positive effect and become rites of passage that kids embrace. This is a case of using a sort of backward design, in that, here is where we want to be, now let's find rationale that will lend support to that want. Flawed at best. I would like to see the high school made smaller, by moving to a k-6, 7-9, 10-12 or even k-7, 8-9, 10-12. 9th graders could benefit from another year of social learning and have the added benefit of leadership opportunity as the highest grade in the building. 4th and 5th graders with 8th graders is a horrendous idea. They are so far apart socially and emotionally, that the negative impact upon the younger kids

would be too great. k-8 schools are an equally bad idea unless the numbers are so small that physical separation can be effectively achieved.

- I wish we would go to a k-6 model. I have seen it in application and it is more effective.
- There is some truth to that statement, but it is not the only or most important factor in student success.
- Just look at the number of failures for 9th grade students.
- I believe that students should have transitions that are necessary and support their academic and social growth and development. I do not support limiting those transitions as the number of transitions is NOT a major factor, but rather the issues that need to be addressed themselves.
- However, personally, my own children in Shaker schools, did fine with 4 transitions: k-4th, 5-6th, 7-8th and 9-12th.
- I think that if a transition system is in place to help students succeed and communication between transition grades is maintained and well supported that students can be very successful with the transitions.
- More work could be done between buildings to assist the students in transitions, particularly in academics.
- It is hard for students to adjust to high school expectations because they lack discipline and soft skills such as time management.
- A successful district my personal children attended, divided the students at Pre-K to 5th, 6th to 7th, 8th to 9th, and 10th to 12th.
- I think those two are an acceptable number if support and structure are put in place.
- What kind of trouble - how are they measuring this?
- I think no matter what the grade level in which the transition occurs there will always be an adjustment for the student from being the oldest in their previous building to the new students in the new building.
- Having a k-3, 4-8 and high school is the same amount of transitions. I think the problems lies in the middle school stigma.  
Having a 4-8 might help this...what are reports from systems that have this in place?
- Although we cannot control this factor, transitions in and out of the district cause a greater concern.
- Perhaps the district should consider 7th through 9th grade programming. Having 4th graders with 8th graders will be a wide age gap.
- When the new transition points coincide with teacher qualifications I think it is important.
- The number of transitions don't outweigh the proper/BEST age transition such as k-4, 5-6, 7-8, 9-12 building configuration.
- K-8 buildings are not ideal - too wide of a spread
- Transitions lose parents too! I believe we'd have stronger learning communities and family involvement with PK-8 schools.
- Student needs could be better served if our transitions were different.
- don't know enough to comment
- I would be interested to see the research behind this. I think other issues might be impacting achievement more than transitions between buildings.
- The district has already shot down K-8 buildings, plus we don't have the space for this right now.
- Transitions are a part of life if they are done in small steps. I suggest K-4 neighborhood schools. Then gr 5-6 buildings that continue neighborhood populations with "quad" teaching schedules. Each student would only have 4 core teachers but their peer population would stay the same among the "quad" grouping.

- How the buildings are physically structured and how the administration plans for the students to transition makes the difference. Perhaps not leaving them in one school for 6 years would help make the transition easier. (K-4 instead of K-5).

**How important in your opinion is grade configuration to student success in our district?**

72	38% Very important
99	53% Moderately important
17	9% Not important

**Comment on how grade configurations affect our students' success.**

- Young students need to be in a more sheltered environment in order to maximize their learning.
- We implement policy. We should BELIEVE in the policy
- Many districts have primary, and intermediate building that cover the elementary years. I have also seen where districts have preschool/kindergarten centers with all of the resources needed to meet the needs of their students. The buildings need to meet the social/emotional and developmental needs of the students.
- What we do in our classrooms and the types of instruction children are exposed to is FAR MORE important than the grade levels housed within a building. Having said that, there is some significance to having much older and much younger students socially interacting within one space.
- I do not want age groups inappropriately assigned because of transitions because it may cause more problems with bullying, sexual innuendos and promiscuity
- As a middle school licensed teacher, it could affect my employability in a particular building due to configuration and licensure of other staff members.
- Much of their success is based on parent involvement not building set up
- Having a school with high school students and elementary students is not a good idea, so yes grade configuration matters at least to some degree. Having a school with 8th graders and kindergarteners is also not a good idea.
- Grade 4 should never be in the same building as grades 7 &8. I recommend K-4,5-8,9-12.
- Smaller configuration, more people on the same page, more collaboration.  
Can concentrate resources more easily.
- I fear it would be detrimental. As a 9th grade teacher, I notice the students act up more around other 9th graders. They need and thrive from positive role models. If they are sequestered, then they never get those models of good students.
- Grade configuration does not address the main issues such as poverty, attendance, gangs, etc.
- We have far bigger problems. In equity of teaching loads, being inundated with assessments that are not reliable for valid, having administrators position teachers in the name of being teacher-driven; our building configuration is the least of our problems.
- These changes would affect the whole building atmosphere to make it much more clinical and inappropriate for primary grade students.
- k-3 have very specific developmental needs, especially with the reading guarantee, 5-6 are developmentally more similar to 3rd grade, 7-8 are beginning transition to high school but are not prepared for the emotional challenges, 9-12 is the standard

