

Walter Johnson Cluster Roundtable Discussion Group

Meeting #7 Agenda
May 4, 2016, 7:00 – 8:45 p.m.
Walter Johnson High School, Cafeteria

Desired Outcomes

By the end of this meeting, we will have:

- Reviewed feedback, agenda, outcomes, and process;
- Review second round of elementary school approaches; and
- Discussed next steps and provided feedback.

Activity	Facilitator(s)	Process	Time
Review feedback; agenda, outcomes, and process.	Debbie Szyfer	Review	7:00-7:10 10'
Review second round of elementary school approaches	Dana Davison/ Debbie Szyfer	Review/Discuss/Clarify	7:10-7:50 40'
Next Steps, Observer Questions, Feedback	Debbie Szyfer	Determine/Share	7:50-8:00 10'

Ground Rules

1. Share openly
2. Give and receive constructive feedback
3. Appreciate everyone's ideas
4. Suspend judgment
5. Limit discussions to the topic
6. Do homework and be prepared
7. Abide by decisions made by the facilitator
8. Start and end meetings on time



Walter Johnson Cluster Roundtable Discussion Group

Elementary School Approaches to Address Space Deficits at Walter Johnson Cluster Elementary Schools

Revised May 4, 2016

Approach 1: Open a New Elementary School

Approach 1a: Open New Elementary School; Remove Ashburton Elementary
School Addition

Approach 1b: Open New Elementary School; Remove Ashburton Elementary
School Addition (Build Core Improvements Only)

Approach 2: Reorganize Schools for Grades K–4 in Conjunction with Secondary
School Approach #4

Approach 3: Expand Some of the Elementary Schools for a Capacity of 850-890
Students

Approach 4: Open and Early Childhood Center

Approach 5: Open a New Elementary School and Pair it With Ashburton
Elementary School

Approach 6: Reorganize Schools for Grades K–4 Elementary Schools, Grades
5–8 Middle Schools

Short-term Approaches

Walter Johnson Cluster Roundtable Discussion Group

Elementary School Approaches to Address Space Deficits at

Walter Johnson Cluster Elementary Schools

April 6, 2016

Approach 1: Open a New Elementary School

- Reopen a closed school or open a new school the cluster with a capacity of 740 students by 2035
- Boundary changes would be required to create the service area for the new school
- Maintain current addition project for Ashburton Elementary School of 881 students
- Maintain planned capacity for Luxmanor Elementary School revitalization/expansion project of 740 students

Program Considerations

- Ashburton Elementary School is built to a capacity above MCPS preferred range of enrollment

SCHOOLS	PROJECTED ENROLLMENT *									
	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2025	2030	2035	2040	2045 **
Ashburton										
<i>Program Capacity</i>	652	652	881	881	881					
Enrollment	926	917	895	890	886					
<i>space available</i>	-274	-265	-14	-9	-5					
			<i>Addition opens</i>							
Farmland										
<i>Program Capacity</i>	729	729	729	729	729					
Enrollment	762	755	744	747	745					
<i>space available</i>	-33	-26	-15	-18	-16					
Garrett Park										
<i>Program Capacity</i>	752	752	752	752	752					
Enrollment	874	902	904	902	880					
<i>space available</i>	-122	-150	-152	-150	-128					
Kensington-Parkwood										
<i>Program Capacity</i>	472	746	746	746	746					
Enrollment	672	685	688	706	715					
<i>space available</i>	-200	61	58	40	31					
		<i>Addition opens</i>								
Luxmanor										
<i>Program Capacity</i>	429	429	745	745	745					
Enrollment	457	472	500	512	542					
<i>space available</i>	-28	-43	245	233	203					
			<i>Rev/Ex Comp. Jan. 2020</i>							
Wyngate										
<i>Program Capacity</i>	778	778	778	778	778					
Enrollment	733	740	726	726	745					
<i>space available</i>	45	38	52	52	33					
New Elementary School										
<i>Program Capacity</i>								740	740	740
Enrollment								740	740	740
<i>space available</i>										
								<i>Proposed Opening</i>		
Total Elementary Schools										
<i>Program Capacity</i>	3812	4086	4631	4631	4631	4631	4631	5371	5371	5371
Enrollment	4424	4471	4457	4483	4513	4800	4800	5100	5300	5500
<i>space available</i>	-612	-385	174	148	118	-169	-169	271	71	-129

* Projections from 2035 to 2045 assume complete build-out of White Flint and Kensington sector plans and proposed housing not associated with these sector plans. Total build-out includes 115 single-family detached units, 115 townhouse units, 350 multi-family mid-rise units, and 14,334 multi-family high-rise units. Market conditions and the pace of redevelopment of existing properties could change the number of units built and the timing of full build-out. Most master plans never reach full build-out.

**The projection for 2045 considered peak enrollment. However, the projection for 2045 does not include White Flint II and Rock Spring sector plans, because housing unit counts for these plans are not known at this time. The longer the forecast period, the more error is possible. It is considered equally likely for enrollment to come in below the numbers as it is for enrollment to exceed them.

Walter Johnson Cluster Roundtable Discussion Group

Elementary School Approaches to Address Space Deficits at

Walter Johnson Cluster Elementary Schools

April 6, 2016

Approach 1a: Open a New Elementary School: Remove Ashburton Elementary School Addition

- Reopen a closed school or open a new school the cluster with a capacity of 550 students in 2022
- Boundary changes would be required to create the service area for the new school
- Remove Ashburton Elementary School addition from current Capital Improvements Program and continue to use relocatable classrooms until new school opens
- Maintain current capacity for Luxmanor Elementary School revitalization/expansion project
- Consider additions or new school in the future

Program Considerations

- All schools fall within MCPS preferred range of enrollment

SCHOOLS	PROJECTED ENROLLMENT *									
	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2025	2030	2035	2040	2045 **
Ashburton										
<i>Program Capacity</i>	652	652	652	652	652					
Enrollment	926	917	895	890	886					
<i>space available</i>	-274	-265	-243	-238	-234					
Farmland										
<i>Program Capacity</i>	729	729	729	729	729					
Enrollment	762	755	744	747	745					
<i>space available</i>	-33	-26	-15	-18	-16					
Garrett Park										
<i>Program Capacity</i>	752	752	752	752	752					
Enrollment	874	902	904	902	880					
<i>space available</i>	-122	-150	-152	-150	-128					
Kensington-Parkwood										
<i>Program Capacity</i>	472	746	746	746	746					
Enrollment	672	685	688	706	715					
<i>space available</i>	-200	61	58	40	31					
		<i>Addition opens</i>								
Luxmanor										
<i>Program Capacity</i>	429	429	745	745	745					
Enrollment	457	472	500	512	542					
<i>space available</i>	-28	-43	245	233	203					
			<i>Rev/Ex Comp. Jan. 2020</i>							
Wyngate										
<i>Program Capacity</i>	778	778	778	778	778					
Enrollment	733	740	726	726	745					
<i>space available</i>	45	38	52	52	33					
New Elementary School										
<i>Program Capacity</i>						550	550	740	740	740
Enrollment										
<i>space available</i>						550	550	740	740	740
						<i>Proposed Opening 2022</i>		<i>Proposed Addition</i>		
Total Elementary Schools										
<i>Program Capacity</i>	3812	4086	4402	4402	4402	4952	4952	5142	5142	5142
Enrollment	4424	4471	4457	4483	4513	4800	4800	5100	5300	5500
<i>space available</i>	-612	-385	-55	-81	-111	152	152	42	-158	-358

