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**Standing Members:**
Kimberly Alonzo, School Administration
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Brady Cantrell, Parent
Kim Danaher, Parent
Kyle Gorrell, District Administration
Hilary Graves, Parent and PTA
Keith Henry, District Administration
Chad Hertzog, School Administration
Laurel Hogue, Higher Education and Parent
Dr. Greg Johnson, School Administration and Parent
Dr. Jennifer Kephart, District Administration
Blake Little, Teacher and Parent
Tim Mathes, Parent
Dena Mezger, City – Public Works
Dr. Emily Miller, District Administration
Radell Oakman, Parent
Jon Plaas, Business Roundtable
Tracy Sample, School Administration
Dr. David Sharp, District Administration
Joe Snook, City- Parks & Recreation
Jennifer Stevenson, SLP
Judy Taylor, Community Member
Kelly Wachel, District Administration
Sonja Wald, Parent
Tony Yarbrough, Parent
Dr. Dennis Carpenter, Superintendent
Dr. Katie Collier, District Administration
Dr. Deborah Delsemme, District Administration

**Ex Officio Members:**
Dr. Dennis Carpenter, Superintendent
Dr. Katie Collier, District Administration
Dr. Deborah Delsemme, District Administration
Dan Mullen, District Administration
Wesley Metz, Chief Financial Officer

Dan Mullen, District Administration
Wesley Metz, Chief Financial Officer
Charge of the CFMP Team

Phase I:
- Consider projected enrollment growth
- Determine appropriate capacity threshold
- Relieve overcrowding
- Keep enrollments within building capacities
- Optimize district operations
- Create bus routes that are logistically feasible, financially viable, and within reasonable time frames

Phase II:
- Consider developmental needs of pre-K-12 students
- Identify model future ready learning environments
- Develop a 5 to 10 year plan to incorporate future learning environments in pre-K-12 educational settings
Current Work Status

Projects Completed

- Phase I boundary recommendations
- LSR7 Playbook
- 6th grade to middle school recommendation
- Elementary theme-based recommendation
- Early Education recommendation
- RFQ for architectural services
- Communication of walk zones

Work to Continue

- Secondary program expansion study
- Furniture standards recommendation
- RFP for Construction Manager at Risk
- Communication of secondary bus consolidation
- EL and Special Services programming
- Year-round school options
6th Grade to Middle School Study Team

Facilitated by Dr. Katie Collier, Associate Superintendent of Instructional Services
Review current and best practices to make implementation recommendations relative to feasibility and benefits of moving sixth grade to middle school. The tasks assigned to the team included the following:

- Explore research relative to middle school concept inclusive of sixth grade and minus sixth grade students
- Examine the impacts to related areas: facilities, human resources, scheduling, transportation, special services, extra-curricular, curriculum transition, etc.
- Determine community and staff support for this transition
- Develop implementation recommendations that align a smooth transition for students and staff
Guiding Questions

