MASTER PLANNING AND VISIONING
EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS OF CONFIGURATIONS

The South Burlington Board of School Directors formed a subcommittee in March 2016 to review the educational benefits of the five proposed reconfiguration options for the District's elementary schools. The subcommittee reviewed the Master Planning and Visioning Task Force report, the Task Force minority statement, input provided by the administration, and research provided by the administration and community members. Although primarily deferring to the findings of the Task Force and to the expertise of the administration, the subcommittee also conducted some limited additional research on certain narrow questions. In addition, the subcommittee asked several questions of the administration related to its conclusions to understand fully its rationales and conclusions.

The following analysis addresses two primary issues: maintaining the District's current educational programming and enhancing that programming. The third section briefly addresses the topics not covered by this report.

1) Which configuration would put the District in the best position to continue offering the current educational programming?

The South Burlington School District currently offers a diverse and expansive educational program. There are abundant class offerings at the High School including several Advanced Placement courses and multiple world languages; alternative pathways to graduation through the Big Picture program; significant extracurricular opportunities at the Middle and High Schools; and caring, safe, and nurturing environments at the three elementary schools. We graduate nearly 100% of our students, over three-quarters of whom enroll in college. Our students at all grade levels achieve better results than the State average on standardized tests, including on the NECAP, SBAC, SAT, and ACT. Our students participate at a high rate in community service, co-curriculars, and athletics.

One of the primary goals of the District should be to ensure that the schools can continue to offer this exemplary educational programming. The continued rising costs of education reflected in annual budget increases combined with flat enrollment threatens the District's ability to achieve this goal. At some point, we may face a situation where the cost of education becomes higher than the community is willing to support, resulting in disapproval of the District's budgets at the polls. If budgets are voted down, the District would likely have to cut back on its educational offerings.

Given this possibility, the Board must be cognizant of the risk to the District's ability to maintain flexibility to adjust programming if it is encumbered by significant levels of debt service payments. The debt service for any consolidation option would be a fixed cost for a number of years that could not be cut if the District confronts budget defeats in the future. Cuts would have to come from other areas, which could include educational offerings.

In determining which school configuration to pursue, the Board must take this risk into account. To minimize this risk, the Board could choose the configuration that is least costly in the short term. But the Board must also be cognizant of the downsides of forgoing a configuration that provides important educational benefits and may provide cost savings after the debt service is retired. Being too short-sighted and looking only at the near term financial picture risks losing the educational and social benefits of an option that may have a cost that the community would, in fact, support. The key is to identify the configuration and its attendant educational benefits that the Board believes is best for students and that the community will support in the short and long term. The optimal scenario is one that brings the most value to the entire community in a cost-effective manner. It would allow the best educational opportunities possible and be a continued draw to families and businesses.

There is no dismissing the fact that costs and savings are major factors in determining the choice of which configuration to pursue, but we must also factor in the less calculable educational value of each option. Each option brings certain values to the larger South Burlington community, but each option also has its drawbacks.

There is an additional uncertainty to consider related to opportunity costs. We understand that the Middle School and the High School would see significant value in moving forward with 21st Century learning opportunities and other improvements. Would the community be supportive of these investments at the same time that they are investing in the elementary schools? Could investments in the Middle and High Schools continue after an investment in the elementary schools?

Also, it is not clear that the community has the capacity to support capital initiatives in both the city and school. In making our recommendation we must judge if the community has the capacity and willingness to fund its portion of a new library and city infrastructure along with a new elementary school, and upgrades at the Middle and High Schools.

The other opportunity cost we must consider in our fiscal role is the current interest in one or more school properties by other parties. There is clear interest in the RMCS property. There have been informal statements made that the Chamberlin property could be repurposed for a community center or other public good if the District chose an option that did not include its use. Since our commitment as a Board is to provide education value at a cost the community will support, it is our duty to investigate options that are financially advantageous to the District. With active suitors for the RMCS property and a plausible suggestion that there could be interest in the Chamberlin property, we have to reflect on our position in the market. We also need to ask whether the market value of these properties will change in the future if we want or need to alter our plans.

2) The administration has identified a number of benefits that can be gained through consolidating to two (options 3 or 4) or one elementary school (option 5). What are the educational benefits to be gained through reconfiguration (options 3, 4, or 5) ?