* Projections from 2035 to 2045 assume complete build-out of White Flint and Kensington sector plans and proposed housing not associated with these sector plans. Total build-out includes 115 single-family detached units, 115 townhouse units, 350 multi-family mid-rise units, and 14,334 multi-family high-rise units. Market conditions and the pace of redevelopment of existing properties could change the number of units built and the timing of full build-out. Most master plans never reach full build-out.

**The projection for 2045 considered peak enrollment. However, the projection for 2045 does not include White Flint II and Rock Spring sector plans, because housing unit counts for these plans are not known at this time. The longer the forecast period, the more error is possible. It is considered equally likely for enrollment to come in below the numbers as it is for enrollment to exceed them.

Walter Johnson Cluster Roundtable Discussion Group

Elementary School Approaches to Address Space Deficits at

Walter Johnson Cluster Elementary Schools

May 4, 2016

Approach 1b: Open a New Elementary School; Remove Ashburton Elementary School Addition (Build Core Improvements Only)

- Reopen a closed school or open a new school the cluster with a capacity of 550 students by 2022
- Boundary changes would be required to create the service area for the new school
- Build only core and support spaces at Ashburton Elementary School and continue to use relocatable classrooms until new school opens
- Maintain planned capacity for Luxmanor Elementary School revitalization/expansion project of 740 students

Program Considerations

- All schools fall within MCPS preferred range of enrollment

SCHOOLS	PROJECTED ENROLLMENT *									
	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2025	2030	2035	2040	2045 **
Ashburton										
<i>Program Capacity</i>	652	652	652	652	652					
Enrollment	926	917	895	890	886					
<i>space available</i>	-274	-265	-243	-238	-234					
Farmland										
<i>Program Capacity</i>	729	729	729	729	729					
Enrollment	762	755	744	747	745					
<i>space available</i>	-33	-26	-15	-18	-16					
Garrett Park										
<i>Program Capacity</i>	752	752	752	752	752					
Enrollment	874	902	904	902	880					
<i>space available</i>	-122	-150	-152	-150	-128					
Kensington-Parkwood										
<i>Program Capacity</i>	472	746	746	746	746					
Enrollment	672	685	688	706	715					
<i>space available</i>	-200	61	58	40	31					
		<i>Addition opens</i>								
Luxmanor										
<i>Program Capacity</i>	429	429	745	745	745					
Enrollment	457	472	500	512	542					
<i>space available</i>	-28	-43	245	233	203					
			<i>Rev/Ex Comp. Jan. 2020</i>							
Wyngate										
<i>Program Capacity</i>	778	778	778	778	778					
Enrollment	733	740	726	726	745					
<i>space available</i>	45	38	52	52	33					
New Elementary School										
<i>Program Capacity</i>						550	550	740	740	740
Enrollment										
<i>space available</i>						550	550	740	740	740
						<i>Proposed Opening 2022</i>		<i>Proposed Addition</i>		
Total Elementary Schools										
<i>Program Capacity</i>	3812	4086	4402	4402	4402	4952	4952	5142	5142	5142
Enrollment	4424	4471	4457	4483	4513	4800	4800	5100	5300	5500
<i>space available</i>	-612	-385	-55	-81	-111	152	152	42	-158	-358

* Projections from 2035 to 2045 assume complete build-out of White Flint and Kensington sector plans and proposed housing not associated with these sector plans. Total build-out includes 115 single-family detached units, 115 townhouse units, 350 multi-family mid-rise units, and 14,334 multi-family high-rise units. Market conditions and the pace of redevelopment of existing properties could change the number of units built and the timing of full build-out. Most master plans never reach full build-out.

**The projection for 2045 considered peak enrollment. However, the projection for 2045 does not include White Flint II and Rock Spring sector plans, because housing unit counts for these plans are not known at this time. The longer the forecast period, the more error is possible. It is considered equally likely for enrollment to come in below the numbers as it is for enrollment to exceed them.

Walter Johnson Cluster Roundtable Discussion Group

Elementary School Approaches to Address Space Deficits at

Walter Johnson Cluster Elementary Schools

April 6, 2016, Revised April 14, 2016

Approach 2: Reorganize Schools for Grades K–4 Elementary Schools in Conjunction with Secondary School

Approach #4

- Reorganize elementary schools for Grades K–4 and middle schools for Grades 5–7, reopen Woodward as a Grades 8–9 school, and reorganize Walter Johnson High School for Grades 10–12 beginning in 2021–2022 school year.
- Reduce size of Ashburton Elementary School addition from 881 to 740 students.
- Build addition at North Bethesda Middle School with a capacity for 1229 students and master plan for 1350 students
- Design capacity of Tilden Middle School revitalization/expansion project for 1200 students with a master planned capacity for 1500 students

Program Considerations

- All elementary schools are built to MCPS preferred range of enrollment
- Grade reorganization impacts current elementary, middle, and high school instructional models and staffing allocations
- Core instruction for Grade 5 students would continue as elementary school

SCHOOLS	PROJECTED ENROLLMENT *									
	2017–18	2018–19	2019–20	2020–21	2021–22	2025	2030	2035	2040	2045 **
Ashburton										
<i>Program Capacity</i>	652	652	740	740	740					
Enrollment	926	917	895	890	741					
<i>space available</i>	-274	-265	-155	-150	-1					
			<i>Addition opens</i>		<i>Reorganize</i>					
Farmland										
<i>Program Capacity</i>	729	729	729	729	729					
Enrollment	762	755	744	747	615					
<i>space available</i>	-33	-26	-15	-18	114					
					<i>Reorganize</i>					
Garrett Park										
<i>Program Capacity</i>	752	752	752	752	752					
Enrollment	874	902	904	902	720					
<i>space available</i>	-122	-150	-152	-150	32					
					<i>Reorganize</i>					
Kensington-Parkwood										
<i>Program Capacity</i>	472	746	746	746	746					
Enrollment	672	685	688	706	595					
<i>space available</i>	-200	61	58	40	151					
		<i>Addition opens</i>			<i>Reorganize</i>					
Luxmanor										
<i>Program Capacity</i>	429	429	745	745	745					
Enrollment	457	472	500	512	455					
<i>space available</i>	-28	-43	245	233	290					
			<i>Rev/Ex Comp. Jan. 2020</i>		<i>Reorganize</i>					
Wyngate										
<i>Program Capacity</i>	778	778	778	778	778					
Enrollment	733	740	726	726	620					
<i>space available</i>	45	38	52	52	158					
					<i>Reorganize</i>					
Total Elementary Schools										
<i>Program Capacity</i>	3812	4086	4490	4490	4490	4490	4490	4490	4490	4490
Enrollment					3746	4000	4000	4250	4420	4585
<i>space available</i>	-612	-385	33	-83	744	490	490	240	70	-95

