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This report includes all the comments made at the six forums held in February and March 2007 facilitated by the CSU Center for Public Deliberation (CPD). Both spoken comments and written comments are included. Compiled and typed by Martín Carcasson, Ph.D., assistant professor in the Department of Speech Communication at Colorado State University and director of the CPD. Feel free to email questions to mcarcas@colostate.edu. See page 64 of the report for more information on the CPD.

Explanation of the Process: Six meetings were held, four designated as “public meetings,” and two designated as meetings for PSD staff and faculty, though either audience was welcome at each meeting. The dates, location, and attendance are as follows:

- Lincoln Junior High (Staff forum) – February 13th, Attendance: 54
- Fossil Ridge High (Public forum) – February 15th, Attendance 55
- Preston Junior High (Staff forum) – February 21st, Attendance 41
- Fort Collins High School (Public forum) – February 22nd, Attendance 76
- Rocky Mountain High School (Public forum) – March 1, Attendance 76
- Poudre High School (Public Forum) – March 7, Attendance 184

At each meeting, all participants first gathered in a common room. Manny Ortega, Executive Director of Secondary Schools, and Ron Maulsby, Assistant Superintendent of School Services, from PSD spoke first, providing some background on the issue and explaining why the district was considering making a change. The information they provided is primarily available on the PSD website (see “Frequently Asked Questions and Responses” as well as “Process and Timeline” documents at http://www.psdschools.org/psdinfo/newsevents/index.aspx?newseventid=2906&affid=). Then Martín Carcasson, director of the CSU Center for Public Deliberation, explained the process as detailed below. Dr. Carcasson also explained the rationale for using this sort of process rather than a traditional public information meeting in which the district officials would answer questions from the large audience. In such meetings, only one public participant can speak at a time, the district officials are primarily talking (answering questions), and both sides often talk past each other. Participants do get answers to a limited set of questions, but the district only receives limited information regarding the overall concerns of the public.

By using breakout groups, and developing a process in which the participants primarily talk to each other, multiple goals can be pursued. Overall, the primary goal was to provide the district with information concerning the public view of the various configuration options. However, rather than simply identify the surface opinion, we hoped to query that opinion after the participants had a chance to hear from each other concerning the advantages and disadvantages of the different options, as well as the inherent tradeoffs between the options, and thus develop a more nuanced judgment. Hearing fellow residents discuss their views concerning those advantages and disadvantages, highlighting what was important to them, would hopefully help accomplish that goal. Each room did have representatives from the school district available to answer factual questions as necessary.
Outside facilitators from the CPD were used in order to provide additional legitimacy to the process due to their neutrality toward the issue. The students were focused on the process, not the result of the deliberation. They had no particular preference concerning the options. The CPD provided the students and this report as a free public service.

The process involved splitting the participants into breakout rooms consisting of 15-30 individuals, depending on the overall number of attendees. Student facilitators from the CPD, consisting of a moderator and a notetaker, ran each breakout room. Once in the rooms, the students explained the ground rules, which were as follows:

- The goal is to help make the best decision for the community as a whole
- Speak honestly and respectfully
- Listen carefully and respectfully
- One person talks at a time
- Be brief to allow all to participate

Each room spent dedicated time on the each of the options, focusing first on advantages and then on disadvantages. More time was dedicated to options A and B, because a majority of the issues involved in grade configuration were introduced there. Option C, for example, inherently involves all the advantages and disadvantages of moving the 9th grade up as well as all the advantages and disadvantages of keeping the 6th grade in elementary, many of which were discussed during the time for options A and B. The key unique issue to deliberate for option C was having two year junior high schools.

During these discussions, notes were captured on paper, organized by option and advantages and disadvantages, and then those large pieces of paper were taped up around the room. The notes were written on large easels, so all participants could see what was being written, and participants were encouraged to help their notetakers and suggest corrections as needed to capture the discussion. Once every option was discussed, the group spent a few minutes in a “reflections” period in which overall thoughts about the issue were discussed. In particular, the participants were asked about their opinion concerning the appropriate criteria for the decision. At the end of the forum, participants were provided a strip of 5 dot stickers, and each participant was instructed to place the dots next to statements they most agreed with on the notes. The dot exercise helps provide a sense of the priorities of each breakout room. During the forum, participants also had the opportunity to write comments on index cards, and then turn those comments into the notetaker.

The information presented in this report, therefore, is organized in several categories. The raw data section of the report begins on page 11. There are spoken and written comments for each option, organized by comments made while discussing the advantages to the option, and then comments made discussing the concerns or disadvantages with the option. Spoken comments are comments that were made verbally during the forum, and captured in the notes. What appears in these notes is simply a transcription of the notes taken during the forum, with only misspellings changed. Even if a comment seems to fit more as an advantage rather than a disadvantage or even a different option, it was kept where it was placed during the forum. Miscellaneous spoken comments represent general comments or questions made during the forum that were not tied to the option being discussed, therefore were captured in a different sheet of paper off to the side. Written comments were comments handed to the notetakers on index cards. When the written comments were organized and returned, they were added to their respective notetaker. The text in this report was transcribed from the notetakers' notes and then organized into categories as described.
comment was clearly focused on an advantage or disadvantage of one of the options, it was
coded as so and appears in that order in this report. Written comments on the process were also
coded and appear all together. The remainder of the written comments appear at the end of the
report.

In the following pages, some overall summaries of the report are provided, including a statistical
summary of the number of comments made for each option, the number of “dots” placed in
support of those comments, and some overall themes observed in the discussions.

**Suggested Use of this Information:**
The most obvious use is for the district to get a sense of public preferences and concerns. I
nonetheless suggest caution assuming this represents the true “public voice” as a whole. Since
the meetings were open to all, the participants were not necessarily representative of the broader
community. This information therefore represents the collective opinion of those who showed up
to the meetings. In addition, it should be noted that for any sort of major change, the status quo,
especially when the status quo is seen as functioning well, will often have an inherent advantage,
as it seems to have in this case.

That being said, the information should be useful in a number of ways. The prevalence of certain
advantages or concerns being repeated across forums provides a sense of key issues for the
public. Some of the consistent themes are listed in the next section of this report.

Misconceptions or factual questions expressed in the forums also represent opportunities for the
school district to respond. I have recommended that someone from the district provide a written
response to the report to be posted soon after the report is posted, that deals with some of the
misconceptions and questions expressed during the forums.

Regardless of what option is ultimately chosen, this information will also be very useful for
implementation (or for making changes while remaining in the current configuration). For
example, if the district decides not to change, all the disadvantages to option A and the
advantages of options B, C, and D, as well as the miscellaneous comments, should be mined for
issues that perhaps could be addressed in different ways. A number of concerns were raised
during the forums, many of which are only indirectly connected to grade configuration. I would
encourage the district to follow up on many of these public concerns.

The information also shows clear concerns over the division between the North/West and
South/East communities. Attendance was clearly higher at the forums at Rocky Mountain and
Poudre High School, with 70% (260 of 372) of the total participants coming one of those two
nights. On one hand, that raises concerns over a skewing of the overall numbers, while on the
other hand, it also shows that participants in those communities are more engaged and concerned
about this issue.
Discussion of overall numbers (see Table 1 and Table 2, pages 7-8)
The dots should be the primary information considered. The number of comments can be helpful, but the number of comments can simply be a function of how much time was spent on each comment versus a true measure of support or concern. For example, each breakout room had about 15-20 minutes to discuss the pros and cons of option A and option B, but usually only spent about 10 minutes each on options C and D. In addition, anyone could make a comment, regardless of whether the room supported the idea or not. The dots, placed at the end when participants could see all arguments, are the best measure of the views in the room.

Overall use of dots:

**Option A:** 33.7% of the total dots used were placed next to comments in support of option A, while only 8.5% were in opposition to option A, a significant gap. That means 80% of the dots placed concerning the current configuration were placed on perceived advantages rather than perceived disadvantages.

**Option B:** 13.8% of the total dots were placed in support of option B, and 19.8% in opposition. Of the dots placed on option B, 41% were in favor, 59% in opposition.

**Option C:** 9.3% of the total dots were placed in support of option C, with 3.9% against. 70% of the dots placed on option C were in support.

**Option D:** 3.2% of the total dots were placed in support of option D, and 7.7% against. 71% of the dots placed on option D were for disadvantages.