A. 21st Century Learning Spaces

The District is rightfully focused on teaching 21st Century skills, which include collaboration, digital literacy, critical thinking, and problem-solving. Such skills will help students thrive in today's world. The Board has received expert input and advice, as well as documentation, to the effect that physical space is important for the teaching of 21st Century skills. "While the building alone does not make a 21st century school, common sense suggests that the qualities of where we learn affect the quality of how we learn."*Partnership for 21st Century Skills*, *21st Century Learning Environments,* p. 5, http://www.21stcenturyskills.org/route21/. In particular, physical space can be designed to enhance collaborative and transformational learning (in maker-space areas, for example, that allow for building, producing, and experimenting).

Constructing a 21st Century Learning physical space could be most readily accomplished with options 4 and 5, each involving construction of a new building. Analysis provided to the Board shows that retrofitting existing schools to be exemplars of such spaces would be prohibitively costly, although less major changes made to the existing spaces could improve learning spaces and outcomes at a rate relative to the investment.

It is difficult to quantify the extent of the benefits to education that would be gained by building a new school specifically to the standards of 21st Century learning spaces, but research tells us some additional value could be gained. As the Partnership for 21st Century Skills noted,

> Inherent in these and other 21st century designs is the notion of buildings that flex to accommodate the human relationships that are critical to successful learning. As a leading school architect has noted, schools must "create an environment where the kids know each other and know their instructors, not just academically but as people." School designs that convey friendliness, openness, and accessibility promote cooperation and interaction, and reduce the tensions that can lead to inattentiveness, acting up, and bullying. What goes for kids, goes for adults, too. Educators need tools and spaces that enable collaborative planning and information sharing.
>
> Georgetown University researchers, for instance, have found that improving a school's physical environment can increase test scores by up to 11%.

21st Century Learning Environments, http://www.21stcenturyskills.org/route21/.

In another report focusing on measures that contribute to developing 21st Century skills in preK-8 students, findings included:

- School and classroom design should accommodate diverse learning needs. Space should be large enough and furniture and other classroom objects should be easily reconfigurable to allow multiple learning activities to occur simultaneously.
- Space should be designed in anticipation of evolving learning needs, as both student populations and the relevance of specific subjects change over time.
- Flexible learning spaces allow for interactions and collaborative work, which are fundamental to the development of several 21st century skills. Such skills include: leadership, communication, teamwork, and interpersonal skills.
- Flexible schools provide space outside of classroom for collaborative work. Such spaces include: project rooms, atriums, and courtyards.
- Environmental factors such as lighting, air quality, and temperature affect student learning and should be incorporated into school design.
- Money saved from efficient lighting, ventilation, and temperature control can be reinvested in other things that directly contribute to student achievement, such as support staff or technological upgrades.
  Schools designed according to principles of environmental sustainability can serve as a laboratory for students to observe the application of environmental concepts and principles.

School Structures that Support 21st Century Learning, Hanover Research (2011)

There are many aspects to providing a 21st Century Learning environment. The physical space is not the only consideration. Technology, teaching practices, and community involvement are other critical factors in the mix, not to mention an initial investment in professional development. The question is whether investing a significant sum in physical space is the best use of the community's education dollars or whether we should pursue more modest upgrades to existing structures to obtain some of the benefits of 21st Century Learning spaces along with increased investment in the other factors of 21st Century Learning. Unfortunately, we have not seen research or evidence that provides a clear answer to this question nor have we investigated the plausibility of more modest upgrades towards this end.

B. Academic Opportunities – Language and Music

Research shows that early learning of language and music has educational benefits. Offering such opportunities could be more readily accomplished in one or two consolidated schools. The administration has estimated, for example, that it would cost $384,000 annually to have French and Spanish teachers in three elementary schools as opposed to $160,000 if there were one school, a savings of $224,000 annually (over $1,000,000 over five years). Offering a band or string music lessons in three elementary schools would cost $144,000 annually versus $64,000 in one elementary school.

Presumably, in either option 4 or option 5, language and music opportunities could be limited to one elementary school. In the case of option 4, those programs could be offered only in the grade 3 to 5 school, not the K-2 school.

Under option 3 (2 existing K-4 schools), the cost for language instruction would be $320,000 annually and for music $115,200.

The savings to the language and music programs outlined above suggest the costs or savings of other new programs that the community/District chose to offer in the future as well as standard offerings (STEM classes, Art, Physical Education, etc.). In most situations there would not be any fixed costs to adding these programs but there could be one-time costs if the new programs requires some kind of change to the physical space (sound proofing as an example) or some fit up (laboratory equipment, 3-d Printers…).