SCHOOLS	PROJECTED ENROLLMENT *									
	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2025	2030	2035	2040	2045 **
North Bethesda MS										
Program Capacity	864	1229	1229	1229	1229	1229	1229	1229	1350	1350
Enrollment	1183	1200	1206	1194	1154	1270	1300	1255	1310	1325
space available	-319	29	23	35	75	-41	-71	-26	40	25
		<i>Addition opens</i>			<i>Reorganize</i>				<i>Proposed Addition</i>	
Tilden MS										
Program Capacity	939	939	939	1200	1200	1200	1200	1500	1500	1500
Enrollment	959	992	1024	1094	1152	1270	1270	1325	1375	1430
space available	-20	-53	-85	106	48	-70	-70	175	125	70
				<i>Rev/Ex Comp.</i>	<i>Reorganize</i>			<i>Proposed Addition</i>		
Walter Johnson HS										
Program Capacity	2335	2335	2335	2335	2335	2335	2335	2335	2335	2700
Enrollment	2356	2466	2649	2763	2865	2250	2325	2400	2510	2625
space available	-21	-131	-314	-428	-530	85	10	-65	-175	75
					<i>Reorganize</i>					<i>Proposed Addition</i>
Woodward HS										
Program Capacity						1850	1850	1850	1850	1850
Enrollment						1610	1505	1670	1735	1785
space available						240	345	180	115	65
						<i>Reopen 2022</i>				

* Projections from 2035 to 2045 assume complete build-out of White Flint and Kensington sector plans and proposed housing not associated with these sector plans. Total build-out includes 115 single-family detached units, 115 townhouse units, 350 multi-family mid-rise units, and 14,334 multi-family high-rise units. Market conditions and the pace of redevelopment of existing properties could change the number of units built and the timing of full build-out. Most master plans never reach full build-out.

**The projection for 2045 considered peak enrollment. However, the projection for 2045 does not include White Flint II and Rock Spring sector plans, because housing unit counts for these plans are not known at this time. The longer the forecast period, the more error is possible. It is considered equally likely for enrollment to come in below the numbers as it is for enrollment to exceed them.

Walter Johnson Cluster Roundtable Discussion Group

Elementary School Approaches to Address Space Deficits at

Walter Johnson Cluster Elementary Schools

April 6, 2016, Revised April 14, 2016

Approach 3: Expand Some of the Elementary Schools for a Capacity of 850-890 Students

- Expand Kensington-Parkwood and Luxmanor Elementary School for a capacity of 850-890 students and consider boundary changes in the future
- Consider opening a new school in 2045; future boundary changes would be required to create the service area for the school

Program Considerations

- Ashburton, Kensington-Parkwood, and Luxmanor elementary schools are built to a capacity above MCPS preferred range of enrollment
- Possible site constraints at some schools may limit expansions; feasibility studies would be needed to confirm if all schools could be expanded

SCHOOLS	PROJECTED ENROLLMENT *									
	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2025	2030	2035	2040	2045 **
Ashburton										
<i>Program Capacity</i>	652	652	881	881	881					
Enrollment	926	917	895	890	886					
<i>space available</i>	-274	-265	-14	-9	-5					
			<i>Addition opens</i>							
Farmland										
<i>Program Capacity</i>	729	729	729	729	729					
Enrollment	762	755	744	747	745					
<i>space available</i>	-33	-26	-15	-18	-16					
Garrett Park										
<i>Program Capacity</i>	752	752	752	752	752					
Enrollment	874	902	904	902	880					
<i>space available</i>	-122	-150	-152	-150	-128					
Kensington-Parkwood										
<i>Program Capacity</i>	472	746	746	746	878					
Enrollment	672	685	688	706	715					
<i>space available</i>	-200	61	58	40	163					
		<i>Addition Opens</i>			<i>Addition opens</i>					
Luxmanor										
<i>Program Capacity</i>	429	429	877	877	877					
Enrollment	457	472	500	512	542					
<i>space available</i>	-28	-43	377	365	335					
			<i>Rev/Ex Comp. Jan. 2020</i>							
Wygate										
<i>Program Capacity</i>	778	778	778	778	778					
Enrollment	733	740	726	726	745					
<i>space available</i>	45	38	52	52	33					
New Elementary School										
<i>Program Capacity</i>										740
Enrollment										740
<i>space available</i>										<i>Proposed Opening</i>
Total Elementary Schools										
<i>Program Capacity</i>	3812	4086	4763	4763	4895	4895	4895	4895	4895	5635
Enrollment	4424	4471	4457	4483	4513	4800	4800	5100	5300	5500
<i>space available</i>	-612	-385	306	280	382	95	95	-205	-405	135

* Projections from 2035 to 2045 assume complete build-out of White Flint and Kensington sector plans and proposed housing not associated with these sector plans. Total build-out includes 115 single-family detached units, 115 townhouse units, 350 multi-family mid-rise units, and 14,334 multi-family high-rise units. Market conditions and the pace of redevelopment of existing properties could change the number of units built and the timing of full build-out. Most master plans never reach full build-out.

**The projection for 2045 considered peak enrollment. However, the projection for 2045 does not include White Flint II and Rock Spring sector plans, because housing unit counts for these plans are not known at this time. The longer the forecast period, the more error is possible. It is considered equally likely for enrollment to come in below the numbers as it is for enrollment to exceed them.