- I have taught students in public, city school districts, from grade 2, to grade 12. We, as teachers know how important it is to know where the students are coming from, and where they're going after us.
- If the grade configurations allow for better communication amongst teachers and specialists, then they are extremely important.
- Grade configuration may define culture for students which could influence their behavior and what is important. I would not want my 4th and 5th graders with middle school students. Even 6th graders are in a transition period physically and emotionally that may not mesh well with 7th and 8th graders.
- I do not think the 9th graders are ready for the high school.
- I agree with the less transitions the better.
- Having more narrow grade bands (PK-3 or 4-8) would help teachers share resources, plan vertically and focus on grade and age appropriate systems.
- Grade configurations give students access to social skills appropriate to grade/age levels.
- Students need to be grouped with similar age peers with respect to age and grade level developments
- Due to various maturity levels students need to be in certain settings.
- The 8th and 9th grade should be at the high school but separated from the 10th to 12th grade students.
- Adjusting to transitions is part of education even at the secondary level. Minimizing transition time by smoothing the way (student liaisons or ambassadors, placing students in advisories, etc. are ways to lessen the effect of transition).
- Teachers should be aligned with the grade levels they are best suited to teach. This will have the most impact on students' success.
- The overall climate of each school greatly impacts student and teacher performance. With larger buildings, my concern would be heightened disciplinary issues.
- A change in configuration could potentially lessen the number of buildings impacting particular grades. This would result in more members in role-alike positions (i.e. more than 1 science teacher at a grade level).
- I think there are a lot of things that affect our student' success. I don't think spending \$200+million on new buildings without data that proves new buildings improve student test scores in an urban setting is the answer.
- Having affective and effective configurations build age appropriate character balance and lessens desire to behave in numerous disruptive acts of behavior...
- Students need to be grouped in smaller grade level spans to allow for similar activities and educational needs
- If we can have grade configurations which maximize resources and staff expertise for optimal student learning all students will have their best chance to succeed.
- I can understand the arguments, but with anything, if planning is in place to help in the transition and the student have access to continual support in their new buildings then it doesn't have as big of an impact. Our 5th graders have already been over to the middle school twice this year to help acclimate them.
- Look at other districts like Avon Lake would use the successful K-4; 5-6; 7-8; 9-12 model. K-4 provided nurturing and foundation. 5-6 provides practice with a jr high schedule, but also still gives students less teachers and a consistent peer group to learn with. 7-8 is a true jr. high model. 9-12 would be easier for ninth grader to transition into after incremental transition steps prior to this point.
- I believe that the oldest students can have positive interaction with the younger students but that 5th graders are too old to be with kindergarten students and that 7th & 8th

graders should be in a wing of their own, not intermingled in the same halls as 4-6th graders.

**The District has suggested dividing our students into pre-K to 3rd grade, 4th to 8th grade and the high school. Reasons for this can be found at the previously referenced website. Do you agree that this would be the best option for our District?**

62	33% Yes
81	43% No
47	25% Unsure

**Comment on the District's grade configuration plan.**

- There is an enormous difference between a learning/play environment appropriate for a 4th grader and that for an 8th grader. I think it is very important to allow our younger children, who are building basic skills needed to succeed in school to do so in a different environment than young teens.
- It does follow licensure NOW...but licensure is always changing.

It is very nice to have older and younger kids interacting.

With EXCELLENT LEADERSHIP and ENFORCED BEHAVIOR EXPECTATIONS ANY SYSTEM WOULD WORK.

THERE IS NO MAGIC PILL. What is the best way to use our money and the land we own? That is the question. If we downsize buildings, YOU MUST GIVE US SOMETHING CONCRETE IN THE NEW OFFERING like a city swimming pool, a senior community ctr, a large community garden/sustainability ctr

- I like the idea of the primary buildings. However, as a parent I would NEVER want my fourth grader in a building with 8th grade students. Even if I was promised that they would be kept separate. Exceptions always seem to happen. A preferable fix would be to have a 5/6 or a 4/5/6 building. This would meet the developmental needs of our pre-teen students. It would reduce the impact they have on our younger students and allow a better atmosphere to prepare them for middle school.
- Has the district considered the wide range of developmental differences between 4th and 8th graders?
- I think middle school is important, and I don't believe that 8th graders should be in the same building with 4th graders.
- I do not think that grouping fourth and fifth graders with middle school students is a good idea, as they are developmentally at different stages.
- I feel that there is too large of a difference between a 4th graders social-emotional experiences and an eighth graders. I do not feel it is in the best interested to expose 4th graders to the 8th grade mentality.
- PK to 3rd would be fine. 4-8 I think will present some disadvantages for grade 4 and 5 students. I would prefer to keep children in grades 4 and 5, and possibly even 6, all together at an elementary building. I like the thought of PK-2, 3-6 or 3-7, and then 7-12 or 8-12 high school.
- I think that 4th through 8th is a bad configuration because 8th graders will coerce