Overall, therefore, Option A was seen as the best option by those that attended the forums, followed by Option C, Option B, and then Option D. Both Options A and C received significantly more dots on comments expressing advantages versus disadvantages, whereas Option B and D received more dots on disadvantages rather than advantages.

Notable differences between schools: Significant differences arise when comparing different schools, especially the two east schools and the two west schools. To show this clearly, I included the statistics comparing the forums at Fort Collins and Fossil Ridge versus the two at Rocky Mountain and Poudre. At the West schools, 45% of the total dots supported option A, and 22% showed concern for option B. No other option received more than 8.6% of the dots. At the East schools, preferences were much more spread among all the options, with the highest being 26.5% supporting option B, and dots close to even between the advantages and disadvantages of option A.

Overall, it is clear there are significant differences in opinion for the public and staff between the schools in the West and North, and those on the East and South, assuming that the participants at the forums held at those schools can be logically connected to the public and staff for those schools.
**Staff forums:** I should note that a significant number of staff attended the public sessions—which they were certainly entitled to do. In addition, there were significant differences in the opinions expressed at the staff forum at Lincoln Junior High versus the staff forum at Preston Junior High. So, overall, I am not sure the totals for the staff forums overall are as important as the totals for the staff forums individually.

Looking at the designated staff forums, dots on option A were almost even (15 to 13) at Preston Junior High, whereas as Lincoln Junior High, dots supporting advantages of option A doubled the disadvantages (56 to 27). For both, the disadvantages to option B outweighed the advantages (38 to 24 for Lincoln, 34 to 24 for Preston). For option C, once again there were significant differences, as at Preston option C was supported (21 dots for advantages, only 6 for concerns), and at Lincoln it was not (8 dots for advantages, 24 for concerns).
## Results from PSD Grade Configuration Meetings

### TABLE 1: OVERALL NUMBERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AA</th>
<th>AD</th>
<th>BA</th>
<th>BD</th>
<th>CA</th>
<th>CD</th>
<th>DA</th>
<th>DD</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>#</strong></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>814</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total comments</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Spoken</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Written</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                | #          | %          | #          | %          | #          | %          | #          | %          | #          | %          |
| Totals         | 743        | 35.7%      | 166        | 8.0%       | 285        | 13.7%      | 404        | 19.4%      | 196        | 9.4%       | 64        | 3.1%      | 77        | 3.7%      | 149       | 7.1%    | 2084    |
| Total comments | 210        | 17.3%      | 154        | 12.7%      | 147        | 12.1%      | 235        | 19.4%      | 103       | 8.5%       | 135       | 11.1%     | 100       | 8.3%      | 128       | 10.6%   | 1212    |
| Total Spoken   | 184        | 16.5%      | 151        | 13.6%      | 135        | 12.1%      | 220        | 19.8%      | 99        | 8.9%       | 131       | 11.8%     | 96        | 8.6%      | 96        | 8.6%    | 1112    |
| Total Written  | 26         | 34.7%      | 3          | 4.0%       | 12         | 16.0%      | 15         | 20.0%      | 4        | 5.3%       | 4         | 5.3%      | 7         | 9.3%      | 75        |        |

|                | #          | %          | #          | %          | #          | %          | #          | %          | #          | %          |
| Totals         | 71         | 21.5%      | 40         | 12.1%      | 48         | 14.5%      | 72         | 21.8%      | 29        | 8.8%       | 30        | 9.1%      | 4         | 1.2%      | 36        | 10.9%   | 330     |
| Total comments | 65         | 15.3%      | 57         | 13.4%      | 62         | 14.6%      | 81         | 19.1%      | 42        | 9.9%       | 50        | 11.8%     | 30        | 7.1%      | 38        | 8.9%    | 425     |
| Total Spoken   | 60         | 14.8%      | 57         | 14.1%      | 61         | 15.1%      | 77         | 19.0%      | 41        | 10.1%      | 47        | 11.6%     | 29        | 7.2%      | 33        | 8.1%    | 405     |
| Total Written  | 5          | 25.0%      | 0          | 0.0%       | 1          | 5.0%       | 4          | 20.0%      | 1        | 5.0%       | 3         | 15.0%     | 1         | 5.0%      | 5         | 25.0%   | 20      |

### Results Splitting West and East High Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AA</th>
<th>AD</th>
<th>BA</th>
<th>BD</th>
<th>CA</th>
<th>CD</th>
<th>DA</th>
<th>DD</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>#</strong></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West High Schools</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rocky Mountain and Poudre</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Spoken</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Written</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AA</th>
<th>AD</th>
<th>BA</th>
<th>BD</th>
<th>CA</th>
<th>CD</th>
<th>DA</th>
<th>DD</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East High Schools</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Collins and Fossil Ridge</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Spoken</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Written</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AA – Advantages to Option A (current model, K-6, 7-9, 10-12)
AD – Disadvantages/Concerns for Option A
BA – Advantages to Option B (K-5, 6-8, 9-12)
BD – Disadvantages/Concern for Option B
CA – Advantages to Option C (K-6, 7-8, 9-12)
CD – Disadvantages/Concern for Option C
DA – Advantages to Option D (Hybrid)
DD – Disadvantages/Concern for Option D
## Results from PSD Grade Configuration Meetings

**TABLE 2: NUMBERS PER FORUM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AA</th>
<th>AD</th>
<th>BA</th>
<th>BD</th>
<th>CA</th>
<th>CD</th>
<th>DA</th>
<th>DD</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lincoln Jr. High</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total dots</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 13</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance: 54 (11% of total)</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Spoken</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fossil Ridge High School</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total dots</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 15</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance: 55 (11% of total)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Spoken</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Written</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preston Jr. High</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total dots</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance: 41 (8% of total)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Spoken</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Written</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>86.5%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fort Collins High School</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total dots</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 22</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance: 76 (16% of total)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Spoken</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Written</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rocky Mountain High School</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total dots</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 1</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance: 76 (16% of total)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Spoken</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Written</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AA – Advantages to Option A (current model, K-6, 7-9, 10-12)
AD – Disadvantages/Concerns for Option A
BA – Advantages to Option B (K-5, 6-8, 9-12)
BD – Disadvantages/Concern for Option B
CA – Advantages to Option C (K-6, 7-8, 9-12)
CD – Disadvantages/Concern for Option C
DA – Advantages to Option D (Hybrid)
DD – Disadvantages/Concern for Option D
Primary Themes for Each Option
Looking at just comments with at least one dot, these are the primary themes for each of the options. Primary themes are themes that were mentioned at least three times for that option. Information will be available on the CPD website detailing how individual comments were coded (www.cpd.colostate.edu).

Advantages of Option A:
Current system is working well (“ain’t broke, don’t fix it”) (23 comments, 180 dots)
Concerns over maturity or innocence of 6th and 9th graders (24 comments, 100 dots)
Continuity of currently available electives and programs (9 comments, 70 dots)
Known, familiar, less hassle (10 comments, 70 dots)
Keeping specials and specials teachers in elementary (8 comments, 34 dots)
Leadership opportunities given to 6th and 9th graders (7 comments, 24 dots)
Current configuration is best for language program (5 comments, 15 dots)
Closed campus for 9th graders (7 comments, 15 dots)
Safety concerns (3 comments, 11 dots)
Fits facilities (3 comments, 9 dots)

Disadvantages of Option A:
Lack of equity (9 comments, 42 dots)
9th graders are split between two schools (“In limbo”) (14 comments, 38 dots)
Limited opportunities of 9th graders (10 comments, 23 dots)
Split high school years are a disadvantage for college (6 comments, 20 dots)
Current programs in jeopardy (AP, IB, MYP) (3 comments, 16 dots)
9th graders lack motivation, need to be pushed (8 comments, 11 dots)
6th and 9th graders are mentally ready (3 comments, 9 dots)
Overcrowding, boundary problems (4 comments, 9 dots)
Bad fit with CSAP (5 comments, 7 dots)
Goes against state/national norm (3 comments, 4 dots)