Walter Johnson Cluster Roundtable Discussion Group

Elementary School Approaches to Address Space Deficits at

Walter Johnson Cluster Elementary Schools

April 6, 2016, Revised April 14, 2016

Approach 4: Open an Early Childhood Center

- Open an early childhood center for Grades prekindergarten and kindergarten students and special education PEP students in the 2021–2022 school year
- Reassign prekindergarten and kindergarten students from Ashburton, Garrett Park, and Luxmanor elementary schools to
- Future boundary changes would be considered
- Consider opening a new school in 2045; future boundary changes would be required to create the service area for the

Program Considerations

- Ashburton Elementary School is built to a capacity above MCPS preferred range of enrollment
- Impact of reassigning kindergarten students to an early childhood center

SCHOOLS	PROJECTED ENROLLMENT *									
	2017–18	2018–19	2019–20	2020–21	2021–22	2025	2030	2035	2040	2045 **
Ashburton										
<i>Program Capacity</i>	652	652	881	881	881					
Enrollment	926	917	895	890	685					
<i>space available</i>	-274	-265	-14	-9	196					
			<i>Addition opens</i>		<i>Reassign pre-K and Kind.</i>					
Farmland										
<i>Program Capacity</i>	729	729	729	729	729					
Enrollment	762	755	744	747	745					
<i>space available</i>	-33	-26	-15	-18	-16					
Garrett Park										
<i>Program Capacity</i>	752	752	752	752	752					
Enrollment	874	902	904	902	740					
<i>space available</i>	-122	-150	-152	-150	12					
					<i>Reassign pre-K and Kind.</i>					
Kensington-Parkwood										
<i>Program Capacity</i>	472	746	746	746	746					
Enrollment	672	685	688	706	715					
<i>space available</i>	-200	61	58	40	31					
		<i>Addition opens</i>								
Luxmanor										
<i>Program Capacity</i>	429	429	745	745	745					
Enrollment	457	472	500	512	435					
<i>space available</i>	-28	-43	245	233	310					
			<i>Rev/Ex Comp. Jan. 2020</i>		<i>Reassign pre-K and Kind.</i>					
Wygate										
<i>Program Capacity</i>	778	778	778	778	778					
Enrollment	733	740	726	726	745					
<i>space available</i>	45	38	52	52	33					
Early Childhood Center										
<i>Program Capacity</i>					350					
Enrollment					313					
<i>space available</i>					37					
					<i>Proposed Opening</i>					
New Elementary School										
<i>Program Capacity</i>										740
Enrollment										740
<i>space available</i>										<i>Proposed Opening</i>
Total Elementary Schools										
<i>Program Capacity</i>	3812	4086	4631	4631	4981	4981	4981	4981	4981	5721
Enrollment	4424	4471	4457	4483	4826	4800	4800	5100	5300	5500
<i>space available</i>	-612	-385	174	148	155	181	181	-119	-319	221

* Projections from 2035 to 2045 assume complete build-out of White Flint and Kensington sector plans and proposed housing not associated with these sector plans. Total build-out includes 115 single-family detached units, 115 townhouse units, 350 multi-family mid-rise units, and 14,334 multi-family high-rise units. Market conditions and the pace of redevelopment of existing properties could change the number of units built and the timing of full build-out. Most master plans never reach full build-out.

**The projection for 2045 considered peak enrollment. However, the projection for 2045 does not include White Flint II and Rock Spring sector plans, because housing unit counts for these plans are not known at this time. The longer the forecast period, the more error is possible. It is considered equally likely for enrollment to come in below the numbers as it is for enrollment to exceed them.

Walter Johnson Cluster Roundtable Discussion Group

Elementary School Approaches to Address Space Deficits at

Walter Johnson Cluster Elementary Schools

April 6, 2016

Approach 5: Open a New Elementary School and Pair It With Ashburton Elementary School

- Reopen a closed school or open a new school in the cluster and pair it with Ashburton Elementary School
- New school would serve Grades pre-K-2 and Ashburton Elementary School would serve Grades 3-5
- Remove Ashburton Elementary School addition from Capital Improvements Program because current facility could accommodate Grades 3-5 program
- Reassign students from Garrett Park Elementary School to the paired schools

Program Considerations

- Creates a set of paired schools with a primary school and upper grade school
- Transportation considerations with a paired school

SCHOOLS	PROJECTED ENROLLMENT *									
	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2025	2030	2035	2040	2045 **
Ashburton										
<i>Program Capacity</i>	652	652	652	652	713					
Enrollment	926	917	895	890	640					
<i>space available</i>	-274	-265	-243	-238	73					
					<i>Reor- ganize</i>					
New School										
<i>Program Capacity</i>					736					
Enrollment					684					
<i>space available</i>					52					
					<i>Reor- ganize</i>					
Farmland										
<i>Program Capacity</i>	729	729	729	729	729					
Enrollment	762	755	744	747	745					
<i>space available</i>	-33	-26	-15	-18	-16					
Garrett Park										
<i>Program Capacity</i>	752	752	752	752	752					
Enrollment	874	902	904	902	442					
<i>space available</i>	-122	-150	-152	-150	310					
					<i>Reassign students</i>					
Kensington-Parkwood										
<i>Program Capacity</i>	472	746	746	746	746					
Enrollment	672	685	688	706	715					
<i>space available</i>	-200	61	58	40	31					
Luxmanor										
<i>Program Capacity</i>	429	429	745	745	745					
Enrollment	457	472	500	512	542					
<i>space available</i>	-28	-43	245	233	203					
			<i>Rev/Ex Comp. Jan. 2020</i>							
Wyngate										
<i>Program Capacity</i>	778	778	778	778	778					
Enrollment	733	740	726	726	745					
<i>space available</i>	45	38	52	52	33					
Total Elementary Schools										
<i>Program Capacity</i>	3812	4086	4402	4402	5199	5199	5199	5199	5199	5199
Enrollment	4424	4471	4457	4483	4513	4800	4800	5100	5300	5500
<i>space available</i>	-612	-385	-55	-81	686	399	399	99	-101	-301

* Projections from 2035 to 2045 assume complete build-out of White Flint and Kensington sector plans and proposed housing not associated with these sector plans. Total build-out includes 115 single-family detached units, 115 townhouse units, 350 multi-family mid-rise units, and 14,334 multi-family high-rise units. Market conditions and the pace of redevelopment of existing properties could change the number of units built and the timing of full build-out. Most master plans never reach full build-out.

**The projection for 2045 considered peak enrollment. However, the projection for 2045 does not include White Flint II and Rock Spring sector plans, because housing unit counts for these plans are not known at this time. The longer the forecast period, the more error is possible. It is considered equally likely for enrollment to come in below the numbers as it is for enrollment to exceed them.

Walter Johnson Cluster Roundtable Discussion Group

Elementary School Approaches to Address Space Deficits at

Walter Johnson Cluster Elementary Schools

May 4, 2016

Approach 6: Reorganize Schools for Grades K–4 Elementary Schools, Grades 5–8 Middle Schools

- Reorganize elementary schools for Grades K–4 and middle schools for Grades 5–8, reopen Woodward as a Grades 5–8 beginning in 2021–2022 school year.
- Reduce size of Ashburton Elementary School addition from 881 to 740 students.
- Build addition at North Bethesda Middle School with a capacity for 1229 students
- Design capacity of Tilden Middle School revitalization/expansion project for 1200 students
- Boundary reassgments would be required at the middle school

Program Considerations

- All elementary school and middle schools are built to MCPS preferred range of enrollment
- Grade reorganization impacts current elementary and middle instructional models and staffing allocations
- Core instruction for Grade 5 students would continue as elementary school model