• Q1 What are the benefits to school capacity issues by moving sixth grade to middle school?
• Q2 What are the implications to facilities to accommodate moving sixth graders to current R7 middle schools?
• Q3 How are the social, emotional, and behavioral needs of the sixth grade student (early adolescent) best fostered and in what setting?
• Q4 What are the implications to curriculum and instructional programming when moving sixth grade to middle school?
• Q5 What is the fiscal impact to moving sixth grade to middle school?
• Q6 What are the perspectives and opinions of staff, parents, and students on the issue of moving sixth graders to middle school?
## 2018-19 Building Capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building</th>
<th>17-18 Enrollment</th>
<th>18-19 Enrollment</th>
<th>FY18 to FY19 Enrollment Change</th>
<th>5 year Enrollment Change</th>
<th>10 year Enrollment Change</th>
<th>10 year Enrollment % Change</th>
<th>% Program Capacity</th>
<th>Design Capacity</th>
<th>Program Capacity</th>
<th>85% Program Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elementary</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Creek</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>21.04%</td>
<td>up</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>538.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwood</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>-1.55%</td>
<td>even</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>439.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawthorn Hill</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>52.98%</td>
<td>up</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>538.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazel Grove</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>14.50%</td>
<td>up</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>419.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland Park</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>16.96%</td>
<td>up</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>538.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee's Summit</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9.60%</td>
<td>up</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>279.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longview Farm</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>-39</td>
<td>-65</td>
<td>-105</td>
<td>-20.19%</td>
<td>down</td>
<td>79.0%</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mason</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>68.95%</td>
<td>up</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>379.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meadow Lane</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-58</td>
<td>-159</td>
<td>-24.73%</td>
<td>down</td>
<td>101.4%</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant Lea</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>-26</td>
<td>-35</td>
<td>-81</td>
<td>-16.23%</td>
<td>down</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prairie View</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>751</td>
<td>-41</td>
<td>-43</td>
<td>-124</td>
<td>-16.51%</td>
<td>down</td>
<td>72.6%</td>
<td>1,151</td>
<td>1,034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richardson</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>-91</td>
<td>-155</td>
<td>-25.04%</td>
<td>down</td>
<td>94.1%</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summit Pointe</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>30.01%</td>
<td>up</td>
<td>103.8%</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunset Valley</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-79</td>
<td>-69</td>
<td>-15.23%</td>
<td>down</td>
<td>77.2%</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trailridge</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>16.07%</td>
<td>up</td>
<td>87.6%</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underwood</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-51</td>
<td>-10.63%</td>
<td>down</td>
<td>71.6%</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westview</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>-35</td>
<td>-52</td>
<td>-11.61%</td>
<td>down</td>
<td>105.9%</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodland</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>47.68%</td>
<td>up</td>
<td>62.2%</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>9,251</td>
<td>9,306</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>332.0</td>
<td>604.0</td>
<td>86.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td>11,325.0</td>
<td>10,782.0</td>
<td>9,164.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Middle</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernard Campbell</td>
<td>872</td>
<td>959</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>14.45%</td>
<td>up</td>
<td>1,227</td>
<td>1,227</td>
<td>1,043.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant Lea</td>
<td>873</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>-63</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>9.39%</td>
<td>up</td>
<td>1,132</td>
<td>1,132</td>
<td>662.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summit Lakes</td>
<td>1119</td>
<td>1096</td>
<td>-23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>9.92%</td>
<td>up</td>
<td>1,260</td>
<td>1,260</td>
<td>1,071.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,619</td>
<td>3,619</td>
<td>3,076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2,872</td>
<td>2,868</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>79.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,619</td>
<td>3,619</td>
<td>3,076</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2018-19 (K - 5) (6 - 8) Building Capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building</th>
<th>18-19 Enrollment</th>
<th>5 year Enrollment Change</th>
<th>10 year Enrollment Change</th>
<th>10 year % Change</th>
<th>% Program Capacity</th>
<th>8th Grade</th>
<th>Design Capacity</th>
<th>Program Capacity</th>
<th>85% Program Capacity</th>
<th>Mobile Classroom Capacity</th>
<th>Program Capacity with Mobile Classrooms</th>
<th>85% Program Capacity with Mobiles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elementary</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Creek</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>-69</td>
<td>-96</td>
<td>21.10%</td>
<td>up</td>
<td>71.8%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>538.9</td>
<td>634.0</td>
<td>538.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwood</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>-6.08</td>
<td>-1.60%</td>
<td>even</td>