C. Access to Extracurricular Programs

Each current elementary school offers different outside-class opportunities such as mini-milers, spring fair, school musical, science fair, and invention convention. Research shows that having a myriad of extracurricular opportunities benefits students. Research reviewed seems to focus on older students and on sports or clubs, rather than the community events primarily listed above that are generally supported by the schools' PTOs. It is likely fair to assume that there is some similar value to students at the elementary school level. Since these programs are currently overseen by PTOs, the Board and Administration would need to advocate and support each programs continuance, but we cannot assume that all the current opportunities at the existing schools would continue in one or two consolidated schools. If a reasonable number of these programs continue, students will have the ability to meet and interact with new students with similar interests and become involved in programs and content areas that they would otherwise not have access to until the move to the middle school. Opportunities for new extracurricular programs might also become available in a consolidated school that are not currently available with the current configuration in schools with a smaller number of interested participants or parents.

There is also a loosely connected value here tied to diversity (see below). If there is a socioeconomic diversity gap for our students it also exists for our parents/guardians, potentially having an impact on their engagement in our Extracurricular Programs (financial and time availability).

D. Diversity

Having a diverse student body can enhance the learning experience of students. Through consolidating cohorts into one school (option 4 would move K-2 to Orchard and 3-5 to a new school), the diversity would become more consistent within those grades. Currently, racial diversity varies from 16 to 24 percent of the student body in the three existing schools. Socioeconomic diversity, as evidenced by number of students who receive free and reduced lunches, ranges from 15 to 30 percent.

By moving to one-school cohorts, some students will actually encounter less diversity while others will encounter an increase in diversity. For example, the students who were in the school with a 16 percent diverse student body would see some additional

diversity, while the student in the class with a 24 percent diverse student body would encounter less diversity. Although increased diversity can improve educational experiences, it is unclear that the marginal difference in diversity that consolidation would provide would lead to other than minor, if any, improved educational outcomes.

E. Equity

The educational offerings, ability of staff, and learning environments are equivalent among the three schools. The relevant issue related to equity relates to inconsistent class sizes and the ability for the District to effectively manage Student to Teacher ratios. For example, in the 2015 school year, the fifth grades at Chamberlin School had 23.5 students, Central had 19.3, and Orchard had 18. If the fifth-grade cohort had been in one school, the class sizes would have been consistent, and more equitable, at 19.9.

Options 4 and 5 would do the most to improve consistency in class sizes. Option 3 would offer some improvement.

Maintaining the existing three elementary schools and striving for better class size equity would require re-districting (likely soon and on an ongoing basis) and some degree of staffing (and costs) higher than we see in options 4 or 5.

F. Value to Students Through Improved Teacher Collaboration.

Improving teacher collaboration, and the resulting improvement to student outcomes, is a proven beneficial outcome from consolidating the cohorts into one single school. A larger number of educators for a single grade in one physical space allows for those educators to learn from a greater number of colleagues and allow administrators more opportunities to create better teacher/student fit. Staff that attend professional development can more effectively bring learning back to all their colleagues. This sharing of information is more difficult to do and inherently takes more time in a configuration with more than one school. Teams of teachers would be able to draw even greater inspiration, knowledge, and best practices, from one another when housed under one roof. Opportunities for learning and growth by less experienced teachers is improved and program design is more consistent compared to three schools. Monitoring of educator performance is also improved due to the more consistent manner in which feedback to educators would be done.

Researcher Carrie R. Leana and her team at the *Stanford Social Innovation Review* conducted a substantial study in the New York City public schools 2005-2007 and discovered the following: “Most striking, students showed higher gains in math achievement when their teachers reported frequent conversations with their peers that centered on math, and when there was a feeling of trust or closeness among teachers. In other words, teacher social capital was a significant predictor of student achievement gains above and beyond teacher experience or ability in the classroom.”