SCHOOLS	PROJECTED ENROLLMENT *									
	2017–18	2018–19	2019–20	2020–21	2021–22	2025	2030	2035	2040	2045 **
Ashburton										
<i>Program Capacity</i>	652	652	740	740	740					
Enrollment	926	917	895	890	886					
<i>space available</i>	-274	-265	-155	-150	-146					
			<i>Addition opens</i>							
Farmland										
<i>Program Capacity</i>	729	729	729	729	729					
Enrollment	762	755	744	747	745					
<i>space available</i>	-33	-26	-15	-18	-16					
Garrett Park										
<i>Program Capacity</i>	752	752	752	752	752					
Enrollment	874	902	904	902	880					
<i>space available</i>	-122	-150	-152	-150	-128					
Kensington-Parkwood										
<i>Program Capacity</i>	472	746	746	746	746					
Enrollment	672	685	688	706	715					
<i>space available</i>	-200	61	58	40	31					
		<i>Addition opens</i>								
Luxmanor										
<i>Program Capacity</i>	429	429	745	745	745					
Enrollment	457	472	500	512	542					
<i>space available</i>	-28	-43	245	233	203					
			<i>Rev/Ex Comp. Jan. 2020</i>							
Wyngate										
<i>Program Capacity</i>	778	778	778	778	778					
Enrollment	733	740	726	726	745					
<i>space available</i>	45	38	52	52	33					
Total Elementary Schools										
<i>Program Capacity</i>	3812	4086	4490	4490	4490	4490	4490	4490	4490	4490
Enrollment	4000	4000	4250	4420	4585	4000	4000	4250	4420	4585
<i>space available</i>	-612	-385	33	-83	4490	490	490	240	70	-95
						<i>Reorganize</i>				

SCHOOLS	PROJECTED ENROLLMENT *									
	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2025	2030	2035	2040	2045 **
North Bethesda MS										
Program Capacity	864	1229	1229	1229	1229	1229	1229	1229	1229	1229
Enrollment	1183	1200	1206	1194	1181	1133	1057	1140	1182	1207
space available	-319	29	23	35	48	96	172	89	47	22
		<i>Addition opens</i>				<i>Reorganize</i>				
Tilden MS										
Program Capacity	939	939	939	1200	1200	1200	1200	1200	1200	1200
Enrollment	959	992	1024	1094	1132	1133	1057	1140	1182	1207
space available	-20	-53	-85	106	68	67	143	60	18	-7
				<i>Rev/Ex Comp.</i>		<i>Reorganize</i>				
Woodward MS										
Program Capacity						1200	1200	1200	1200	1200
Enrollment						1133	1057	1140	1182	1207
space available						67	143	60	18	-7
						<i>Reopen 2022</i>				
Walter Johnson HS										
Program Capacity	2335	2335	2335	3000	3000	3000	3000	3000	3600	3600
Enrollment	2356	2466	2649	2763	2865	3000	3100	3200	3350	3500
space available	-21	-131	-314	237	135	0	-100	-200	250	100
	<i>Begin Planning</i>			<i>Proposed Addition</i>					<i>Proposed Addition</i>	

* Projections from 2035 to 2045 assume complete build-out of White Flint and Kensington sector plans and proposed housing not associated with these sector plans. Total build-out includes 115 single-family detached units, 115 townhouse units, 350 multi-family mid-rise units, and 14,334 multi-family high-rise units. Market conditions and the pace of redevelopment of existing properties could change the number of units built and the timing of full build-out. Most master plans never reach full build-out.

**The projection for 2045 considered peak enrollment. However, the projection for 2045 does not include White Flint II and Rock Spring sector plans, because housing unit counts for these plans are not known at this time. The longer the forecast period, the more error is possible. It is considered equally likely for enrollment to come in below the numbers as it is for enrollment to exceed them.

Walter Johnson Cluster Roundtable Discussion Group

Elementary School Approaches to Address Space Deficits at

Walter Johnson Cluster Elementary Schools

May 4, 2016

Short-Term Elementary School Solutions

1. Reassign students to Luxmanor Elementary School after the revitalization/expansion project is complete

Consider reassignment of students from one or more schools where the enrollment exceeds capacity to Luxmanor Elementary School after the revitalization/expansion project is complete

2. Create a grade level annex at a closed school for Ashburton Elementary School

Consider moving a grade level (such as Kindergarten or Grade 5) temporarily from Ashburton to another facility (such as a closed school or commercial building) until permanent space can be constructed.

Walter Johnson Roundtable Discussion Group

Summary of Meeting #6 — April 21, 2016

The Walter Johnson Cluster Roundtable Discussion Group (Roundtable) met for its sixth meeting on April 21, 2016. The meeting was held in the cafeteria of Walter Johnson High School from 7:00 p.m. to 9:15 p.m... The materials handed out at the meeting follow this summary.

Ms. Deborah S. Szyfer, senior planner, Division of Long-range Planning, Department of Facilities Management, Montgomery County Public Schools (MCPS), facilitated the meeting. Ms. Szyfer reviewed the agenda and outcomes for the meetings.

Roundtable members shared the pros/cons of each elementary school approach. The pros/cons for each elementary school are attached.

Following the sharing of pros/cons for the first round of elementary school approaches, Ms. Szyfer facilitated a brainstorm session for a second round of elementary school approaches. The following are a list of possible second round of elementary school approaches:

- Only build core and support spaces at Ashburton Elementary School with no classroom space
- Grades 5–8 model (Includes K–4 and Grades 9–12)
- How early can we open an elementary school by removing current capacity projects?
- Short-term-reassign students at the elementary school to alleviate over utilization
- Make all schools Grades K–6 by building a new elementary school with a capacity of 740, middle school for Grades 7–8
- Temp/short-term solution for Ashburton Elementary School by transferring PEP/Pre-K to Luxmanor Elementary School
- Create annex for one grade for Ashburton Elementary School

For the first suggestion, Ms. Szyfer explained that the numbers in the table would not look any different than Approach 1a if no classrooms are added. She added that Ashburton is not the only school with an undersized multipurpose rooms and many other schools face similar situations managing being over capacity with small multipurpose rooms. She also explained that a core space addition has not been done before. As a point of clarification, since the handouts from the last meeting.

Roundtable members shared the pros/cons for the second round of secondary school approaches the pros/cons are attached to this summary.

Ms. Szyfer explained the process of putting together the report. She will collect each roundtable member's evaluation and all evaluations will be an appendix to the report. Evaluation forms will be sent out next week and will be due in late May. The committee will have an opportunity to

review the report. PTA position papers will become part of the report and will be due in late May. The Google form input will be summarized and will be another appendix to the report.

Ms. Szyfer stated that normally with a recommendation there is funding tied to it and reminded the Roundtable that the most pressing issue in the six years is at Walter Johnson High School. The recommendation could but may not necessarily address the full cluster and will come out as a supplement to the CIP in mid-October. The recommendation will be sent out to all Roundtable members when it is released. Dates for the CIP will be published in June on the last page of the FY17 Educational Facilities Master Plan.