<td>73.7%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>439.5</td>
<td>517.0</td>
<td>439.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawthorn Hill</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>-57</td>
<td>259.98</td>
<td>61.17%</td>
<td>up</td>
<td>67.0%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>538.9</td>
<td>634.0</td>
<td>538.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazel Grove</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>-57</td>
<td>71.25</td>
<td>18.36%</td>
<td>up</td>
<td>78.7%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>410.1</td>
<td>94.0</td>
<td>587.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland Park</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>-82</td>
<td>72.95</td>
<td>16.54%</td>
<td>up</td>
<td>69.6%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>538.9</td>
<td>634.0</td>
<td>538.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee's Summit</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>5.69%</td>
<td>up</td>
<td>81.2%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>279.7</td>
<td>329.0</td>
<td>279.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longview Farm</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>-76</td>
<td>-78.54</td>
<td>-18.35%</td>
<td>down</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>559.3</td>
<td>658.0</td>
<td>559.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mason</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>-192</td>
<td>307.98</td>
<td>69.21%</td>
<td>up</td>
<td>99.8%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>379.1</td>
<td>94.0</td>
<td>540.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meadow Lane</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>-63</td>
<td>-146.06</td>
<td>-26.41%</td>
<td>down</td>
<td>87.2%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>536.9</td>
<td>634.0</td>
<td>538.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant Lea</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>-28</td>
<td>-76.93</td>
<td>-18.10%</td>
<td>down</td>
<td>72.4%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>499.0</td>
<td>587.0</td>
<td>499.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prairie View</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>-37</td>
<td>-99.75</td>
<td>-15.88%</td>
<td>down</td>
<td>60.7%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,151</td>
<td>1,034</td>
<td>878.9</td>
<td>1,034.0</td>
<td>878.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richardson</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>-71</td>
<td>-126.36</td>
<td>-24.44%</td>
<td>down</td>
<td>78.6%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>559.3</td>
<td>658.0</td>
<td>559.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summit Pointe</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>148.32</td>
<td>24.68%</td>
<td>up</td>
<td>91.3%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>559.3</td>
<td>658.0</td>
<td>559.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunset Valley</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>-51</td>
<td>-46.47</td>
<td>-13.03%</td>
<td>down</td>
<td>63.4%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>469.0</td>
<td>567.0</td>
<td>499.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trailridge</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>58.24</td>
<td>14.31%</td>
<td>up</td>
<td>75.4%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>459.0</td>
<td>540.0</td>
<td>459.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underwood</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-45.19</td>
<td>-11.33%</td>
<td>down</td>
<td>60.8%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>559.3</td>
<td>658.0</td>
<td>559.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westview</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>-49</td>
<td>-56.61</td>
<td>-14.55%</td>
<td>down</td>
<td>92.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>359.6</td>
<td>423.0</td>
<td>359.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodland</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>157.99</td>
<td>44.50%</td>
<td>up</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>559.3</td>
<td>658.0</td>
<td>559.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,876</strong></td>
<td><strong>306.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>503.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>73.9%</strong></td>
<td><strong>69</strong></td>
<td><strong>11,325.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,782.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,164.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>282.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>11,064.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,404.4</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Middle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building</th>
<th>18-19 Enrollment</th>
<th>5 year Enrollment Change</th>
<th>10 year Enrollment Change</th>
<th>10 year % Change</th>
<th>% Program Capacity</th>
<th>8th Grade</th>
<th>Program Capacity</th>
<th>85% Program Capacity</th>
<th>Mobile Classroom Capacity</th>
<th>Program Capacity with Mobile Classrooms</th>
<th>85% Program Capacity with Mobiles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bernard Campbell</td>
<td>1219</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>7.96%</td>
<td>up</td>
<td>68.52%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1,779</td>
<td>1,779</td>
<td>1,512</td>
<td>1,779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant Lea</td>
<td>1462</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>9.37%</td>
<td>up</td>
<td>86.82%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1,684</td>
<td>1,684</td>
<td>1,431</td>
<td>1,684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summit Lakes</td>
<td>1608</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>12.00%</td>
<td>up</td>
<td>86.74%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1,812</td>
<td>1,812</td>
<td>1,540</td>
<td>1,812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,289</strong></td>
<td><strong>151</strong></td>
<td><strong>427</strong></td>
<td><strong>81.3%</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,275</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,275</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,484</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,484</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,275</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,484</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**K-5 Capacity Projection**
Considerations