- younger ones into all sorts of mischief.
- These reflect current licensure standards by the state which reflect research in child development and the way students in these grade bands learn.
- Early Childhood is defined as Pre-K through 3rd grade and it would be developmentally appropriate to configure the district to support the needs of students in those grades and then transition into a more middle school type environment at the fourth grade level.
- Can see value to keeping like aged students in same building, but in some ways I wonder/am concerned about the amount of transiency it will cause with current student body.
- There is only one (relatively inconsequential) reason to make such a building change and that is due to the current Ohio licensure. Nevertheless, that is not a valid reason. Teachers should be teaching where they can be most effective. Buildings have nothing to do with such issues.
- Don't think 4th graders should be with 8th graders.
- There is a big difference between 4th graders and 8th graders and I believe it would be a mistake to house them together.
- 4th graders and 8th graders do not mix
- see above
- 4 - 8 is too wide.  
I think 6 -8 is too wide
- My opinion is that students should be grouped according to their ages and grade level for safety and educational reasons. IE: K-5 should remain in the same buildings; 6-8; then 9-12.
- I feel like 4-8 is too large of a gab and isn't consistent for needs.  
I feel an intermediate and middle would be better.
- I believe that the groupings would yield a greater benefit if students were grouped to appropriately reflect social/behavioral maturation processes.
- Not sure what might be best, but I prefer to have fewer 7-8 buildings and more community based elementary schools.
- K-3, 4-6, 7-8, 9-12 may be better
- I think the difference between 4th & 8th grade is too large. Middle schools should start at the minimum of 5th grade
- I believe 4th and 8th too large of an age span.
- If would depend on the consistency between buildings. We can divide our kids any-which-way, but if we are held accountable to poor teaching materials (Quality Core), disregard to lexiles for reading, and inconsistent discipline, no configuration is going to matter.
- K-5 buildings are a must. Dismissal difficulties will multiply with k-3, 4-5 and 6-8 buildings.
- I am concerned with such a huge developmental range of 4-8. Is there a plan for differing environments for the two major stages present? Are they to be in separate parts of the building?
- This statement differs from the configuration plan on the previously referenced website, which suggests K-8 schools, rather than three separate prek-3, 4-8, and 9-12 schools.
- Given that 4, 5 and 6 do not interact with 7 and 8.
- 7th and 8th graders have very different social/ emotional needs and should be kept separated.
- Pre-K to 4 may help in the linking between 3rd and 4th grade
- I strongly disagree with 4th graders being in the same building as 7th & 8th graders!

Look at the districts around our area -- successful districts -- our district does not need to do so much rapid change every single year! Stability. Consistency. Clarity. Come on! Must every single year be like the first year of teaching? Each August is dreadful -- the rug is yanked out from every one of us, we're spun around, blindfolded, hands bound, and expected to start the year out strong?!

- Primary grades can strongly focus on literacy skills and provide interventions more appropriately this way.
- 4th graders do NOT need to be schooled with 8th graders. That is insane and would cause untold problems with bullying and inappropriate role models.
- I think this a good configuration.
- I like the idea of dividing the grade levels differently, but I don't like the idea of 4-8 at all. There's too big of an age/maturity difference.
- I prefer the option of K-8.
- 4-8th grade is too big of a span.
- K-4, 5-8 would be better
- I like the top and bottom pre-K to 3 and high school. Not so sure about that middle grade configuration. There is a lot of change between 4th and 8th grade. Separate areas of the building would be mandatory and not even sure that would work for staffing.
- The ninth graders should be moved down.
- The only success would k-1, 2-3, 4-6, 7-8, and then the high school. You don't want 4th graders mixed with 8th graders. That's a recipe for disaster.
- It would be better than the model we use now but I wish we would go to a k-8 model.
- Regardless of the suggested separation between 4th and 8th grades, there will be an inherent mix of grade levels. Our students already are growing up too fast in the 4th and 5th grade at the elementary schools. The 4th and 5th grades need to stay in an elementary building.
- I would prefer to see K-3; 4-6th & 7-9 & 10-12.
- I believe that grouping children based on transition is important. However, another importance of school is social development. Grouping 4th grade students in the same building with 8th grade students can be detrimental to APPROPRIATE social development. I believe that there will be more loss of knowledge because of the developmental distractions.
- I think the Prek - 5 grade level is beneficial because of the interaction between students at different ages and because older students can be role models.
- I STRONGLY disagree with 4th, and even 5th graders, sharing a building with 7-8th graders. 4th graders especially are still young emotionally, etc. They do not need the influence of the adolescent behaviors of 7-8th graders who are struggling with their developing adolescent bodies and minds (hormones!!).
- I think that the bands need to be redistributed.
- My two biggest concerns are as follows:
  - \* Families who have quite a few children K-5 - splitting them up might be difficult.
  - \* Mixing 4th anywhere near 8th graders is a bad idea. Even if they are in different wings, they might still be in too close of proximity.
- I believe middle school should be grades 7-9 or 5-8.
- Third Grade Guarantee mandates the retention of what could potentially be 100+ children. This will require that they not only have instruction from reading endorsed teachers, which will shuffle around current staff, but it also has implications for their actual grade level location. Some students, based on the way the law is written, will still