Advantages of Option B:
More academic opportunities for 6th and 9th (16 comments, 76 dots)
9th in high school (6 comments, 40 dots)
Better curriculum alignment (14 comments, 29 dots)
Will motivate/challenge students (8 comments, 25 dots)
More equitable (4 comments, 22 dots)
Consistent with state/national norm (9 comments, 18 dots)
Better for college preparation (7 comments, 16 dots)
Better transitions (3 comments, 14 dots)
Would improve drop out rate (5 comments, 12 dots)
9th graders are not split between schools (6 comments, 12 dots)
Could use middle school philosophy (4 comments, 11 dots)
More extracurricular/athletic opportunities (5 comments, 10 dots)
**Disadvantages of Option B**
Concerns over maturity/innocence (30 comments, 92 dots)
Unnecessary (5 comments, 68 dots)
Would negatively impact specials (19 comments, 55 dots)
Concern over school closures (12 comments, 37 dots)
Change too fast (3 comments, 30 dots)
Concern over moving 6th graders (8 comments, 25 dots)
Cost (especially of building a new high school earlier) (6 comments, 25 dots)
Open campus for 9th graders (8 comments, 20 dots)
Less choice (due to full high schools) (4 comments, 19 dots)
Concerns over implementation (4 comments, 14 dots)
Concerns over impact on language curriculum (6th grade critical) (4 comments, 14 dots)
Would require more extensive boundary changes (6 comments, 13 dots)
Overcrowding of schools (6 comments, 11 dots)
Loss of programs (such as IB, AP, Avid) (3 comments, 10 dots)

**Advantages of Option C**
6th grade stays in elementary (26 comments, 114 dots)
Benefits of smaller two year junior highs (11 comments, 38 dots)
9th grade moves up (13 comments, 32 dots)
Less change, less students and teachers moving (6 comments, 15 dots)
Curriculum alignment (3 comments, 5 dots)

**Disadvantages of Option C**
Drawbacks of two-year junior highs (18 comments, 34 dots)
Impact on electives and specials (12 comments, 23 dots)
Changing for the wrong reasons (3 comments, 10 dots)
Possible closure of junior high(s) (5 comments, 7 dots)
6th graders don’t get to move up (4 comments, 7 dots)
Poor fit with current facilities, inefficiency (5 comments, 5 dots)

**Advantages of Option D**
More choices and flexibility (15 comments, 34 dots)
Possibility of K-8 (7 comments, 21 dots)
Fits situation, demographics (7 comments, 13 dots)
Least disruptive (3 comments, 7 dots)

**Disadvantages of Option D**
Creates division, equity concerns (16 comments, 55 dots)
Chaos (11 comments, 22 dots)
Only a short term solution (4 comments, 11 dots)
Implementation unclear (4 comments, 8 dots)
Comments concerning “Reflections” (the closing part of the forum)
The information concerning reflections was rather disjointed. It was difficult to pull clear common themes from those discussions. The one clear theme was the notion that the decision should focus on what is best for students (mentioned four times in comments with at least one dot).

Comments concerning the process
On the overall notes, all the written comments concerning the process are listed separately (see p. 51). I should note that I personally received many positive comments on the process verbally at each forum, and only a handful of verbal negative comments overall (I would estimate positive verbal comments outnumbered negative comments 10 to 1). In particular, a number of participants complimented the CSU students. Many of the process comments on notecards, however, were more negative.

Additional Common Concerns of Note
There were a number of written and spoken comments expressing concern over the decision-making process, with a particular assumption that the decision had already been made.
A number of participants discussed an interest in considering a K-8, 9-12 configuration. A couple breakout rooms, as shown in the notes, even asked to devote specific time to discussing the pros and cons of the K-8 configuration.
A number of comments were made concerning the lack of consideration over special education students and the impact of grade configuration changes on them.
A number of comments expressed concern over the timetable for the change, believing that it would be too fast to implement in 2008.
A number of comments expressed concern over the lack of a clear implementation plan, and argued that it was difficult to judge the options fairly without being informed on how the options would be implemented.
There were a number of conflicting comments concerning the impact moving the 9th grade up would have on electives and special programs. Some participants assumed the 9th graders would have many more options in high school for classes, while others assumed that bringing 9th graders into the high schools would take away options and flexibility for all high school students because the schools would have to focus more teachers and classrooms on required classes.
There were also a number of conflicting comments concerning the maturity levels of 6th and 9th graders. Many participants expressed concern that 6th graders were not ready for junior high, and that they needed to be protected or “kept innocent.” The same, to a lesser extent, was expressed for 9th graders going to high school. Other participants, however, believed that the students were ready, or that moving them up would help them develop maturity and would challenge them.
A number of comments were made concerning the likelihood a school would have to be closed, regardless of grade configuration.
A number of comments were made expressing concern that grade configuration is being motivated by facilities and demographics, especially concerning the high schools, rather than student achievement.
A number of comments were made discussing the “Middle School” versus “Junior High” philosophies and how they could impact grade configuration, especially with option B.
Full Listing of Notes from All Six Forums

Explanation of Columns

Comment* – Comment on noteboards or index cards
Dots – Number of dots placed next to the comment (each participant was given 5 dots to place on the comments of their choosing that they agreed with the most)
School – What forum the comment was made or written
Rm – What room during that forum the comment was offered. Note: Rooms 7 and 8 at PHS were facilitated in Spanish and the comments translated for this report.
P/S – P = Public forum and S=Staff forum (though each forum was open to either)

* Notes were taken on spoken comments on easel boards in the forums, and placed on the walls of the room. The comments appearing below as “spoken comments” were pulled directly from those notes without adjustment (except for fixing misspellings and removing names). Each paper was labeled by option and advantages and disadvantages. For this report, comments were kept where they were categorized during the forum.