Research by Amy Edmonson at the Harvard Business School finds that organizations often thrive, or fail, based on their ability to work as teams to learn, improve, and innovate. Other contributions to teacher research have derived similar conclusions for schools. Drawing on the notion of social capital, research points to the high value teachers of all abilities draw from working together and the extent to which teachers report doing so as a remedy to solve instructional problems. In fact, schools with higher levels of teacher collaboration are associated with stronger student performance. *(http://www.peecworks.org/peec/peec_research/S0179ABD9-0179ABE1)* For example, a study in New York City showed that teachers were more likely to produce student achievement gains if they taught in schools where they had strong ties to colleagues with whom they worked often on instructional issues, regardless of their education, experience, or previous student achievement levels. *Carrie R. Leana, The Missing Link in School Reform (Fall 2011)*; *Jennifer Poulos, et al., Making space: The Value of Teacher Collaboration (2004).*

Currently, teachers and staff do try to collaborate with one another across schools. The District provides time for in-service, but it is logistically difficult to bring staff together from different schools on a regular basis. In a single elementary school the opportunities for enhanced collaboration would be more effective both in the formal sense (in-service) and the informal (hallway, lunch conversations).

Option 4 and 5 would offer the most opportunity for improvement in collaboration and team teaching. Option 3 would offer some improvement.

G. Transitions (Option 4)

Option 4 would include transitions for students that do not exist today in South Burlington as we would have a single pre-K through 2nd grade school and a single 3rd through 5th grade school. In addressing the concern regarding the increased number of transitions in option 4, the Task Force stated the following:

> Some students transition easily, others do not. The more transitions the shorter the length of time a student has in a particular building, and the harder it is for teachers to know their students well.
>
> If transitions were the only issue in structuring a school system we would have PK-12 schools. In practice the concern for minimizing transitions has to be balanced against other issues, such as size and locations of existing buildings, opportunities for improving educational deliveries and for reducing operating costs, and equity for all students, all of which have been cited in the Task Force report.
>
> The high school students added another aspect to this issue in their "Big Deal" meeting: several of them felt that transitions are good for students because they create the opportunity for students to "reinvent" themselves, to forge new

relationships and explore new activities.

The minority statement discussed this issue as well. Its discussion reflects concerns voiced by numerous community members during the Board's public outreach sessions. It noted that:

> Multiple resources and studies conclude that children do better with fewer transitions. "School transitions impose stress on students and negatively influence schools' identity and sense of community." (Renchler 2000). In addition, literature suggests that students do not get "used to" transitioning over time and attempts to mitigate the negative effects of transitioning have not been consistent or successful. (Wren, 2003; Anderson, 2000; Gregg).
>
> . . . Evidence suggests reducing the number of grade levels in a school has been associated with a decrease in school identity, parental involvement and teacher/student/parent relationships. (Wren, 2003; Howley, 2000-2002; Moffit, 1996; Hopkins, 1997). As Gregg states, "research suggests that the most equitable and cost efficient means of delivering high student achievement is through smaller schools with broader grade spans."

One of the adverse impacts from transitions would be mitigated under the option 4 configuration, namely the impact of exposure to new peer groups after a transition.

> School transitions are related to a variety of behavioral and psychological changes. Research indicates that across transitions, students often experience changes in relationships with peers, parents, and teachers. In addition, behavioral problems often become evident after a school transition, which is particularly true when students interact with new peer groups after the transition. Much research has examined changes in academic variables after transitions; many transitions are related to notable changes in students' motivation to learn, academic performance, and attitudes toward school. (http://www.education.com/reference/article/school-transitions/)

The emphasis on the new peer group is of considerable note since options 4 and 5 would both reduce the number of new peer groups South Burlington students would transfer into. In a model of a single pre-K through 2 and 3-5 or a single 5th grade, students would be with the same cohort of peers throughout their South Burlington elementary education experience. So, while option 4 does implement a new transition, it does have this advantage. Option 5 would have similar value.

That being said, the weight of the evidence suggests that fewer transitions is preferable.

H. School Size (Option 5)

In relationship to a schools size, all students in our schools are unique in how they

respond to the size of their physical school space and the specific environment in which they will be doing most of their learning. Researchers seem to agree on the importance of following best practice to enhance the experience of each learner through "interpersonal connectedness...a safe learning environment...and academic engagement" (http://urbanhealth.jhu.edu/media/best_practices/effective_schools.pdf).