- Enrollment at 1000 - 1200 mark, smaller enrollments desired.
- Augmentation of current facilities does not allow for overall lower middle school capacity.
- Current spaces:
  - Require improved traffic flow
  - Opportunities to repurpose space
  - Require future ready adjustments and major classroom adjustments /additions
- Lower building capacities at middle assist with facilitating beneficial adult to student relationships at a pivotal developmental time.
- **No other time, other than toddler years does a child experience such rapid growth and change and therefore requires support.**
- Allow for sixth graders to be infused into the middle program while allowing independence within their own spaces and a unique schedule to fulfill their learning needs.
Implications

- Curriculum revisions
- Exploration options expanded
- Enhance career and technical education programming
- Increase instructional time for literacy
- Feeder system
- Staffing (elementary / secondary)
- Future ready space availability (elementary)
- Associated costs
I believe 6th graders are better suited for middle school. Having taught 6th grade for 8 years and middle school for 13 years, it is my opinion that 6th graders are more than ready for MS.

6th graders should move up to middle school. Social / emotional / behavioral changes. 11-14 year olds share many traits. Elective classes give them a chance to explore different things.

I think our 6th graders would thrive in a middle school environment. School Activities and sports, opportunities for social interactions with peers, variety of curriculum choices, and even physical development = ready.

6th grade curriculum is aligned with middle school. Teachers need to be specialized in order to best teach the curriculum the district and the state expect us to teach.

Adding another grade to MS will offer stability to the kids. This is a rough age anyway and having only 2 years in middle school is a lot of transition. There are either new to the school or leaving the school.
Teacher Input

Group A rated these thoughts high

**Middle School** 6th graders are developmentally ready to be out of elementary school.

- Group A: 23 (avg 4.9)
- Group B: 6 (avg 1.5)

I think the middle school environment is better for *sixth grade*. Most have reached a maturity level to know expectations of a learning environment and can take it farther.

- Group A: 25 (avg 4.8)
- Group B: 6 (avg 2.0)

Middle School: Middle School, in general, would be improved by moving to 6th-8th, since it would increase continuity for students and student-staff relationships.

- Group A: 22 (avg 4.9)
- Group B: 6 (avg 2.0)

I think that the middle school environment best needs the needs of sixth graders.

- Group A: 23 (avg 4.9)
- Group B: 6 (avg 2.0)

**Group B rated these thoughts high**

**Elementary** They’re only “babies” once. Why speed up the growing-up process? The elementary setting allows for deeper nurture.

- Group A: 18 (avg 1.3)
- Group B: 11 (avg 4.5)

The sixth grade students need to stay in the elementary schools. We do not have the staffing or space in order to have sixth grade in the middle schools.

- Group A: 18 (avg 1.2)
- Group B: 4 (avg 4.8)

**Elementary school for emotional development**. Our 6th Graders thrive emotionally in our elementary setting and have many opportunities to be leaders and positive role models.

- Group A: 18 (avg 1.6)
- Group B: 10 (avg 4.7)

**Sixth grade should be left in the elementary school.** I feel this is important because there is quite a bit of difference between sixth and seventh grade.

- Group A: 18 (avg 1.2)
- Group B: 6 (avg 4.5)
I would like to see 6th grade stay in the elementary setting. With all of the physical and emotional changes that 6th graders are experiencing I think it’s important for them to be in a comfortable setting.

As stated in the opening thoughts, I grew up in a junior high setting that was 7th through 8th grade only. I felt as though children thrive at the 6th grade level while in elementary school because they learn how to lead and set positive examples.

Elementary school: Students all mature physically and mentally at different rates. Overall, I’d say they aren’t mature enough to be around 8th graders

I believe that it better to allow each child space and time to grow, elementary school will allow them to do that over being pushed ahead. Protecting the development of emotional maturity is key to changing the mental health narrative we struggle with today.