Spoken Comments on Advantages of Option A (Current Configuration) | Dots | School | Rm | P/S
---|---|---|---|---
(Dots placed on bottom supporting option A advantages in general) | 60 | PHS | 2 | P
(Dots placed on top supporting option A advantages in general) | 32 | RMHS | 1 | P
Having transportation for those students who want school of choice | 25 | PHS | 8 | P
Currently functioning very well for students “Isn’t broken, doesn’t need to be fixed” | 25 | RMHS | 1 | P
We’re good right now, too much put into a “numbers problem” | 22 | PHS | 5 | P
Schools with less students have more programs. | 20 | PHS | 7 | P
Not broken, don’t fix it | 19 | PHS | 6 | P
Creation of alternative programs to bring more students | 18 | PHS | 7 | P
Students do not need to get familiar with new system | 18 | PHS | 8 | P
More input desired before change | 17 | PHS | 1 | P
Why change something that works? Others envy what we have | 17 | RMHS | 5 | P
Can offer advanced level electives when high school is 10-12 | 16 | RMHS | 2 | P
7 year rebuilding/disruption not necessary | 15 | RMHS | 1 | P
More academic opportunities | 13 | PHS | 7 | P
6th graders remain kids for a little longer | 12 | PHS | 3 | P
Many special programs (AVID, soph. academy, etc.) that could be lost (instructors as well) | 11 | PHS | 4 | P
Continuity of instruction, teachers can focus on improving what we have now (minimize transition for staff and students) | 11 | PHS | 4 | P
6th graders doing well in PSD’s current system | 11 | PHS | 5 | P
In general for most students in the areas, system is already working well | 10 | PHS | 3 | P
Doesn’t require community and staff transition (district wide achievement falls for ¾ years) | 10 | PHS | 5 | P
10-12 system allows for more availability of upper level classes, courses (it works) | 10 | PHS | 5 | P
Many advantages and opportunities in high school now, maybe lost if more students are in school | 10 | RMHS | 4 | P
It’s working – we’re nationally recognized | 9 | PHS | 2 | P
Reputation strong/high achievement, challenges offered as it is now, excellent model for high achievement | 9 | PHS | 4 | P
6th – maturity levels – stress added in middle school environment | 9 | RMHS | 2 | P
6th and 9th grade kept from vulnerable transitions developmentally, keeps 6th grade healthy, effective position; not rushing 6th graders to develop; 6th grade able to experiment with their academics and friends, less pressure without junior high pressure | 9 | RMHS | 5 | P
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6th graders and 9th graders keep their innocence</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doesn’t require children to “get older quicker” not too far too fast</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th Graders thrive in that year with language, particularly at Harris Bilingual Elementary School and Irish Elementary</td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly ranked district</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeps special programs in 6th grade</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current system is already strong, high achieving</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers keep current teaching licenses</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Dots placed supporting option A advantages in general)</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same system as in Mexico</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementaries stay with more money.</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works like it is, better than other districts, doing well on national assessment</td>
<td>PJH</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School choice options</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety for 9th graders and 6th as well</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For 6th – elementaries offer good leadership and involvement opportunities</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSD ranks high on performance</td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th graders in smaller, more personal environments, benefiting their level of maturity</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeps kids in SLC’s longer</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t want kids to grow up too fast</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th grade leadership opportunities (6th graders too)</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More opportunities with current system electives, don’t need to redirect resources</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More cost effective (don’t build another high school until 2030)</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More/better electives; more students = less electives</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It has been working for many years</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.E., Music &amp; Art Programs will be preserved and quality staff retained</td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No bilingual middle schools, this would give an extra year of bilingual education</td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th grade too young and immature for high school</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Dots placed supporting option A advantages in general)</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor the 6th grade students until they get a little older.</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functions okay the way it is.</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th and 9th grade environment and curriculum begin to ease eventual transition into junior high</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th graders still in small school community</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maturity differences between 6th, 7th, and 9th and 10th</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If not broken, why fix it?</td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic achievement is doing well</td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Specials” concern</td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More breadth and depth currently for electives</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional support available for 6th graders due to familiarity/smaller schools</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership opportunity for current 9th graders</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delay the need for a new high school building</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current 10th graders feel lost, why lower the age</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students already accustomed to this system</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings are designed for current configuration</td>
<td>PJH</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilizes current resources</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th graders on a closed campus</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th graders in elementary school not exposed to junior high</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Its familiar</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No new high school, cost effective</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full core knowledge education</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary students have “full time” specialty teachers</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity of classes</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school – good to have one more year before entering</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th grade in grade school – more parental communication and involvement</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t have funds, delay building of high school</td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety of children concerning age difference</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationally recognized school by <em>Newsweek</em></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th grade with younger kids better</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP courses can be offered, if 9th move, difficult to teach all high level courses in 9-12 model</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th grade has closed campus</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can continue with current curriculum – no interruption, management changes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current model working well, high achieving district</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special needs support is better in elementary</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed campus for 9th graders</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th graders still have fewer classes to worry about</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th grade leaders</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If it is not broke, do not fix it (most parents pleased)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smaller class size</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t need to worry about a 9th grader in all open campus situation, safety</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th more socially in tune with younger children, also good role models</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allows learning in smaller learner community for another year</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Its already working</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could address drop out rates, etc., rather than focusing on change with uncertain outcomes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too much daily transitions and responsibility for 6th</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most cost effective</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community / neighborhood engagement and cohesion</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allows them to remain kids longer/maturity (Duke study)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status quo is good until we have more info</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th graders not ready to make “good and appropriate decisions” regarding drugs, alcohol, tobacco</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th graders currently on closed campus</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large study (N.C.) showed fewer discipline problems with 6th in elementary</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership opportunity for current 6th graders</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th grade needs time to develop skills</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PJH</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th grade – not lost in larger school shuffle – form strong group/leaders</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special needs kids get more help</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less impact on school communities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get to stay in schools we love</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeps students in a single school setting (elementary)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th graders on closed campus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longer continuity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing infrastructure gets turned to Plan A, don’t have to change</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th grade homeroom</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maturation &amp; Social Development is good in current 9th &amp; 6th grade situations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT scores show achievement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th grades (at risk 6th graders) research shows higher rate of achievement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of special programs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of option schools/lab schools/core knowledge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of Bilingual programs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written comment – ELL students in 6th grade elementary classrooms have easier transition to new language/culture than in a junior high setting (k-6), more likely situation for them to experience success in a more individualized setting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th/9th graders get early leadership abilities (1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allows 9th graders to stay kids a while longer; they’re not subject to social pressures of high school</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separating pre-pubescent from adolescent, helps lower/eliminate peer pressure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likes 10-12, 600 per grade level</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior highs smaller and less scary (due to size)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition isn’t as hard as people think</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports at high school gives them an ease in high school in 10th</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiar with the system</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students won’t get behind</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs are known</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PJH</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choice could help even them (magnet schools) out, idea for all options</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PJH</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign language level integration K-6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety for 9th graders - Driving</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety for 9th graders - Closed campus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th grade – maturity and opportunity/involvement good in this model</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th in elementary = #s to fund specials</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th grade teachers qualified to stay in elementary school, maybe not as effective in junior high</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takes into account new schools in the plan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fits with infrastructure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th graders are leaders, don’t push them out</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School district is capable of meeting 9th graders bussing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More room for advanced level class</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep more options for choice of schools</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full schedule</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiar/not broken</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better teacher student relationships</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th and 6th graders are able to be leaders</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th graders are allowed extra time to mature</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers teach multiple grades</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No fallout of 6th graders (sports)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More room in classes for students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many 8th graders knowledgeable of college requirements</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnitude of drop out rate overstated (#s)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social transitional fears, less consistency</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of sixth grade teachers, certified for current grades/schools</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specials</td>
<td></td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoother transition (maturity = smoother transition)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known</td>
<td></td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities built for current system</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The kids cans adapt to various situations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least disruptive</td>
<td></td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociability and self-esteem one classroom in elementary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs affected outside simply academic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical structures appropriate for how it is now</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particular teacher credentials</td>
<td></td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known entity, comfortable</td>
<td></td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kids kept in elementary schools 7 years, consistent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status quo</td>
<td></td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perhaps different curriculum @ different schools</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No matter what plan, students needs matter most</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th grade has fewer teachers, 1 whole year for transitions, own curriculum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Programs ( i.e. Core knowledge, IB, AP, Avid, Sophomore Academy, ESL, ELL, New Comers etc) would stay the same with less transition.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research supports more positive outcomes with 6th in elementary setting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern High Schools do not have the room for 9th</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is familiar</td>
<td></td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th &amp; 9th Grade acquire leadership roles in current positions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevent overcrowding high schools</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No major disruption in the system</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good support system</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue established communities, continue to help the kids’ needs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictability, “status quo”</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How are they going to pay for teachers teaching 9-12? current system is more advantageous</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students are achieving</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same thing with 6th graders</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSD highly ranked, do a good job getting them ready</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is it really that broken?</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northside: 9th graders into biggest high school in district already</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeps senior boys from 9th grade girls</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeps safety – drivers and non-drivers</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives one more year to prepare for high school and to become leaders</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives 9th graders chance to mature</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>community passes mill/bond</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safeguards 9th graders from open campus</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retaining 6th graders in elementary school increases enrollment</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduces 9th into a HS crowd more protected, extra year is beneficial</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th graders are more open to peer pressure, this protects them</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-AP courses offered</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good distribution of grades and transitions</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiar</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District excellent how it is</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom management regard 9th grade maturity and time in classes</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th ability to have smaller classes/academic enhancement</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open campus not needed for 9th grade</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can it be accomplished incrementally instead</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advantageous for 9th grade to be on top</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allows full schools to continue to offer the advanced courses it does; keeps high school smaller (in #s)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th grade IB</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th graders “staying with children” better for them</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vast majority of 6th grade teachers want to keep current configuration</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research showing k-5 districts are looking at possibly changing</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeps 6th grade in elementary because lack of sports</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeping age groups separate – more advantageous for girls, especially 9th away from 12th</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slow/ease acclimation for 9th graders entering high school</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Established, can improve what is there</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th graders “top dogs” in junior highs, lose leadership opportunity</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th graders immature, best to keep them where they are</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Might eventually balance out</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-6 is working well</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently functional</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 high schools working effectively (Poudre, Rocky)</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retaining 6th grade at elementary schools better for 6th development</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More opportunities to interact with students and greater achievement</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiarity, change is stressful</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better specials curriculum</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status quo is sufficient</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smaller ranges</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich diversity in curriculum</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers are teaching at their level/capacity willingly</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rocky at capacity – excellent AP programs, possibly have to get rid of in order to accommodate 9th graders</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem will fix itself in a few years</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-12 more mature</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity for shifting programs within current configuration</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Comments on Advantages of Option A (Current Configuration)</td>
<td>Dots</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>R m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option A Advantage (not listed) RMHS has an excellent program as is. Keeping it the same will insure the excellence will continue.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option A- It’s working well.</td>
<td></td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern with options B&amp;C: 9th graders would be using space in high schools, like science labs and those spaced would be filled by 9th graders and no longer available for enrichment options</td>
<td></td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why build a new high school before it is needed? Keep 10-12 and use a portion of the $100 million savings to solve low attendance in the southern high schools.</td>
<td></td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are a model district. Changes in configuration at this point are our first step toward mediocrity. 9-12 districts who are looking at swinging the pendulum back to 10-12 and junior high cannot make that transition back. Do we want to be mediocre just to fit in?</td>
<td></td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitions were one factor. No matter which model chosen – still 2 transitions – why change what already works?</td>
<td></td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too much change for PSD, too quickly. Student based budgeting, grade configuration. Regardless of decision we need to address school consolidation.</td>
<td></td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSD needs to keep K-5, 6-8, 9-12 by transition and not change nothing. But maybe more room for teachers and student activities for pre-high school students.</td>
<td></td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option A is the best until there is integration. Lack of integration between grade configuration, student-based budgeting and boundary issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option A is the best option for all kids. If equity &amp; quality of education are major criterion for this decision, this is the best option. The system we have place allows for choice, so people can decide where they would like to go. If students and parents are not selecting certain schools, the district should consider why this is happening. It seems as though student-based budgeting addresses these issues with the small-school multiplier. Changing the configuration may help one or two schools, but it will affect many others (jr. highs and elementary), and would most likely force closures. Moving 9th grade would also change the dynamics at existing high schools – more staffing or changing staging to accommodate 9th grade would eliminate programs. This should not be a facilities-based decision. Ultimately the district is forcing a N.V.S. in Fort Collins. This is a segregating issue. The north will suffer while the advocates of the south will benefit.</td>
<td></td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid is not an option for above reasons. This will totally segregate community.</td>
<td></td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option A is the best for this district. Buildings are designed for the current configuration. Too significant transitions take place under any configuration. With option A the students are a year older, and thus more mature when they move to a new school.</td>
<td></td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option A – Advantages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there research about transitions and age.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are 10th (and 6th) more ready/mature to handle transition?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra year before different transition may be beneficial.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why spend money, time, and resources to change what is working? We should be looking at boundaries and population shifts in the future. That can help fix south schools without reconfiguration.</td>
<td></td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think option A is the best mainly because we only seem to be reconfiguring to temporarily fix small enrollment at Fossil Ridge and Fort Collins. We are one of the best districts in the state (and potentially the nation). Why fix something that isn’t broke? It seems that we could wait for the small high school enrollment in the south and east to naturally grow since this is the area of the most growth in Fort Collins. I have heard from those on the research committee that there is no evidence to suggest 9-12 is better for academic success over 10-12. If we are going to change the grade configuration. I was told that the research clearly show more success in allowing for a 3 year transition time before implementing the change.</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think option A is the best because of development levels. 6th graders are definitely too young to be at a junior high and 9th graders are also too young to be mixing with seniors. If the state requires all students to be in school until age 17 (which they just passed this law) the dropout rate will decrease!</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After taking part in this discussion, I learned that what we currently do in PSD is best…maybe…</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-12 is a step back to rest of the state. Maximum size of high schools is 1800 students. Current 10-12 model- 1200 11, 12 graders Proposed 9-12 model- 900 11, 12 graders I believe this means 300 less upper classmen which means less advanced elective classes, less depth and breadth of academics and less competitive even in athletics as compared to other larger HS.</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We don’t want changes in the schools because it will affect the students and they are not prepared to change. We want it to continue the way it is</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why change? Why change if it is functioning ok?</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why change the 9th graders. They are not prepared to be with the older students.</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like the system the way it is.</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Option A- It isn’t helpful at all – change isn’t helpful. + give school choice and transport too. This will help the connections between families and teachers increase numbers of students by offering programs</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why upset this system?</td>
<td>PJH</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where’s the wisdom in overcrowding PHS? How can we best serve our students best with our current infrastructure?</td>
<td>PJH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space not available at two high schools to 9-12</td>
<td>PJH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wow – if statistics show a trend in schools nationwide considering going back to the configuration we currently have, why change anything at all? Teachers being forced to teach grades they aren’t familiar with. If sixth grade moves to junior high, those 6th grade teachers would have to be trained on teaching 7-8th graders. Make school of choice issues known. Change requirements. Enforce them. If school of choice percentages are on the rise, that’s what needs to be studied. Enforce requirements. If a student chooses one school, they must follow the curriculum of that school, or go to the school in their district.</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To quote Daniel Webster’s famous speech for union that was so important for Northern support in the Civil War: Liberty and Union, Now and Forever, One and Inseparable.”</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option A all the way.</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’m concerned about losing the 6th grade year for many of our students who have elected to attend elementary schools with special programs. I want my kids at Harris Bilingual for the important 6th grade year- the program would not be the same without the last year. How about a K-8 bilingual school? Or a 7-8 bilingual junior high? Why are we changing something that’s working? PSD is a high performing district. Also – districts are moving back to our model – maybe our current model is the best.</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I don’t believe a change now is warranted. It is not clear if any of these changes will fix anything. It is just diverting thought and resources from solving the issues toward reconfiguration.