Feedback forms were collected. The next meeting will be held on Wednesday May 4, 2016 at Walter Johnson High School, 6400 Rock Spring Drive, Bethesda, Maryland, in the cafeteria. At this meeting additional elementary school approaches will be presented. As a reminder, the second public information meeting will be held on Wednesday, May 11, 2016 in the cafeteria at Walter Johnson High School. At that meeting the approaches will be presented and there will be an opportunity for questions and answers.

Walter Johnson Cluster Roundtable Discussion Group

Elementary Schools Approach 1 April 21, 2016

Pros	Cons
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ashburton Elementary School gets relief the fastest * • Smaller school more ultimate experience ***** • Enrollment is already at Ashburton Elementary School to justify the addition and relief ***** • Additional school to absorb capacity ***** • Another school added ***** • More programming opportunities ***** • More schools will meet the MCPS preferred size guidelines ***** • Accommodates White Flint development * 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Too far in future/timing solution ***** • Garrett Park Elementary School stays overcrowded for long time **** • Other schools remain overcrowded for long time ***** • Boundary study required ***** • Ashburton Elementary School is bigger than Board of Education standards **** • School exceeds state guidelines • Could include redistricting of some families outside cluster *

Walter Johnson Cluster Roundtable Discussion Group

Elementary Schools Approach 1A April 21, 2016

Pros	Cons
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Smaller Ashburton Elementary School long-term * • New school ***** • Most schools meet MCPS size guidelines ***** • More programming opportunities * • Long term solution *** • Moves up timing for new school by 10 years from approach #1 ***** • Earlier opening of 7th elementary school ***** 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No relief for Ashburton Elementary School for 10 years ***** • Too many kids in portables at Ashburton Elementary School for too long *** • Lousy solution for Ashburton Elementary School * • Potential reassignment of Ashburton Elementary School students ** • Garrett park Elementary School stays overcrowded for long times ***** • Still requires a boundary study for Garrett Park Elementary School • Exceeds state size guidelines *** • Time to implement too long ***** • Need to redistrict, loss of community

Walter Johnson Cluster Roundtable Discussion Group

Elementary Schools Approach 2 April 21, 2016

Pros	Cons
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduces crowding at high school • Alleviate overcrowding at elementary schools** • Smaller schools ** • Benefit for 5th graders on accelerated track * • Could provide opportunities for 5th grade students to take middle school classes ** • Force earlier availability of middle school space • Time to implement * • Some employees might be interested in dual educational opportunities with new grade level* 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More school transitions *** • Split articulation in elementary school would be difficult on students and parents. The extra transitions would be hard on students during earlier years *** • Pushing 5th graders to be old too fast • Result in social-emotional issues **** • Concerns with restructuring of schools *** • Developmental differences between 5th and 7th graders **** • Transition could be tough for kids **** • Difficult for parents juggling kids at different schools ***** • Transportation costs increases ***** • Kids will have to attend more schools (4) from Grades K–12 • Challenges for kids on academic accelerated track *** • Program issues ***** • Related middle school plan that makes it hard for kids on accelerated track • Missing high school experience * • Families would need to pay to join and be active in 4 different PTAs if they have children at all 4 levels** • Logistics **** • Cuts across all levels of schooling (elementary, middle, and high school) ***** • Every student in entire cluster affected • Parents have to split their energy resources among too many schools (community is less strong) • Still requires a boundary study * • Teachers would require additional accreditation ***** • Middle schools do not benefit from overcrowding **

Walter Johnson Cluster Roundtable Discussion Group

Elementary Schools Approach 3 April 21, 2016

Pros	Cons
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No redistricting • Builds capacity for the future • Could solve cluster wide overcrowding • Time to implement * • Keeps neighborhoods together but there will be redistricting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Large Elementary schools • Way too large ***** • Bigger is not better **** • Cluster would be the only ones in the county with three large elementary schools without a draw for the community resale *** • Schools larger than state recommended and MCPS recommendations ***** • Large schools difficult for special needs kids • Managing a large school is more challenging ***** • Kensington-Parkwood Elementary School community may not support • Ashburton Elementary School community does not support • Will not be supported by Luxmanor Elementary School community * • Adds cost and delays current rev/ex plan for Luxmanor ES * • Pushes out the need for a new elementary by 10 years ** • Parents are skeptical that they won't get even larger *** • Not a long term solution *** • If PEP declines anywhere empty space can't close a school * • Won't be enough room for lunch/core space * • Lack of parity in cluster elementary school sizes • Increased traffic in local neighborhoods not built for the large size **** • Student safety for walkers an issue with so many cars/busses *** • Would permit county to continue building ** • Still requires a boundary study *

Walter Johnson Cluster Roundtable Discussion Group

Elementary Schools Approach 4 April 21, 2016

Pros	Cons
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should provide easier transition to kindergarten * • Most schools will meet the MCPS preferred size guidelines ** • Prekindergarten and kindergarten students are more developmentally similar **** • Time to implement ** • Opens up space in elementary schools***** • Financially cheaper to house prekindergarten and kindergarten students at smaller existing school site * • Classrooms can be specifically built for this age group ***** • Fewer kids in smaller schools ** • Provides more prekindergarten offerings *** 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Long bus rides/distances for young students *** • Split articulation ***** • It would be possible for a family to have children at both levels, so families would have to commute to two schools **** • No bang for buck, capacity still an issue ** • Horrible morning drop off/afternoon pick up scheduling/commutes if families had kids at 2 schools ** • No opportunity for 5th grades to mentor kindergarten students ** • Cluster schools would not be consistent with other MCPS schools ***** • Multiple PTAs to join and school events to attend (back to school, etc.)(limits parent resources time and energy) ***** • Size of elementary schools exceed state recommended guidelines ***** • Too many transitions for kids (Prekindergarten to K, K to 1) in a short time **** • No older kids with younger students on buses; safety patrol challenged **** • Too creative, doesn't meet the need • All the costs of opening a new school opening a closed school but few of the universal benefits ** • Less flexibility for teachers ** • Transitions hard for this age, especially for special needs kids ***

Walter Johnson Cluster Roundtable Discussion Group

Elementary Schools Approach 5 April 21, 2016

Pros	Cons
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time to implement ***** • Paired PTA and school events ** • MCPS precedent exists for this approach *** • Ashburton Elementary School will not be as big ***** • Alleviates the overcrowding in the two most crowded school ***** 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transportation costs increase *** • No longevity at same school ***** • Too many transitions for kids ***** • Will result in boundary study that could affect more than just 2 schools listed ** • Can't see benefit over approaches 1 and 1A • Value to younger kids having older kids as role models • School schedules impacted with stop/start times • No flexibility if large class sizes move in "bubbles" through schools ** • No addition for Ashburton Elementary School; need relief in short term *** • Logistically challenging for families ***** • MCPS staff and communities seem relieved when school return to typical program ** • During transition family could have students at 2 different middle schools • Complicated *