I think elementary would be more beneficial to a student who is 11 or 12 years old. Having that extra year of maturity, knowledge, and confidence before entering middle school at such a time of adjustment for a preteen is vital.
Middle School 6th Graders are old enough to move to the next phase in education.

Group A
- 14 (AVG)

Group B
- 7 (AVG)

Group A rated these thoughts high

Students need a longer time frame in a middle school setting. R-7 current two yr. time-frame in middle school isn't long enough, students need more time to grow and be ready for high school obligations.

Group A
- 14 (AVG)

Group B
- 7 (AVG)

A Middle School Concept that involves grades 6-8 would be advantageous for students in LSR7. A Middle School involving grades 6-8 would provide academic and extra curricular opportunities not available at the middle level.

Group A
- 15 (AVG)

Group B
- 7 (AVG)

My first thought is, I wonder how much it matters? What do studies say is the recommended format, why is it recommended? I grew up in a 6th-8th school and liked it, I was surprised by the format at R7

Group A
- 15 (AVG)

Group B
- 6 (AVG)

The overcrowding issue appears to have moved to Trailridge for the 2019-2020 school year. If it's not possible to build another elementary school, I would like to hear more about moving 6th grade up as the overcrowding could be detrimental.

Group A
- 15 (AVG)

Group B
- 7 (AVG)
Potential Budget Implications

Projections for Operational and Instructional Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Operational Expenditures</th>
<th>Instructional Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>75262</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>3054</td>
<td>3494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2027</td>
<td>93293</td>
<td>95153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2028</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>2051</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendation:
Move 6th grade to middle school with the opening of a fourth middle school projected in 2022.

2019-2020 Work:
• Student voice (elementary / middle)
• “Education” opportunities (i.e “A Day in the Life ...”)
• Elective “wheel” revision
• Schedule designs (“Flex Time”)
• Social / emotional curriculum identification
• Review of other district middle school sites
• Closer analysis of staffing considerations
Elementary Theme-Based School

Facilitated by Dr. Jennifer Kephart, Assistant Superintendent of Elementary Instruction
Charge of the Team

- Explore implementation and planning considerations for a theme-based elementary school
- Determine community support and partnership for a theme-based elementary school
- Utilize research when determining instructional programming needs
- Develop implementation recommendations that align to the developed district and CFMP philosophy and priorities
- Investigate instructional topics that have high-yield outcomes for elementary students through a theme-based school concept
- Review current and best practices to make implementation recommendations for future programming in a theme-based elementary school environment
Committee Research and Exploration

- Research articles
- Best practice readings
- Video clips of schools in action
- Transforming elementary 5 year plan
- Elementary student advisory voice
- Community input
- Rich conversations
The overall recommendation from the exploratory team is to continue future-ready, innovative practice, development and implementation at each of the elementary schools as aligned to the Instructional Compass and Portrait of a Graduate.

MLE could act as the “incubator school” with the award of the Kauffman Foundation grant.

A recommendation to move forward on a Theme-Based Elementary School is recommended in conjunction with the passage of a bond:

- as a lab school of innovation
- as a connection for the community of Lee’s Summit
- with initial training and utilization of transformational practices
- with a focus on experiential learning through its unique ties to the business community, entrepreneurship in the community, and the various aspects of social, civic and historical perspectives for which the City of Lee’s Summit is revered
Implementation

Timeline

- 1 Year Prior to Implementation - Preplanning work with the community
- 6 Months Prior to Implementation - Staff establishment and training
- Implementation Year - Preplanning work with the community

Rough Budget Implications

- *This budget does not include budget considerations for innovative expansion across all elementary buildings; budget considerations are necessary in those environments as well.
- Staffing $70,000
- Training $150,000
- Materials $300,000
- Building furniture $300,000
- Preparation expenses $10,000
Early Education Revised Recommendations