What constitutes the optimal school size is the subject of continuing debate. Input from the District's three elementary school principals suggests the optimal size is from 250 to 400 students. Research suggests that elementary schools should be in the range of 300 to 500 students. Picus Odden & Associates, *Using the Evidence-Based Method to Identify Adequate Spending Levels for Vermont Schools*, p. 16 (January 28, 2016). www.leg.state.vt.us/jfo/education/adequacy/VT%20EB%20Analysis%2020.1%20Executive%20Summary.pdf). In Vermont, a prototypical elementary school would have 357 students. *Id.* at p. 17. The Task Force addressed this issue:

> Literature on effectiveness of elementary school size favors medium and small schools, as they have, to varying degrees, foster stronger relationships (between students and teachers, between parents and school, among teachers) and generally have less bureaucratic structures.
>
> The research however tends to focus on individual schools and not schools within a district context. A single elementary school serving all South Burlington elementary students was favored by the South Burlington educational leadership, largely because of operational effectiveness and community dynamics, as it structurally assured equity for all students, regardless of their socioeconomic background or housing location within the city.
>
> A PK-5 school would be considered a large school. Sequential schools, such as PK-2 and 3-5, would be considered medium sized schools. A key consideration for both the educators and the Task Force was that such schools would not be operated as large, or even medium sized schools, but rather as small learning communities (SLCs) as semi-autonomous components within the overall school structure.
>
> SLCs could be grade-based, or multi-grade, or even thematic (such as with an arts-based or math/science-based learning theme). The SLCs would each have a small group of collaborating teachers who would know each other, and their students, very well. SLCs could have a teacher/leader or an assistant principal. They would be expected to have their own "domain" within the larger building. Students would spend most of their time in their SLC domain, leaving for shared programs, services and courses, such as Physical Education. Each SLC could even have its own entry and bus drop-off.

Many community members have voiced concern over the size of the option 5 school. As the minority statement stated, "evidence suggests larger consolidated schools have a negative impact on academic achievement, student/staff relationships, and parental

involvement."

The Hanover Research study cited above states that "[a] significant body of research has found that small schools contribute to improved student achievement" and that "[t]he American Architectural Foundation and the communications director of Smart Growth America warn that the movement toward large consolidated schools could isolate schools from their communities."

A response, in theory, to the concern related to large schools is the use of small learning communities (SLCs) within the larger school, as referenced by the Task Force. Our District has a proven track record on this front that should help to mitigate the downsides of the size of the school of option 5. Our own Middle School uses an SLC-type approach by placing students on teams within each grade level with grades 7 and 8 having looping teams. These practices have proven effective and continue to be strengthened each year.

Most of the research available on SLCs, and the District's own experience with SLCs, is focused on high schools and middle schools. Unfortunately, there has been little evidence provided or located suggesting that SLCs address the issues that a large school may raise at the elementary school level. Accordingly, there is a risk as to whether the use of SLCs would entirely address the negative aspects of a school that exceeds the physical size deemed most effective for elementary schools. The risk mitigation approach to such a scenario would include professional development for those involved, strong school based leadership, and a robust community engagement program.

I. Summary of Educational Benefits

The following summarizes the educational benefits that may be attained for each of the reconfiguration options (2 through 5), as compared to the status quo option (1).

1. Option 2

Option 2 would continue the current configuration of three elementary schools at their current locations as well as the Middle and High Schools. Basic maintenance and some renovations would occur. These renovations would not include significant changes to provide improved 21st Century learning spaces.

None of the educational benefits identified above would be achieved through implementation of option 2. The option would preserve the current exemplary programming offered by the South Burlington School District but would forego the educational benefits available in other options. Arguably, however, the option would leave the Board and the administration with more flexibility for some period of time by avoiding the fixed debt service costs entailed in other options.

2. Option 3

Option 3 would entail the consolidation of the three elementary schools into two existing schools, with Orchard and Rick Marcotte Central each becoming K-4 schools and the fifth grade attending Tuttle Middle School. Chamberlin Elementary School would be sold. Some renovations would be required at the elementary schools and the Middle School, but these would not include changes to provide improved 21st Century learning spaces.

Academic opportunities such as language and music instruction could be more readily expanded at the two elementary schools than under options 1 or 2. Access to extracurricular programs in elementary schools as well as for fifth graders in middle school could expand. Improvements in diversity would occur, although would be marginal. Class-size equity would also improve: with cohorts in two schools, class size would be more easily balanced. The ability for teachers for each grade to collaborate would improve: rather than having 2 to 4 teachers per grade under options 1 or 2, there would be 4 to 5 teachers per grade in option 3.