Walter Johnson Cluster Roundtable Discussion Group

Secondary Schools Approach 1

March 16, 2016

Pros	Cons
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removes any chance of being redistricted out of cluster **** • More program, more educational activities more AP classes, etc.**** • Possible in near term***** • Everyone in Walter Johnson cluster graduates with Walter Johnson on their diploma**** • Good to have breadth of course offerings *** • Can we think about how to use/optimize technology to make classes smaller? • Larger Walter Johnson community remains intact ** • Elite sports teams, best of best • Maintain reputation of schools** • Kids go to same high school through the four years * • Cheapest, quickest short-term remedy * • Ranked 1st by several parents • Can address size of school with through schools within schools 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Elite sports teams only best of the best *** • Students will get lost in the crowd – no personalized learning • More competition for college entrance/acceptance ***** • Limited number of college acceptance per school ***** • Adversely affects students with IEPs (ADHD, anxiety, depression, etc.)? How can they be expected to navigate through a mega school? **** • Fear that very big schools will not serve needs of special education/learning disabled students **** • Issues with personalized education ** • Extracurricular activities too competitive; too few students get to participate versus smaller high school ***** • Too many bodies in the building for safe operation ***** • Exceeds state and MCPS school size guidelines **** • Community can't absorb the additional traffic ***** • Students safety because of more traffic (drivers and walkers) **** • Walter Johnson property is fixed in acreage so there would be a loss of green space with addition ***** • Graduation limitations ***** • Overtaxing for administration and counselors ***** • Size of middle schools still huge ***** • Limited opportunity for participation in after school sports, arts, etc.***** • Does not foster a sense of community and cannot fit the community at events such as concerts, theater, sports ***** • Lack of parking for events such as concerts, theatre, sports * • Navigating physical building***** • Large number causes kids to get lost in the crowded hallways, internal traffic **** • Addition would reduce green space on Walter Johnson site*** • Logistics for pick-up/parents *****

Walter Johnson Cluster Roundtable Discussion Group

Secondary Schools Approach 2

March 16, 2016

Pros	Cons
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Possibility of becoming a consortium • Opportunity for magnet or specifically program at high school level ***** • Long term solution that accommodates Walter Johnson cluster (and possible surrounding high school capacity issues) ***** • Better safety net for students and options for special education needs ***** • Woodward reputation * • Student safety (drivers and walkers) ***** • Two high schools that meet state and MCPS size guidelines ***** • Smaller school is more personal ***** • More opportunities for college acceptance because of more leadership positions and more extracurricular opportunities *** • Builds sense of community immediately and long-term ***** • Smaller teams at grade level ***** • More opportunity for extracurricular activities ***** • More access to administration and counseling • Smaller school and student body ***** • More opportunities for activities that colleges look at such as lead in plays first chair in band/orchestra, etc. ** 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Split articulation from middle to high school may be a possibility **** • Possibility of becoming a consortium • Fewer courses offered ** • Additional school not feasible as a near/mid-term solution ***** • Deciding boundaries for Walter Johnson-Woodward split ***** • Size of middle schools *** • Can't start improvements for Woodward until Tilden Middle School leaves facility in 2020 *** • If Woodward is not revitalized/expanded, students will be sent from top high school (Walter Johnson) to 2nd class school (Woodward) *** • Woodward might not get revitalized/expanded just renovated ** • Woodward needs to be totally rebuilt (time/cost issue) ***** • Walter Johnson High School would have large excess capacity that would need filling • Loss of holding school *

Walter Johnson Cluster Roundtable Discussion Group

Secondary Schools Approach 3

March 16, 2016

Pros	Cons
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How many students would need to be transported between schools • All students graduate from Walter Johnson High School *** • Smaller schools ***** • Two campuses still one school • Reduces number of kids in building * • More individualized attention 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exceeds state and MCPS guidelines **** • Splits school which diminishes high school experience for Grade 9 and 10 students ***** • Doesn't change size of graduating class ***** • Closed campus for Grade 9 and Grade 10 (no open lunch) • Transporting students between building ***** • School still too big for students with IEPs • Limited number/more competition of college acceptance **** • Average kids may get lost in high populated schools *** • Loses opportunity to take full breath of classes *** • Over taxing on administration and counselors ***** • Scheduling challenge for some classes that are appropriate for all grade levels. Would teachers teach at both campuses? ***** • Age segregation ** • Time to implement ***** • Security issue * • Difficult for Grade 9 who are taking upper level classes **** • Limited extra-curricular activities for students *****

Walter Johnson Cluster Roundtable Discussion Group

Secondary Schools Approach 4

March 16, 2016

Pros	Cons
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Walter Johnson High School building can accommodate the number of students without an addition ***** • Both middle schools stay at 1,000 students (no addition needed) ***** • Keeps younger students separate from older students* • Possibly the most cost effective ** • Elevated issues at both middle and high HS level *** • Grade 8 students could easily take Grade 9 classes *** • Separated Grade 8 from Grade 6 at key developmental stage *** • Creates more bonding across Grade 9 * • Similar to Grade 9 academy at Blair High School or “wing” in Howard county ** • Everyone graduates from Walter Johnson High School * • Keeps Walter Johnson High School at current size * • Some kids already switch schools and some classes * 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Doesn't change size of graduating class * • Grades 8 and Grades 9 cannot do high school activities ***** • Diminished experience for Grade 8 and Grade 9 students ***** • Limited extracurricular activities ***** • Grades 8 and Grades 9 cannot compete with middle school/high school opportunities ***** • Upsets the academic structure ***** • Average kids may get lost in highly populated schools **** • Infrastructure busses ***** • Developmental challenges for Grade 8 and Grade 9 pairing **** • Not a possible solution in near term ***** • Grade 9 students need to be in a high school environment ***** • Concerns with implementation of athletics and sports * • Sports competition is affected ***** • College acceptance limited # per school ***** • Different teacher certifications for Grade 8 and Grade 9 *

Walter Johnson Cluster Roundtable Discussion Group

Secondary Schools Approach 5

March 16, 2016

Pros	Cons
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could block schedules help transportation and availability of all classes? • Similar to college schedules/campuses *** • Cost effective short term option ** • More parking * • Kids would get exercise • Happens sooner rather than later ** • Probable easier to get space for an annex than to get land for a school * • Keeps some curricular /extracurricular opportunities • Lots of private schools make it work • Connected community as all students would graduate from one school **** • If it came with a field than could be supported * • Reduces overcrowding in physical building ** • Only support as a short term option * • The actual space available may be a good fit (class, etc.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kids would have to walk ***** • Not clear that there is any cost savings * • Doesn't solve the issue of one football team, one play, etc. *** • Some duplication of administrative positions and nurses **** • Only a temporary solution ***** • Only deals with high school capacity issues **** • Solution to get kids out of the building is not a lofty education goal *** • Kids may not like this approach because they may not feel like they are part of school ** • More competition for college entrance/acceptance ** • College acceptance- limited # per school * • Average kids may be lost in big school **** • Graduating class too big • Current and future residents could be turned off – bad for property values • Students have to cross streets ***** • Concern with safety and security ***** • Scheduling difficulties ***** • Logistics * • Course limit/course availability • The actual space available may not be a good fit • Long, dangerous walk