Are these “community input” sessions really being seen as input or are they just sessions used to justify a decision that has already been made.

Any changes are a solution looking for a problem to solve!

Advantage of option A: Prevents increase in 8th dropout rate by having a transition between 8th and 9th.

None of these options speak directly to increase student achievement—why would we do anything this drastic without a research driven solution to increase student achievement?

Why is this at the table in the first place? What is broken? I don’t see advantages in fixing something that’s not broken for a quick fix for minor problems. Being a new resident in Fort Collins, I am amazed that this configuration is even an issue! No system works perfectly – why would such drastic actions (changing school configuration) be used to solve problems that can be addressed in a different way? Actually, I’m not sure why these issues are such problems! Building a new high school by 2010 is a ridiculous notion if it happened just because the configuration was changed!

Current system, option A is not equitable for students in high school because of drastic differences in enrollment in terms of education opportunities.

6-8 is ok with me. We moved here from Oregon that was 6-8, 9-12 and my son hated going back to elementary school. So kids do not have the problem with 6-8 as do parents

---

**Spoken Comments on Disadvantages of Option A (Current Configuration)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Dots</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>RM</th>
<th>P/S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North side voices (teachers + staff) not adequately being considered or heard by administration</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficult transitions for 9th grade, don’t fit with Jr. or HS</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System lacks equity of opportunity</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP classes may be eliminated</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling North maybe less important - unfair bias for others</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th graders – activities unavailable, difficult to participate, college apps</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th graders are physically and mentally ready for high school</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th grade grades go on transcript, and the students don’t realize it</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th grade going to high school for activities</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible closure of Fort Collins High School</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th graders experience can be disjointed (athletics but no other extra curricular activities (limbo) &amp; seriousness about academics counting for college transcripts</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We need equity through boundary changes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>PJH</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourages immaturity in 9th graders</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Splitting extracurriculars for 9th graders is tough, productivity/test scores/achievement</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current system will destroy Poudre MYP program</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continued inequity to all schools (programs)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB for 10th grade would be gone</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PJH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some have 9th graders/some don’t</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers in high school are docked based on CSAP scores from junior high teachers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jr. high not able to provide advanced classes (also athletics)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limits extracurricular activities (music, theater, art, language, etc.)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content and curriculum of 9th graders/future of students – academic limitations 6th grade and 9th grade</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less educational opportunities for 9th graders</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less buy in from students because they aren’t at school long enough</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSAP/achievement – are based on students (10th) who have only been at high schools a few months</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Instead of moving 9th graders, research other options

Divides loyalty for students (belong to different high school activities)

Moving 9th graders to high school gets them connected and could decrease dropouts

High schools offer richer extracurricular for 9th grade (but district already works with students), but costly

Worried about mental shift of 9th graders

9th graders have to be at high schools for sports

Less flexibility for 9th graders

sports/extracurriculars, no personal contact with other athletes

Concerns for 9th graders involved in H.S. Transportation

Sense of limbo for 9th graders – lack of school spirit/community

Jr. high must pick school which develops rivalries, curriculum overlaps, don’t add up, don’t match up

Higher achievement students work with specialized teachers

Emotional disconnect for low level achieving 9th graders that they are high schoolers, importance of school

9th graders in sports but still housed in junior high school (in limbo/detached)

Sports – 9th - division among the class and where they participate in sports

Communication between 9th students in jr. high and teachers in high school

9th grade is part of high school, should be IN high school

The difference between 7th and 9th (K-6th) is too great

9th grade counts on transcripts

10th graders have a hard time adjusting, then it might be too late for college

9th graders have opportunity among young children

Loss of equity of high schools

Doesn’t compare well with other school systems (e.g. college requirements)

Discontinuity for 9th graders

CSAP accountability – not enough time to prepare them, but are responsible for their scores

Drop in test scores different because 9th in junior high

9th grade classes count toward college – need to be in high school

9th graders not in high school mode

9th grade in junior high when students are working toward college credit

Socioeconomic impact causes further division in community

How will reconfiguration budget if certain programs/schools lose students?