need 4th grade level math, at the same time. So if 3rd grade is in a separate building, how will that be navigated? Also, the rigor of 3rd grade curriculum and PARCC assessments will require constant vertical level work with 4th grade. If 3rd and 4th grades are in separate buildings, this will be nearly impossible to implement in a meaningful way.

- The idea of having sexually aware 8th graders with 4th grade students does not seem like a good idea.
- Consolidating resources and being able to offer more sustained programs in all buildings seems like a big reason to consider this change in configuration.
- 4th grade is too young to be tossed in with middle school. I would rather see 4-6 and then 7 and 8 separate. Middle school students can't manage their hormones and that is not their fault, but I have seen the poor influence on the younger ones in other districts.
- The gap between 4th and 8th is too large, physically and socially.
- I do not think that 4th Grade students should be placed at the Middle School. There are behaviors at the MS that are typically adolescent and behavior that is not - developmentally I believe they should stay within a smaller, more controlled environment.
- I think the range of students for grades 4 to 8 is a broad one in terms of student maturity.
- I would rather see 6, 7 and 8 grouped together, with separate hallways for each grade. 4 and 5 could be included with K-3 or placed in a separate building.
- I am not an expert in this area. I know the decision makers have been reviewing research. The best option for our District should be a configuration that has been proven to be successful in similar districts. As a parent, I would have concerns sending my fourth grader to school with eighth graders.
- I feel 4th graders should be with Pre-K. They are too young to be in middle school
- I am concerned about 4th through 8th being together. I understand the difficulties our students have with transitions; however with retention there will be 4th graders in buildings with 15 year olds.
- It would be easier to separate students with challenging behaviors between a higher number of classrooms. Also, the wealth of resources and staff would be housed in the same building. PLC's have the opportunity to be more meaningful. Also each group has its own challenges that are unique. It will be easier to build a developmentally appropriate culture suitable for all students that attend that specific building.
- This choice coincides with teacher credentials and the third grade guarantee.
- The same number of transitions will occur with this configuration as we have now. If they really want to cut down on transitions, then shouldn't it be pre-K-8 and 9-12?
- This seems more appropriate to K- 8.
- I would prefer this to our current plan and I think there are good reasons for this model but the way this translates into buildings based on where they happen to be located now is not optimal in my opinion.
- Having older student with younger students (K-5) provides both ends of the spectrum with opportunities to interact that have and will allow children to be role models, helpers and at the same time allow younger children to make connections of a different age and kind.
- 4th-8th would not be in the best interest of our students' developmental needs.
- If I lived in the district, I would be concerned about my 4th grader being in the same building as 8th graders and would want to know more about how it would look on a daily basis.
- There would need to be a designated entrance, wing, etc. for the 4/5 graders from the 6/7/8 graders - they are not ready to mix. Would start and end times of the 'middle'

schools remain the same? Older siblings would not be able to walk home with younger children. Putting more teachers of similar grade levels will make planning harder, not easier and trying to do grade level projects with 100 kids or more will be quite unmanageable.

- Gr.4-8 is too developmentally inappropriate. You are still making the same amount of transitions as before, but now you are putting little nine year olds with potentially physically and socially developed fourteen year olds. Transitions can be made, but they should be at developmentally secure ages.
- As previously mentioned, I believe that jr. high aged students should be in a part of a facility that does not require them to share space with 4th or 5th graders. The developmental milestones, physical attributes, etc. are too varied and could lead to a variety of disciplinary issues.
- Concerns about keeping 4, 5 and 6th separate from 7 and 8th. There needs to be enough space for their needs at their level...such as recess facilities, bathrooms, 2 separate full size gymnasiums, appropriate art rooms, music rooms, intervention/sensory rooms. There needs to be a separate activity room/space for at least the Pre-K level and possibly also K levels, separate from the gym. Play is an extremely important part of learning at these ages.
- I believe it should be k-4, 5-6, 7-8, and then high school. But, if only 2 groupings is the name of the game, k-4 and 5-8.
- Yes, this sounds like a good division of ages with their corresponding needs.