Facilitated by Dr. Staci Mathes, Executive Director of Special Services
LSR7 Early Childhood Programs

- Early Childhood Special Education
  - Peers
  - Speech Improvement Services
- Head Start
- Parents as Teachers
- Title I Preschool
- Average Daily Attendance (ADA) classrooms
Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE)

• The district is obligated to serve all students who meet IDEA eligible requirements.
• The district approach continues to use the DESE integrated model which allows up to 50% of students to be unidentified peers.
• Due to an increase in eligibility for special programs in ECSE, students who have traditionally been served in Great Beginnings Early Education Center (GBEEC) are also served in satellite classrooms at elementary schools. This does not allow for centralized services and supports for all students receiving ECSE.
Head Start

- Head Start preschool classrooms serve 68 students who meet the income qualifications.
- Head Start is requiring partners to expand to full day programming by 2021.
- Full day programming would double the number of teachers and paraprofessionals in order to serve the same number of students.
  - If federal funds are increased to support the additional personnel costs, the district recommends continued partnership with Head Start.
  - If federal funds stay at the current level, the district recommends selective abandonment of the program and investigation of other revenue sources to support students (i.e. ADA classrooms).
- Early Head Start (birth to 3 home visits) is recommended to continue.
Average Daily Attendance (ADA) Preschool Classrooms

- This funding stream has the same income eligibility requirements as Head Start.
- ADA preschool slots are limited to 4% of the number of students who are eligible for F/R lunch grades K-12, which is approximately 140 students.
- Administration recommends piloting one classroom for the 2020-2021 school year to assess feasibility of phasing out Head Start.
- Transportation costs (bus, fuel, insurance, staff, etc.) would need to be considered as an additional cost using local funds vs. Head Start.
Title I preschool serves approximately 90 students who are determined ‘at-risk’ based upon standardized screening assessments.

• Administration recommendation that the Title I budget should be re-evaluated annually to determine if additional revenue exists to expand the number of classrooms.

• The district has received recent information that indicates Title I funds are decreasing for the 19-20 school year.
Recommendation

- As 6th grade students are moved to the middle schools, this creates available capacity at the elementary schools. PVE—North is projected to have sufficient space to act as a second early education center.
Transportation:
Consolidating Secondary Routes and Updating Walk Zones
Facilitated by Keith Henry, Director of Transportation
Secondary Route Consolidation/Streamlining

**Why make changes:** Ride times have increased significantly for secondary students, averaging over 50 minutes each way, with some students riding over an hour. The average round trip for students is over 1.67 hours.

**Resolution:** Transportation and administration reviewed operational practices, board policy and code of state regulations. The only feasible way to reduce ride time without a significant increase in cost is to consolidate bus stop and bus route protocols for secondary students. Recommendations to decrease ride time where developed in accordance with Board Policy and Code of State Regulations which outline:

- **Routing:** Buses will follow the most direct path and eliminate the following: turnarounds, duplication of miles, deadheading, dead-ends and cul-de-sacs.
- **Bus Stops:** Stops will be 1,200 feet apart. The current average walk to a bus stop is .05 mile (264 feet), which will increase to .15 mile (792 feet).

**Engagement:** During Phase I of the CFMP, the community gave input through district-wide surveys. In addition, members of the CFMP team took individual questions and comments during the 11 evenings of the engagement series.

**Results:** There was general understanding and support of adjusting secondary bus stops.
Secondary Continued

Timeline
Summer 2017: Study of Transportation operations
August 2018: Phase 1 CFMP
December 2018: Board approves CFMP plan
January 2019: Route/stop development process
May 20, 2019: Principal update communication
May 30, 2019: District eNews
June 17, 2019: Transportation website updated
Secondary bus stop look-up activate
Email to secondary parents notifying of Look-up website
Walk Zone Audit

- A walk zone audit occurred as a follow-up to community discussion held in the fall. The audit evaluated practices around board policy EEA, which states:
  
  "Resident students living one-half mile or more from students attendance areas will be entitled to free transportation to and from school. The board of education may also provide transportation to resident students who live less than one-half mile from school."