Not enough enforcement for truancy/dropout

There still needs to be some change (i.e., boundary)

Students may take school more seriously if they were in high school

9th grades count for college, having 9th grade in high school would help them mature

“Specials” such as band aren’t offered to 9th graders (hurts scholarship opportunities)

Curriculum/science standards K-5 (K-2, 3-5), 6-8, 9-12, some difficulties with coordination and communication across levels

9th graders don’t participate much due to newness, lack of sense of belonging

The problem: there is no access to the sports in the elementaries. The 6th graders are sufficiently mature enough to go to junior high.

Remediation

IB program requires 9th and 10th on site

Severe overcrowding in SE elementary schools

Boundary concerns – students moving

9th grade courses on high school transcript, but still in junior high attitude

Only district not following the rest of Colorado

Continuous programs disrupted – foreign language, sciences, etc.

Also communication between teachers

9th grade in junior high doesn’t feel “real”

Grades affected
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivation issue</th>
<th></th>
<th>RMHS</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transition – difficult to understand grades, impact, etc.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers better able to push students to higher level</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher level would improve mentoring opportunities – help raise potential</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school makes students more serious about school</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kids that are ready to move on can’t</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th graders don’t get extra curricular activities in high school</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can fix problem without reconfiguring schools</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some particular programs get more support</td>
<td></td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate high school work from junior high locations/program may be difficult for some</td>
<td></td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May be emotionally hard at a time when they NEED to be connected (friendships impacted)</td>
<td></td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maturity level at high school level not with “kids”</td>
<td></td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logistics of sports participation</td>
<td></td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less opportunities for 9th graders, more programs at high schools</td>
<td></td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB program needs to be clarified – what advantage for 7-8th graders?</td>
<td></td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers coddle 9th graders because they are in junior high, not high school</td>
<td></td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current system is inequitable</td>
<td></td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can’t remediate 9th graders in high school</td>
<td></td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 years of foreign language is better</td>
<td></td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smaller high schools will lose out on budgeting model (lose academic possibilities)</td>
<td></td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No college counseling</td>
<td></td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimidated by high schoolers</td>
<td></td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum alignment</td>
<td></td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can’t fit more students</td>
<td></td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buses</td>
<td></td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitions are hard on kids</td>
<td></td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems with credit transfers into the 10-12 system</td>
<td></td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only district that has current system</td>
<td></td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Losing extra-curriculum activity if 9th grade is brought up</td>
<td></td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited selection in junior high</td>
<td></td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having 4 years is an advantage</td>
<td></td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity isn’t even</td>
<td></td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th less mature</td>
<td></td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th graders have to move back and forth between schools</td>
<td></td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th graders feel left out</td>
<td></td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th graders are disconnected from both senior highs</td>
<td></td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specials not coordinated between schools</td>
<td></td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower achievement with transitions (teacher coordination to address this problem)</td>
<td></td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum/transcript coordination broken</td>
<td></td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns for 9th graders - intimidation when visiting high schools</td>
<td></td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th GPA counts for high school but students don’t know importance while in middle school</td>
<td></td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th and 10th both transitions</td>
<td></td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too much change, need to plan long term goals (reduce change)</td>
<td></td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some want to be in high school</td>
<td></td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awkward for 9th graders (some in high school)</td>
<td></td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accelerated schools get stuck</td>
<td></td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th grade year – excel to potential then get bored</td>
<td></td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th grade tough year, then students need to continue 9th grade in junior high</td>
<td></td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports – bussed to high school, miss end of class</td>
<td></td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential motive? Cost? To fill under utilized facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less rigorous/varieties of courses</td>
<td></td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of course offering/opportunity for 6th and 9th</td>
<td></td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact drop out rates?</td>
<td></td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failing mandatory 9th grade courses in junior high creating issues → drop out rates</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra curricular opportunities @ high school not available for 9th graders</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where does transportation fit?</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School decisions take away from more important matters</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents have no choice, unless you leave district</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large discrepancies between schools</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-8 positive</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-5 – helping 6th graders transition via changing teachers</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If status quo, what about athletic transportation?</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum creates teachers burdens</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creates a smaller gap @ junior high, limits leadership opportunities</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will not support/achieve stated goals of reconfiguration</td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language of configuration handout is different and not clearly explained in regards to current programs/schools</td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where will parents send their kid?</td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underutilization of facilities</td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low enrollment</td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inefficient use of present space</td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drop out rate is high</td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th grade athletics causes &quot;cultural&quot; fragmentation</td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using “IB” program to manipulate athletics</td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similar situation with 6th graders, don’t fit in with elementary schools</td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyalty</td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having 9th graders not in high school when the rest of the state is, possibly missing out on college credits</td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t get the transition year of high school, too short</td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doing numerous things to help 9th graders, why not just do it and help them in that sense</td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disjointed for 9th graders, have to make decision early on because of athletics</td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics transportation -choice schools v. lack of transportation</td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shuttle buses</td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Game days</td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takes top 9th graders from Jr. highs to PHS only</td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Denver schools say they may change back</td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research not found and/or shared for schools w/ 9-12, 7-9</td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More transitions for IB 9th graders</td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More opportunities for IB students as 9th graders</td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inequities among all district such as some marching band = feeder schools</td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inequitable that PHS houses IB students</td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disparity between Hispanic / Caucasian students and achievement</td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th graders only take 2nd semester seriously</td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative to have 9th graders who fail or struggle in middle school still</td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inconvenient for a small amount of athletes to commute</td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mature students at 6th and 9th being held back</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach to dropout rate concerning 8th (investigate reasons)</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other districts are 9-12</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic materials are 9-12</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish speaking population’s concerns</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maturity level of 6th graders is a concern for K-5 students</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school lack facility/staff</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current facilities unbalanced/ under-utilized/overcrowded</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current curricula are not correlated with correct school</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limbo where 9th graders belong</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity across board – our 9th graders can’t be involved in areas other than athletics</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Comments on Disadvantages of Option A (Current Configuration)</td>
<td>Dots</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>R m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern Option A- It makes no sense to bus 9th graders from junior high to high school for advanced courses and then back to junior high. They should be able to get what they need at high school and stay there.</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Option A – Schools with no space don’t have money for programs either</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spoken Comments on Advantages of Option B (K-5, 6-8, 9-12 Configuration)</th>
<th>Dots</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>R m</th>
<th>P/ S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9th grade in high school seems to be best option for students (regardless of cost)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th graders in high school = creates opportunity in academics and extra curriculars</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set the expectations higher – the student will meet them</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th graders @ high school for all activities</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB document discrepancy</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moving IB down to 9th not feasible, money, financially, also credit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Dots placed on bottom supporting option B advantages in general)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equitable grade configuration for all schools</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality between districts (within state)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcripts for 9-12 all in house</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allows 9th graders to participate in high schools</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More educational opportunities for 9th graders</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In line with more districts in state and nation</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better curriculum alignment for all schools not just high school</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More AP classes available to them</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitions better</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The earlier students start high school the lower the drop out rate</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th grade could participate in more accelerated classes offered at high schools</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th graders in high school</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>PJH</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th transition smoother</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th grade HS – no longer drives schedule for 2 lower grade</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting 9th graders to high school, driving force</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>LJJH</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th grade do very well in high school (sports, academics, extracurriculars, previous experience)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th grade participation in all activities would increase</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Put 9th graders in line with high school, curriculum alignment</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happy medium</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics/extracurricular activities- all 4 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilizing facilities → cost efficiency → more money for programs/teachers/etc.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electives available for younger students (more options)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do something new – Middle Level Philosophy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More students = more programs at high school</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More challenging and levels the playing field</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle school model is beneficial if it is ran correctly</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textbooks, curriculum, sports, consistent with state</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advantageous for athletes or club participants in same facility</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some curriculum would be better aligned</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>LJJH</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math series, core knowledge ends in 8th grade</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data supports 4 year high school in academic achievement</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition might be easier</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum books in middle schools would be more effective for teachers in this option</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All high school requirements together 9-12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better vertical curriculum alignment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>PJH</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to academic achievement for 9th graders</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>PJH</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th graders get more freedom and options</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th graders in high school, are geared toward college, take high school more seriously</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More buy-in/investment when 9th in high school, research correlation with lowering dropout rate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel like a freshman, more mature</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All day kindergarten</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle school model – more emotional based</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most common model in CO – provides better transitions for those moving in and out of district</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to have a middle school format to support their development</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>LJJH</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easier for articulation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>LJJH</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aligning curriculums</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>LJJH</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takes care of transportation / athletic issues</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>LJJH</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation for college, have 4 years of academic consistency</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No split athletics and extra curriculars = increased participation, improvement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More equivalitity for AP program</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSAP scores more accurately reflected for 10th grade (1.5 years of prep opportunity)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th graders can’t retake a core class at high schools, caught in the middle (dropout rate)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggestion</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease drop-out rate due to continuity</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PJH</td>