**If you do not prefer the District's grade configuration plan, what in your opinion would be the best way to divide the grade levels (pre-K through 12) into buildings in our District? What is your rationale?**

- I prefer the current configuration to the proposed one. I believe the reconfiguration proposal would require bussing more young children which makes their school day longer and more difficult. I am concerned that the proposal is based on how to staff the school with the least number of teachers rather than how to best educate.
- ????????????
- Pre-School/kindergarten building  
1-4 or k-4  
5/6 pre-teen building  
7/8 middle schools  
1-12 high school
- Keep them as they are and save money.
- Keep the same.
- PK-2, 3-6, and 7-12. I think these groups of ages and needs are very complementary to each other. I think children at grade 6 are too young to transition to a middle school setting. Children in grade 3 are just entering testing grade, and the academic demands increase significantly at this grade level, making it a better match with grades 4, 5 and 6.
- I do not feel that the freshmen are any worse than any freshmen in other districts.
- Staying how they are now Pre-K to fifth grade, sixth through eighth and high school.
- The current configuration is already optimal.
- No K-8 buildings. It doesn't seem to be working well in Cleveland.
- leave it alone,

- pre-K 2  
3-4  
5-6  
7-8  
9-12
- I actually answered this in the above box. However, I feel that when you combine too many ages, you have to be aware of the maturity levels, behaviors and safety of the students. Do we really want our 4th graders to be exposed so early to the negative behaviors that we know our 7th-8th graders have been known to do?
- I think the district should have four pre-K through 8 buildings (or campuses if necessary) that feed into one high school. They should be located at Wiley, Roxboro, Boulevard and Monticello.  
This will reduce transitions to one - at the 9th grade.  
This will reduce district buildings to five to decrease facility costs. The elementary buildings can be built in a way to allow flexible grouping and compartmentalization of age groups/grades.
- Pre-K - 4  
5-6  
7-8  
9-12
- A better grouping plan would consist of a pre-K to fourth grade setting, a fifth to ninth grade setting; and a tenth to twelfth grade setting. This better reflects the maturation of CHUH students and optimizes the social and behavioral constructs which CHUH students can be supported.
- K-6, 7-9, 10-12
- I feel 4th graders are too young to be in an 8th grade building. I think the K-5, 6-8, 9-12 configuration is best for our students and their well-being.
- One or two 7-8 buildings bring together enough students at different levels to teach students where they are. Having a few advanced kids at Wiley or Monti makes meaningful classes difficult for our upper end.  
More community based elementary schools makes it easier to get younger kids to school and have parents active in "their" school.
- K-3, 4-6, 7-8, 9-12
- pre-K-4 in Elementary  
5-8 in Middle  
9-12 in High
- It doesn't matter how the grades are configured if we continue to have inept leadership and people making bad decisions without thought as to what is best for the students starting at the state level and working its way down.
- How would the changes in configurations impact the pathways?
- K-5 buildings provide stability. Children in the district that start in kindergarten succeed because they started school in one building. Moving around will not solve our districts test score problems!
- Pre-K-3, 4-8 (developed as a true middle school model), 9-12.
- PK-4, 5-8, 9-12. I teach multi-age groups, and the impacts of the drastically different social development of students older than 4th grade on primary age students is largely negative... so much so that it outweighs the opportunities for older students to gain

leadership opportunities in working with younger students, which our district already provides in its current grade setup.

- k-5, 6-8, 9-12 as it is.
- k-4, 5-6, 7-8, 9-12. See above answers
- K-2. 3-5. 6-8. Breaks down by testing and social needs of kids
- K-3, 4-6, 7-8, 9-12  
Itching 7-8th graders are a rough influence on 4-6th graders.
- Pre-K-4; 5-6; 7-8.  
Bring the district together in 5th grade, or BEFORE. (Prior to full-on puberty and turf-marking begins). Keeping the youngest kiddos with the elementary students works. The 4th graders need stability & leadership, before transitioning. They are more apt to focus on successes with standard-based learning & testing. They are in a good place to participate in visiting, reading, & collaborating with younger students, and building their skills. 5th & 6th together makes sense. They are able to adjust to each other, build trust and tolerance, and focus on being part of one group. 7th & 8th grades, together, allows for more of the same, as they continue to mature and prep for high school...without the younger students around to witness &/or be influenced by the ever-changing, ever-moody, teenagers.
- Keep the same - 4th graders should not be in the same building as 7th and 8th graders
- Pre-K through 3, 4 through 6, 7-8, and 9-12.
- The configuration above was actually a suggestion I and others made at previous planning meetings. I think there is a huge jump between 3 and 4 in terms of buy in by students. The 4th and 5th graders are not serving a good influence to younger students whereas if in the other setting they might benefit from the and 8th grade positive influences. Also love pre K in all schools.
- K through grades 4 or 5: separate the kids in puberty from the little ones
- Pre K to 4th, 5th to 9th, and 10th to 12th
- k-3  
4-6  
7-9  
10-12
- According to the info on the web site, research shows that k-8 and 9-12 is best. So, as long as we are shooting for the moon, I think we should stick with that.
- My children went through a school system that had pre-k to 4, then a 5 and 6 grade school, 7 and 8 middle schools and 9-12 high school. This seems to work very well.
- Return to the Junior High School model with k-6 elementary, 7-9 middle and 10-12 high school. Have consistent expectations throughout. This would cluster students in a more developmentally appropriate manner.
- 9th grade should be in a separate facility
- K-4, 5-8
- Is it possible to put pre-k to 4, 5 to 6, 7 to 8, and high school separate from each other? There may be issues with transportation in dealing with students in this manner, but in terms of staffing students in the middle configurations could have the same teachers for two years as a cohort and that may help them to build relationships with teachers and develop soundly as students.
- K-6  
7th grade building  
8th grade building  
9th grade building