- Inconsistencies in application of board policy were identified, which resulted in adjusting designated walk zones.

- Part of the audit included identifying “barrier streets” that are not suitable for crossing and/or walking along. Examples of “Barrier Street” criteria include the following:
  - Street classified as a functional freeway or expressway or primary arterial road
  - Street with a speed limit of 45 mph or more
  - Daily traffic volume of 20,000 vehicles per day or 180 vehicles per hour

---

**K12 Transportation Data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Walkers</td>
<td>567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Walkers</td>
<td>973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Bus Riders</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CFMP Team Project Recommendations

Planning for 19-20 and beyond
CFMP Phase II Recommendations

- Early Education
- Elementary School
- Middle School
- High School
Recommended Future Projects

Phase I Projects

- Add fourth middle school
- Renovate 3 existing middle schools to increase capacity for 6th grade enrollment
- Renovate the following elementary schools based on future-ready standards: GWE, HGE, LSE, MAE*, PLE, and LSHS*
- Renovate PVE North to include early education programs

Phase II Projects

- Expansion of STA/MIC to accommodate for secondary program expansion
- Renovate the following schools based on future-ready standards: CCE, MLE, PVE, RHE, TRE, UWE, LSN

Phase III Projects

- Renovate the following schools based on future-ready standards: HHE, HPE, LFE, SPE, SVE, WLE
Budget Implications

Bonding capacity and general overview of project costs
• Estimated Assessed Valuation (AV)  $2,178,732,032
• Bonding capacity (15% of AV)  $326,809,805
• Outstanding general obligation bonds  $122,257,000
• Available bonding dollars in April 2020  $204,552,805

• Future Board Work Session with George K. Baum
RFQ for Architectural Services

Facilitated by Kyle Gorrell, Director of Facilities
RFQ Process

- The following individuals participated in the RFQ process: Brady Cantrell, Bruce Gibson, Kyle Gorrell, Greg Johnson, Emily Miller, Radell Oakman, Jodi Thompson, Greg Johnson.

- The team screened and ranked eight written submittals based on five categories: experience, personnel, project approach, available resources, and responsiveness to the RFQ.

- Six firms were invited to participate in interviews with the team on May 13, 2019.

- The RFQ team scored the architectural firms on the overall engagement with the team, presentation style, communication style, understanding of future ready concepts, and overall comfortability with the firm.

- Scores in these areas were tabulated and discussed. Each firm was evaluated based upon their individual strengths and the alignment with proposed projects.
Recommended Architectural Firms

- **Elementary and Early Education Learning Environments**
- **Middle School Learning Environments**
- **High School Learning Environments**
Sample Timeline for New Construction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Finish Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>RFQ / RFP</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architect RFQ</td>
<td>5/13/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Manager RFP</td>
<td>7/26/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOE Award Contracts</td>
<td>August/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Design</strong></td>
<td>7/1/2019</td>
<td>3/2/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schematic Design</td>
<td>7/1/2019</td>
<td>8/31/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Development</td>
<td>9/1/2019</td>
<td>11/1/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Documents</td>
<td>11/2/2019</td>
<td>3/2/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bond Election</strong></td>
<td>4/14/2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Approval</td>
<td>12/19/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond Certification</td>
<td>1/21/2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond Election</td>
<td>4/14/2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bidding</strong></td>
<td>3/3/2020</td>
<td>3/31/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BOE Award Contracts</strong></td>
<td>4/16/2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction - Elementary School</td>
<td>4/20/2020</td>
<td>6/1/2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction - Middle School</td>
<td>4/20/2020</td>
<td>6/1/2022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“Never a checklist. Always a complexity. There is no step-by-step shortcut To Transformation.”

Michael Fullan