<td>2 S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bigger buy-in from high school students</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PJH</td>
<td>2 S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Dots placed on top supporting option B advantages in general)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>1 P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower drop out rate the earlier a student enters high school</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>2 P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase availability of extra-curriculars in high school</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>2 P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort levels 6th grade in junior high, 9th grade in high school</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>3 P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletes being pulled between schools</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>3 P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aligns with state and national schools</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>1 P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jumpstart mental development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>2 P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th graders have role models and peer counselors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>2 P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication between teachers of school</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>3 P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic → working toward college</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>3 P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th and 8th not quite as influenced by 9th</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>3 P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th and 9th grade advanced class options</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>3 P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addresses physical needs of young women in 5th and 6th grade, allows them privacy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>4 P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher implementation of curriculum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>1 P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like majority of state</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>1 P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate modular rooms (on east side)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>1 P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th more opportunities for sports/clubs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>1 P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fewer transitions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>2 P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aligns with box curriculum CSAP, etc.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>4 P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently they don’t line curriculums from other districts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th graders will benefit from extracurriculars</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>4 P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broader range of electives for 9-12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td>1 S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offers transitional pieces</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td>2 S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs to have a support structure in order to be feasible</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td>2 S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohesiveness within elementary, K grade not isolated, more synergy within all grade levels</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td>3 S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th graders act more like 7th graders than 5th graders</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td>3 S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could help address drop-out rate, and 9th grade credit requirements</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td>4 S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefit to students in regard to college transcripts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td>4 S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex: Upward trend v. rollercoaster trend due to transition struggles &amp; grades</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A more common configuration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td>5 S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-5 allows elementary to have more focus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>6 P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If accelerated at 6th and 9th academically (math) more opportunity for higher level courses (more convenient than current transporting)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>6 P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Collins does well with enforcing closed campus for 10th now</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>6 P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated year long science beginning 6th grade</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>6 P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment in the state</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>2 P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics, outside clubs = fair game for all 9th graders</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>3 P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would help 9th graders mature earlier because in high school</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>4 P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would create singular identity for 9th in high school</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>4 P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropout rates are alarming and need to be addressed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>4 P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better curriculum alignment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PJH</td>
<td>1 S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition into H.S. sooner</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PJH</td>
<td>2 S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population at junior highs similar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PJH</td>
<td>2 S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural transition period</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PJH</td>
<td>2 S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent with nationwide &amp; state wide</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PJH</td>
<td>2 S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matches other districts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PJH</td>
<td>3 S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives 9th graders more options</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PJH</td>
<td>3 S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All schools offer great programs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PJH</td>
<td>3 S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school academic counseling available</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>2 P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility with course options in the high school building</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>2 P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th graders mindset (know-it-all), helpful for them to have peers to look up to</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>3 P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smaller class size for K-5</td>
<td>RMHS 4 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good for schools that are shrinking but bad for schools at capacity</td>
<td>RMHS 4 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nice to have advanced students in place where they do not need to be transported</td>
<td>RMHS 5 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textbook and curricula designed for 9-12</td>
<td>FCHS 1 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourages maturity</td>
<td>FCHS 1 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closer to K-8</td>
<td>FCHS 1 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allows for consistency</td>
<td>FCHS 1 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academically better for 6th to move up</td>
<td>FCHS 2 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher/student relationships</td>
<td>FCHS 1 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having 9th grade in high school (the disadvantages of A are advantages of B)</td>
<td>FCHS 2 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student population</td>
<td>FCHS 3 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-K growth facilitation, room for full day K</td>
<td>FRHS 1 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental convenience</td>
<td>FRHS 1 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less transportation $ to high school clubs</td>
<td>FRHS 1 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-6th on together not good, so K-5 better</td>
<td>FRHS 1 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum tailored for this system not current</td>
<td>FRHS 1 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fewer cars</td>
<td>FRHS 2 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities → built to support 3 grades (elementary and jr. highs)</td>
<td>FRHS 3 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alleviate crowding</td>
<td>FRHS 3 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will help athletics, not part of high school</td>
<td>FRHS 4 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard across country, has worked well</td>
<td>FRHS 4 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science/math curriculum – discrepancy between configuration for 6th graders</td>
<td>FRHS 4 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profound difference between first year 10th and a 2nd</td>
<td>FRHS 4 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase teacher communication</td>
<td>FRHS 4 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helps a universal curriculum</td>
<td>FRHS 4 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required 9th grade courses will be more accessible</td>
<td>LJH 1 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less transitions for 6th grader and increased opportunities for advancement</td>
<td>LJH 1 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuity of curriculum that generally runs K-5 not K-6</td>
<td>LJH 1 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics will be more accessible at high school for 9th (minor)</td>
<td>LJH 1 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustment period for 9th to 10th could be beneficial</td>
<td>LJH 1 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space for early learning</td>
<td>LJH 2 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kids are supported, they are known</td>
<td>LJH 2 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It would be like joining the crowd</td>
<td>LJH 2 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidate high school transcripts from a school</td>
<td>LJH 2 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th through 8th grade aids in small learning community</td>
<td>LJH 2 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers capable of teaching upper level math better in junior high</td>
<td>LJH 3 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space issue is good motivation and would solve that issue</td>
<td>LJH 3 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing advanced math level tests</td>
<td>LJH 3 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More unified teachers to better help children</td>
<td>LJH 3 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of teachers &amp; transition of number of teachers and classes between middle and high school</td>
<td>LJH 3 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Busing would change</td>
<td>LJH 3 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shows growth in CSAP scores (before there is nothing to compare to (10th grade to nothing)</td>
<td>LJH 4 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same as everyone else in the state</td>
<td>LJH 4 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better adjusted to match CSAP test…in science</td>
<td>LJH 4 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th graders have more activities</td>
<td>LJH 4 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th graders don’t have to feel like underdog…again</td>
<td>LJH 4 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 comprehensive high schools and more equitable programs</td>
<td>LJH 4 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More support for junior/senior high students rather than elementary/preschool</td>
<td>LJH 5 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will help enrollment with Fossil Ridge and Fort Collins High</td>
<td>PHS 6 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep MYP program in 2 schools instead of 3</td>
<td>PHS 6 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB primary years = K-5, 6-8, 9-12, follows track better</td>
<td>PHS 6 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District adopted programs to fit this model</td>
<td>PHS 6 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forced boundary changes, increase enrollment at Fossil Ridge and Fort Collins</td>
<td>PHS 1 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Transportation easier
Sports teams would allow students to feel more of a part of a team
IB philosophy
Students know 9th grade counts
Cut costs of busing 9th grades from junior high for sports
6th grade is middle school: increase intro to fine arts a year earlier, more opportunities
Would relieve overcrowding in some schools
9th grade athletics participation has decreased significantly since 9th go to a high school to play, would increase if at high schools
Hard to comment without knowing middle school model or junior high model
Opens opportunities for 6th and 9th graders
Helps with crowding at elementary
Helps enrollment in SE (high school)
Addresses concerns of option A
Transcript richer for 4 year
Opportunity for 5th graders to be leaders
Access to extracurricular activities for 9th graders
What is the curriculum? How will it change for both 6th and 9th grade?
Math curriculum will align better (upper level science)
Instrumental music will start in 6th grade
9th grade has to stay at Poudre for IB
Middle year programs for IB
Lowest drop out rate
Easy access for 9th graders to programs in high school (same for 6th grade)
Sports – in same school as teammates
Smaller class sizes
Same plan as the rest of the state
Allows continuation of high school courses if fail one in 9th
Maturity levels
Culture fractures with option A
Consistency for district with other schools (comparing statistics)
More instruction for 9th graders
More established feeder schools?
Equity issues for all students to access same opportunities
Improved athletic AP courses for 9th
Address drop-out rate and graduation rate
Advantages for 9th graders (but not necessarily for 6th grade)
Option B – Advantage – 6th graders get to participate in band

Written Comments on Advantages of Option B

(K-5, 6-8, 9-12 Configuration)

Option B- I disagree with the point that with grade students would be thrown to the wolves. In my experience the 6th grade classes I was involved with were ready for 7th grade by Jan of 6th grade year.