## H.S. 10-12

- K-6; 7-9; 10-12. Each age range at a separate school, whether campus style or not. I do not think that 4th graders and 8th graders belong in the same building, and I think if we kept 6th graders at the elementary schools, it would give them more time to adjust, as with keeping the 9th graders at middle school. There is a lack of maturity that we see at 9th grade quite clearly with the amount of referrals and students that take two years to complete grade 9.
- K-8; 9-12
- NO 9th graders at the high school
- I think the best success for our students is as the grade level splits remain.
- Pre-k-3  
4-6  
7-9  
10-12
- I believe that the district should increase the number of transitions, so that appropriate knowledge can be attained through limiting academic and developmental distractions. Essentially, the district should be divided as follows: K-4, 5-6, 7-8, and 9-12. This would ensure that in the lower and middle grades, students are more focused on developmentally appropriate activities. Thus, limiting the "loss of knowledge" between grades because of the focus on "suffering" of the students between transitional periods. This will also provide focus for teachers and encourage instructional "teaming". Teachers will be able to focus intently on the issues of the students between their most troubling transitional periods, which, from the article, appears to be those between the 4th and 8th grade levels.
- Pre-K through 6  
7th and 8th  
9 - 12th
- I think the configuration that is currently in place works considering emotional and behavioral concerns for the younger age group. However, the articles did present valid considerations when looking at the research on learning acquisition and loss.
- I think that students should be grouped into 4 distinct bands, Pre-K to 2nd, 3rd to 5th, 6th to 8th, and high school. These bands share similar experiences and the students are developing in similar ways. I do not think that 4th and 5th graders should be grouped with 6th-8th graders. I teach 5th graders and know that they are not emotionally or socially ready to share building space with upper middle school students. These emotional and social inadequacies will affect their academic progress.
- Of that I am unsure.
- Definitely would not like to see K-8 buildings
- Pre-K through 6th, 7th through 9th, and 10th through-12th
- I think this is an invalid question. We need real, research-based suggestions, not what people think we should do based on their own opinions or preferences.
- Pk-3, 4-6, 7-8, High school. Or, 9th in 7-9.
- Pre-K - 3rd  
4th - 7th  
8th - high school
- I still think 4 graders are too young to put in with 8th graders
- I am unclear of the District's rationale other than there are too many facilities and this

would enable them to close some of them.

- I like the present configuration.
- My own children experienced the K-5 and 6-8 and then 9-12 plan and it worked well for them at the time. I have friends in another district where there is a pre-K to 3, 4-5, 6-8 and 9-12 and that works really well for them because the lower grade level bands are more narrow allowing students of similar development to be together.
- I have taught in several districts who divide students up in the aforementioned ways with little negative consequence. I am a big believer that kids are resilient and become even more so by learning to adjust to new environments. I have also observed a big difference in the way student of the 4/5 grade range act when they are in a standalone building. They are ready for more responsibility and behave in a more mature manner.
- I would like to see K-5, 6-8, and 9-12. I have seen a lot of success with this model. K-4, 5-8, and 9-12 would also be acceptable.
- I'm concerned the future of middle/elementary buildings (4-8) would create larger more chaotic school climates. I would highly endorse specialized 8/9th grade programming, with buildings having 4th-7th grades together.
- Why hasn't anyone mentioned Pre-K-4, 5-8, 9-12? I don't have a particularly good rationale for this. I have been in Shaker and actually like their K-4, 5-6, 7-8, 9-12. This has worked well for years, both for teacher collaboration and team teaching and for the students.
- K-4, 5-6 building, 7-8 building, then 9-12  
This also allows for stronger and longer relationships as more students are familiar with one another in such settings.
- Check with successful similar district to see what works
- While I agree with the idea of a pre-K to 3rd grade 9th - 12th grade high school, the middle seems disproportional. Perhaps another layer should be added to the 4th - 8th grade range. It is my belief and rationale that students in the 4th and 5th grades have different social, emotional and academic needs than pre-adolescent students in grades 7 and 8. With that being said, perhaps the configuration could be a 4th - 6th grade building and a 7th- 8th grade building.
- The 9th graders are not ready for high school and should not be at the high school until 10th grade.
- PK-8. I was very much in favor of campuses at our current middle school locations. When you look at PTA strength and parental involvement at elementary you could have that for students through grade 8. There is a big drop off at middle school and I'm afraid in 4-8 the drop off would be sooner. Our middle schools would become our neighborhood schools and that could only improve outcomes for students and community image of our schools. The concerns raised by a few about younger and older students being close are a knee jerk reaction not based in reality. Most highly sought out private schools use PK-8 so they clearly do not have a problem. This plan was tossed too quickly after a few emotional responses at a poorly attended, low representation first meeting.
- Pre-k-6 7-9 10-12.
- K-5, 6-9, 10-12
- pre-K to 4th, 5th-6th, 7th-8th, 9-12
- K-4, 5-8, 9-12
- P-3  
4-6  
7-8  
9-12