Option 3 avoids the potential downsides of the additional transition in option 4 and the large size of the single elementary school in option 5. Moreover, as the option with the lowest net cost, the option would present the most budget flexibility for some period of time through avoiding the fixed debt service costs entailed in options 2, 4, and 5.

3. Option 4

Option 4 would consolidate the elementary schools into one K-2 school (Orchard) and a new 3-5 facility. Rick Marcotte Central School and Chamberlin School would be sold.

The new 3-5 school would be built as a 21st Century learning space and would obtain the attendant benefits discussed above. Orchard School would not be renovated to provide improved 21st Century learning spaces. Arguably, the benefits from 21st Century spaces are more important to grades 3 to 5 than to grades K to 2.

Opportunities such as language and music instruction as well as access to other extracurricular programs could be more readily expanded at the two elementary schools than under options 1 or 2. In addition, the option would provide the District with the flexibility to focus those additional opportunities at the higher elementary grades in the new facility.

Certain benefits would be obtained due to the fact that all students and teachers in each grade would be in the same schools. Diversity would be improved more than in options 1, 2, and 3 in that it would represent our community, class-size equity would be improved, and the ability of teachers to collaborate with their grade-level peers.

Although this option would keep students together with their peers throughout their elementary school experience, it would entail an additional transition from second to third grades.

4. Option 5

Under Option 5, all three elementary schools would be sold and all students from K to 4 would attend one new elementary school. Fifth grade would attend Tuttle Middle School.

The new elementary school would be built as a 21st Century learning space and would obtain the attendant benefits discussed above. Opportunities such as language and music instruction as well as access to other extracurricular programs could be more readily expanded than under the other options.

The benefits from having all students and teachers in each grade in the same school would be achieved. There would be improvement in diversity beyond that in options 1, 2, and 3 in that it would represent our community. Class-size equity would be improved as would the ability of teachers to collaborate with their grade-level peers.

The one-school option would avoid the downsides of an additional transition while achieving the benefits of having all students and teachers in each grade in the same school. There are, however, disadvantages to having one large school. It would mean that the school would be larger than what is accepted as the most effective school size for elementary schools. By utilizing Small Learning Communities, the District might be able to mitigate this risk by providing the same educational value of maintaining separate smaller elementary schools with the other benefits of a single larger school

5. Summary

It is clear that there are educational gains that could be made through pursuing one of the consolidation configuration options (3, 4, or 5), but measuring those gains is imprecise. We have discussed the value of 21st Century Learning Spaces and how the pedagogy and physical structure could come together to help students succeed; the academic opportunities that could be added to the district in options 3, 4, and 5 at a lower operational cost than option 1 or 2; the expanded access to extracurricular programs in options 3, 4 and 5; and the benefits of options 3, 4 or 5 in helping to address both diversity and equity. In addition we have seen research that shows proven value to students through improved teacher collaboration – most easily and productively addressed in options 4 and 5.

There are also risks to those options. In this report we have noted the quandary of additional transitions (option 4) and the impact of school size (option 5) as well as other risks that would need to be managed such as the decreased budget flexibility that bonding

for debt would cause in all the options that require capital expense.

There is no direct mathematical way to express the extent of the educational gains that could be achieved by moving forward with a scenario that consolidates schools. But research can quantify the impact of educational initiatives. *See, for example, Teaching and Learning Toolkit, www.educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/evidence/teaching-learning-toolkit/*. We do not have the benefit of such precision here. We have not been able to specifically quantify the extent of the benefits. The question of how much more prepared the students will be under a consolidation option would ultimately be answered through tracking the outcomes if we actually move in that direction.

3) Other factors related to the configuration decision not covered in this report.

This report has focused on the different configurations' impact on the District's educational programming. There are numerous other considerations related to the preferred configuration that do not have a direct impact on such programming, and are therefore not addressed herein.

The report does not address the important issue of whether Chamberlin and/or RMCS Central should be closed due to outside pressures that could reduce the District's ability to continue to offer a quality education at these schools. It does not address the impact to neighborhoods, including real estate values, of closing schools. It also does not address safety issues not because it is not vitally important but because it is not directly connected to education. One could argue that school safety issues are addressed better under one option than another but these are not educationally related. These and other issues may need to be addressed depending on the Board recommendation. For instance, if the Board recommends option 1 or 2, it should consider how to address the outside pressures to Chamberlin from airport noise and to RMCS Central from development of City Center. If it recommends option 3, 4, or 5, it should consider the impact to neighborhoods.