Walter Johnson Cluster Roundtable Discussion Group

Secondary Schools Approach 6

March 16, 2016

Pros	Cons
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time frame earlier solution * • Grade 11 and Grade 12 only partial day at school * • Helps schedule for internship * 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hurts students who need to work for family income and/or college savings ***** • Need for extra-curricular in order to achieve parity ***** • Doesn't seem to help anything ** • Overall reaction was ridiculous***** • Does not work ***** • Difficult to schedule ***** • Could be logistically challenging/burdensome regarding busses***** • Kids could not have after school jobs***** • Families lose option for older kids to take care of younger kids/siblings*** • Different bus schedule than rest of county ***** • Increases traffic to the community more often than one start one end time/student safety • Negative impact for teachers**** • Less opportunity to participate in sports/extra school activities *****

Walter Johnson Cluster Roundtable Discussion Group

Secondary Schools Approach 7

March 16, 2016

Pros	Cons
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prep for college courses online *** • Could supplement another approach ***** • MCPS is already implementing at some schools ** • Positive for motivated students * • Immediate implementation * • Deals with kids in an “online” world that they understand 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For part of the day, the school is still fully populated, maybe 3200 students ** • Limited opportunities ** • Does not relieve capacity ***** • Might impact social development and communication skills **** • No supervision ***** • No monitoring of grades ** • Still have large graduating class sizes *** • Less student engagement ***** • Less opportunities for extracurricular activities*** • Not good approach for unmotivated students **** • Online classes not uniform ** • Unclear how this would impact students of 504 plans/IEPs ** • Still have a lot of competition for college entrance/acceptance • Course need to be developed, improved, etc. • Could take staff time away from other activities

Walter Johnson Cluster Roundtable Discussion Group

Secondary Schools Approach 8

March 16, 2016

Pros	Cons
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relieves capacity issues ***** • All schools meet state and MCPS guidelines ***** • Long term solution ***** • More opportunity for extra-curricular *** • More leadership opportunities for students ***** • Better for college application **opportunities (colleges only take certain number of students from each high school • Smaller middle schools would provide more personal attention for students ***** • More personalized education at high school *** • Get land from a development plan – same portion paid by developers rather than taxpayers (for middle school) ** • Creates three smaller middle school in long run *** • All pros of #2 • Allows for future growth ** • Smaller schools better for special education needs, both socially and academically** 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need land ***** • Time to implement ***** • Extra capacity at Walter Johnson High School would need to be filled • Redistricting—loss of tradition • Could affect property values • For high school level not Walter Johnson cluster anymore • Will likely require tax increases • Middle school would need a boundary study to decide which kids attend new school • Fewer courses • More expensive *** • Possibility that there is no relief for middle schools • No intermediate relief for middle schools (North Bethesda Middle School addition eliminated)

Walter Johnson Cluster Roundtable Discussion Group

Secondary Schools Approach 9 April 21, 2016

Pros	Cons
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Smaller middle school ** • 2 new schools address overcrowding at Walter Johnson High School and North Bethesda Middle School *** • Extra capacity at Walter Johnson High School could allow for other ways to increase enrollment * • Could provide a specialty school in this part of county ** • More personalized education • More access to administration and counseling • Quality of experience in middle school better • Consortium where you have two high schools within cluster like DCC • Reduce size of Walter Johnson High School** • Smaller schools better for students ** • Will alleviate Tilden/North Bethesda Middle School capacities • Good access to schools from Old Georgetown Road • Most gain/least pain • Long term solution that accommodates Walter Johnson High School and possibly surrounding HS capacity issues *** • Flexibility of space use depending on enrollment at high school and middle school • More opportunity for sports and extracurricular activities ** • Collocation could save money in construction • Size of high school and middle school meets state and MCPS recommended guidelines (smaller schools) • Makes Woodward Grades 9–12 school • Quality of experience in MS better • More leadership opportunities better college applications ** 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Small footprint for both schools* • Redistricting and impact on property value impact on community • Not enough land to accommodate both schools *** • Transportation • Logistics of shared spaces • Enough field space for middle and high schools during and after school ** • Proximity to Walter Johnson High School to make for an awkward cluster boundary*** • Negative if same kids form a middle school to one high school some go to another ** • Special programs • Taller building • Safety • Bell times • 6th graders on same site as 12 graders ** • Funding availability/cost • Extra capacity at Walter Johnson High School but can be used for magnet or special program • Time to implement consider keeping 9th grade at Tilden/North Bethesda middle schools temporarily during Woodward revitalization/expansion • Negative if Tilden Middle School goes to one HS and North Bethesda Middle School goes to another • Two high schools in one cluster • Limit space for future high school expansion • Woodward would take time to develop reputation

Walter Johnson Cluster Roundtable Discussion Group

Secondary Schools Approach 10 April 21, 2016

Pros	Cons
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Takes care of space issue efficiently • New high school not be needed to address Walter Johnson High School overcrowding** • Everyone graduates from Walter Johnson High School ** • Reduces crowding at middle school ** • Relaxed progression to high school for non-accelerated students • MCPS used to have some high schools that were Grades 10–12 • Creates 3 smaller middle schools in the long-term • Alleviates issues at both middle school and high school levels • History and English would likely be okay and will likely have capacity to run biology and geometry • Similar to a 9th grade academy at Montgomery Blair High School • 8th grade could easily take 9th grade classes • Separates 8th grade from 6th grade during a key developmental stage ** • Create bonding across 9th grade • Saves money 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change in physical and emotional development between 6th and 9th graders** • Schedule conflict • Creates a 3 year high school when Montgomery County typically has a 4 year high school** • APEX and ACES probably become Grades 10–12 programs *** • Creates logistics of activities and programs ** • Staffing issues ** • 9th graders in a middle school wouldn't feel like a high school student *** • Only cluster with this grade reassignment • 9th graders would have limited availability to high classes and would not feel like part of the high school community ***** • Logistical issues for an accelerated student wanting to take advance classes • Concern with property values • Still large school • Too many transitions • Logistics of math(above geometry) and language classes for Grade 8 and 9 students and extracurricular activities • Provide transportation for specialty and singleton classes • 2 middle schools so close together • Tradition • Safety • Bell times • No reputation • Program issues

**Walter Johnson Cluster
Roundtable Discussion Group**