- K-4 (elem.); 5-6 (intermediate); 7-8 (jr. high); 9-12 (high). K-4 will give foundations. 5-6 will start the idea of successful transitions in small increments when the student has 4 core teachers (and the specials teachers) but their day is modeled like an elementary day with class periods (bell schedule). Then 7-8 won't be such a huge shock. It works in Avon Lake.
- Pre-k through 4, 5 & 6 in one building or wing of a facility while 7th & 8th are their own bldg. or wing of a structure, 9-12.
- I believe 4th grade is young and fit better in a elementary setting. I would not want my children sent into a "middle school" setting in 4th grade. For the same reason, I don't think 5th & 6th graders should be with 8th graders.
- Maybe a K - 4, then 5-6 and a 7-8

**What further comments do you have about this topic or the facilities building process in general?**

- From the beginning the process has been wrapped in so many buzz words that it has made both school board members and board administrators seem like they are trying to push an agenda that is slick on the outside but will have absolutely no ramifications in terms of educational reform. I have yet to hear any hard facts about how other school districts have improved just by changing the teaching space. There is no question that we need to keep facilities up to date. Spending a lot of public money and teacher energy on reconfiguration seems more for show than any real confrontation of the challenges we face in helping students learn.
- AN engaged, representative and LARGE group of educators should be ACTIVELY ENGAGED in this process. Teachers, as a rule, do not very often agree with administrative policy or interpretations. Therefore, what "THE DISTRICT" recommends doesn't mean much. If you want the district to speak the TEACHERS VOICE SHOULD BE A VERY LOUD ONE. Teachers could do a lot to SELL the plan to the community. We should, and could, be the front line of a good plan. We communicate with parents like no others... especially elementary teachers. So, it's time to involve us or all this work could be for naught.
- It appears that this topic is being looked at from a financial perspective. I understand that educating children is VERY expensive! However, identifying the problems of our students needs to go back to the beginning of their educational experience. There are very distinct reasons why our students are having difficulty with building transitions. The very best way to prepare our students for success is to meet their developmental and educational needs in an appropriate way. Not the cheapest one.
- I've heard comments to the negative about having 4th and 8th graders in the same building. I've worked in these buildings and interaction almost never occurs. When it does, the older students take on a very caring role with the younger kids.
- This building proposal seems to be an attempt by some to make a name for themselves at the expense of the taxpayers and the students we serve.
- Leave them alone; don't fall for the fad of the year, higher taxes will force more people to leave....
- This takes care of segregation by neighborhood. I guess less of a problem now since they foolishly closed Coventry.
- If I teach in a PK-3 bldg., and am not certified to teach pre-K, I do not feel confident to teach that level. Would licensed early childhood teachers join the staff?

- Since we have so many students in poverty, many of whose families do not have vehicles, the ability for families to get to the schools is important- IE, they need to be close, particularly for the younger grades.
- I believe this will be a difficult plan to execute. We need to stick to a plan and see if it works instead of switching ideas every couple of years. Was this not the Progressive movement in the 70'S? How did that work out?
- Are we just changing to try something new? Their research says they “clearly support ongoing efforts in urban school districts to convert standalone elementary and middle schools into schools with K-8 configurations.” They also said more research is needed. How will this affect small schools? Does research on small schools still show it is the way to go? What is the time frame for implementation?
- Please put an end to this process. Make necessary repairs and focus on what's currently going on in the buildings, for example, how about all the high school students with no schedules at the beginning of the year? Or the teachers with 40 kids in a class at the beginning of the year? Research supports smaller class sizes, and it won't cost as much as a new building.
- We need to have more teacher representation on the facilities committee. Administrators and community members don't teach. We do. One of my fears is being in an open classroom again.

What we do need are some flexible-use areas. We also need to make educational space more of a priority at the high school than athletic space.

- The open classroom buildings must go!
- I disagree with the statement in the previously mentioned article, which states that "The only thing wrong with this configuration is that it increases transportation." The proposed configuration also creates problems with younger students being exposed to inappropriate behaviors for primary age children, and negatively impacts programs for the development of students' physical, art, music, and foreign-language education (the current system for 2 traveling instrumental specialists with a "home base" general music teacher has proven highly effective for growing students' arts educations. Students in these programs show significant delays on these areas of development when they do not receive their education on these skills from a consistent source as they move up the grades, simply because they only have 45 minutes of contact time per week. Finally, the atmosphere for learning with younger students suffers greatly. I have taught extensively in 7 different schools, and the most ineffective ones at creating a positive learning atmosphere were the ones with similar configurations as the one that is being proposed.
- At every transition we lose kids to private schools. Also kids sometimes need a new fresh start. Maybe kids who don't pass OAA should be moved to a 4-8 school with small classes, lots of support services.
- Listen to the people! Listen to the community members! Listen to the alumni! Listen to the students! And by all means...LISTEN TO YOUR STAFF & FACULTY! No More Top-Down Decisions! This District is in Utter Chaos! Let's bring calm to the district. Let's restore a sense of community and ownership. Your "buy-in" is here...in the classroom. Your staff are your marketers. If you want the community members and businesses to "buy-in" -- then listen to your employees. We have the biggest mouths. When we are proud, sure and excited, so is the rest of the community. Try it and see!
- I wonder how the changes in the facilities will affect the work we have done on pathways, and especially IB.
- I am on board for change as long as the best interests of the students are what's at the



center of that change,

- Best of luck they will need it. People in this community will not support what they are trying to do.
- I do not think the idea of large open classrooms is conducive to good education. I've taught in open buildings before and it's hugely distracting to both students and teachers. I do not think the benefits outweigh the limitations.
- I am surprised that the District did not come to teachers first for their opinions; especially since teaming seems to be in the plan.
- Read both sites:

[http://www.hks.harvard.edu/pepg/PDF/Papers/PEPG11-02\\_Schwerdt\\_West.pdf](http://www.hks.harvard.edu/pepg/PDF/Papers/PEPG11-02_Schwerdt_West.pdf)

<http://www.amle.org/Research/ResearchSummaries/StudentAchievement/tabid/276/Default.aspx>

- Our athletic facilities are terrible given the history and success of our teams and athletes.
- Please get rid of the open layout buildings (Boulevard, Fairfax, etc.) and DO NOT attempt to use in any new configuration. Schools need walls, period.
- I believe that it is not the transitions between schools that are causing our students to fall behind. It is the lack of commitment to follow through on ideas for more than a short period. We need to focus on community involvement in the schools and getting parents to participate in their child's learning. If we direct our focus on our buildings, we are losing sight of our students in CHUH.
- What current research proves that limiting transitions is effective? How does "district data" specifically support the grouping of such a large variety of ages.

Should a (16 yr. old) repeating 8th grade student be in the same building as a 4th grade student?

- Using the above configuration, a 5/6 wing in the elementary school would be advantageous.
- Continued transparency will be important to community and staff buy-in.
- If the district is concerned about the impact that transitions have on student achievement, there needs to be a significant change in the services provided for children transferring from out of the country. Our ELL children receive virtually no services which allow them to transition into our instruction, and to succeed in the environment and with the learning we are mandated to assess and consequent. The population of ELL children is growing at a near daily rate in our buildings. Will any of the buildings provide for units which help THOSE children transition?
- I am concerned about increased transportation costs due to the new configurations.
- There is little question that to modernize the facilities there will have to be new buildings in place. The current architecture of some of our buildings will prevent 21st century learning environments to exist.
- Are we working with Euclid, Maple, and other inner-ring districts that have had these building plans in recent years?
- I feel that K-8 facilities would be disastrous for our younger students.
- I really appreciate that community members are being encouraged to participate in the process. It is vital that families feel heard and are given the opportunity to contribute their opinions.
- At one time I did live in the district but I am not proud of how the district is being

represented on many levels.

- I currently have little faith in this process. I attended all the meetings last year, thought the district was on the right track and then watched as the entire process imploded. It will take a lot to get me back on board with this.
- The facilities committee needs to focus less on specifics and more on convincing the community on the fact that money is needed to update schools due to the band aid maintenance back log which would be like sinking money into an old used car rather than taking on a payment for a new one. The specifics won't sell the plan and will alienate folks from the real issue that we have to go new not patch old and pour good money after bad for no real gain in instructional potential. Many districts have recently or are in the process of building renewal so this is the evidence to use. Each have done something different so the specifics are not the magic it's the fact that now is the time where money needs to be spent.
- The people making the decisions don't have to LIVE the decision. I am glad staff is getting some input though I fear it will fall on deaf ears as most decisions in the district do. I would like to see a compilation of other schools that are finding success with these proposed changes and research articles to back up the district's choices.
- I work in middle school. Gr 6 continues to be tough b/c they are developmentally unable to handle a jr. high schedule. Gr 6 is also developmentally inappropriate to be in the same building with Gr 8 (especially since we have so many repeating eighth graders).
- Ensure that representatives from all walks of education are included in the actual building needs, such as HS Science teachers, MH teachers, athletic directors, etc.
- Special needs students are often forgotten about. Remember that the special needs students need to be considered in this configuration and building plans. We have a growing population of autistic students, among other spec ed needs, and considerations need to be included in the overall plan. Such as, sensory rooms, equipment, schedules and facilities that include spec ed classes for gym time, lunch, art, music, etc.