When reading the can’s for 9th graders to HS-all say they are concerned about 9th grade maturity and open campus- so get rid of open campus.
I’m all for 9th graders to HS. It will better prep them for HS and college transcripts admittance.
Pro move up 9th graders and 6th graders. More academic classes offered for them.

Plan B advantages- more opportunities for accelerated courses, clubs for 9-12
Equity issues for all students to access same opportunities.
Improved athletic AP courses for 9th
Address drop-out rate and graduation rate

I want Option B- 4 year high schools are better for kids. If we adopt this option I favor a middle school model not Jr. High

Advantages of Option B & C with 9th graders at HS (some mentioned and not recorded)
9th graders can connect to a school at a critical time
students have continuity for all 4 years at a critical time for them
students have additional extra curricular opportunities in 9th grade today PSD 9th graders cannot participate in some state activities (eg music) 9th graders belong in the high school

9-12 Strength: 9th grade counts toward High School overall GPA.

Option B & C: 9th graders absolutely should be in the high school setting

Advantage of Option B– As the parent of a child with special needs, having room to do the preK therapy groups at the neighborhood elementary would give that child a head start that is necessary for early success in school. Research shows the most important years to meet kids with special needs are the early years.

K-5 Configuration – Special ed teacher caseload becomes slightly more manageable, teachers often support K-6, K-5 is a little better

The 5th graders would fall into the leadership role if the 6th graders went to middle school. The 8th graders would fall into the leadership role if the 9th graders went to the high school.
The assumption of kids being too immature should be balanced with expectations of maturity will lead to more mature behavior.

Not all extra curricular opportunities are available to 9th graders, only sports.
Research middle schools more.
Teachers and staff are flexible and roll with whatever changes.
9 through 12 is the way!
Every other district in the state is on this program.
9th grade goes on the high school transcripts and therefore a student's education should reflect that.

To the school board: Make the hard decision – cap the high schools at 1,600, that would solve all the equity issues.

If I had to prioritize, I’d go for Option B, Option A, Option D by order of preference.

Option B positive- 6th grade girls start puberty often and are ill suited for Option A as it is now.

Option B Pos – Clubs count for the university, 9th grade counts, If they want sports, why don’t 9th graders (junior high) clubs and extracurriculars count?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spoken Comments on Disadvantages of Option B (K-5, 6-8, 9-12 Configuration)</th>
<th>Dots</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Rm</th>
<th>P/S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reasons given so far address capacity rather than achievement</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seems entirely facilities driven, not what’s best for kids</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doesn’t address underlying problems within the school district</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change = chaos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The 6th graders and the 9th graders are not sufficiently mature to have relationships with the older students in the schools.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too much too quick</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necessity to redistrict into big boundaries (caps, locations)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rush to implement in 2008, need time for adjustment</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music, art, PE teachers/curriculum may be cut or lost, also planning time cut</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If 6th graders leave, enrollment will decrease, 14% of population will leave, how can smallest schools remain open when so many schools are small (decisions may be linked)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost - $100 million who is going to pay for it, the change will require a new high school sooner than the current system, schools will eventually balance out</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>PJH</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of potential electives at high school already at capacity due to need for 9th grade core courses</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having 6th graders at middle school might be a problem</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shifting empty seats from high school to K-8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th grade students maturity/emotional levels may not be ready for middle school</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huge maturity differences between 9th and 10th and 6th and 7th</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seems like we’re disrupting more people than needed just to fix underpopulation high school</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Priority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th grade bi-lingual programs</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open campus for 9th graders is too young, have to close campus for high school = would lower lag.</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money for more facilities or more teachers</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementaries will close and lose money</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke University study – “Study questions shift of 6th grade”</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.newsobserver.com/712/story/547649.html">www.newsobserver.com/712/story/547649.html</a></td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary issues – people going out of their way to get to school</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take away h.s. choice, disenroll</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th in Jr. high – lose year of innocence</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundaries will have to change</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th grades exposed to 7th, 8th grade = exposed to more drugs, sex, deviants</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student based budgeting impact</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need a new high school sooner</td>
<td>PJH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cap on school of choice, students possibly turned away</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moving 6th grade to middle schools doesn’t have too many advantages</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move 6th grade creates problems where there was none</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation in 2010 not 2008</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any students at schools with a completely integrated specials program (i.e. bilingual) would miss the critical 6th grade year</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th graders have access to all specials – in 7th grade they choose electives, limiting choices</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No school choice – very disruptive, possibly no AP courses available</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental concerns for 6th grades, psychological</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB will be squeezed out of Poudre</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential for loss of specials in elementary, loss of valuable teachers</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Push AP classes out</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical development, puberty, makes 6th grade year a tough year for transition into middle school</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open campus a concern for 9th gradan's</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke study – 6th better in elementary</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Specials” in elementary schools will be affected by funding (i.e. gym, music, art, etc.)</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lumping 6th and 9th transitional issues and problems</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th grade not mature enough, safety issues</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th grade more able to handle change</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should address each individually</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to make sure funds for middle school philosophy and transitions</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/27 elementary schools will lose enrollment</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will teachers lose jobs?</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No set middle school model, need clarification</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>overcrowding west-side high schools</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th grade concerns being in open campus, can’t close campus just for 9th graders</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough kids to support specials and costs, closing of schools for elementary, especially on north end</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maturity of 6th graders going to middle school</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How will specials look</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary population decreases</td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could lead to school closures</td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It’s unnecessary = this problem will solve itself eventually</td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition at a younger age is more harmful</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We don’t know the impact on special programs – because of declining enrollments in elementary</td>
<td>PJS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is music still going to be important?</td>
<td>PJH</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke University study – 6th graders disciplinary actions skyrocketed while test scores went down</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logistics currently unclear</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost and resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will “water down” elementary problems – art, PE, music</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New high school earlier in Fort Collins 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will fill up high school, will cut off choice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacrifices elementary school for high school, funding/specials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rocky and Poudre do not have room</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without 6th graders, how do elementaries fund themselves (Riffenburg)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th and 6th will both go to jr. high in '09, 5th will lose opportunity to be on top and have particular leadership experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th grade programs not adequately addressed, specifically IB &amp; Avid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on student enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closing of elementary schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary changes can be disruptive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers moving to different buildings – job shuffling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential disaster! Too many initiatives tied together</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities, not physical room for more students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th graders could face social &amp; troubles in high school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on elementary school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larger classes, decrease student achievement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would require a new high school built sooner (costs/funds)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This option may force more significant boundary changes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible lead to closing some elementary schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern with Wellington going to high school other than Poudre High school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th graders not ready for middle school, not ready to make step</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad influences for the 9th graders.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We will lose special programs. (ex. Music, Art)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do we deal with the size of high schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inequity: Allocation? Implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where will we put the 9th graders? Is there room for them in Rocky?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pushing 9th graders into high school – potentially teaching them things they don’t/shouldn’t learn – keep them innocent as long as possible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age range in high school: 14-18 too broad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th graders on open campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th grade in middle school = ineffective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary schools declining in enrollment will significantly decline further impacting resources, programming, funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity issues – school closures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible concerns with specials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If 6th grade leaves elementary, that money will go to high schools with loss of students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher certification for 6th graders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overcrowding of some high schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impacting 6th graders to solve a 9th grade problem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“throwing 6th graders to the wolves” should not happen/6th and 7th graders are different (especially special needs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th to 12th mingle – not enough room to keep separate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why should 6th graders be involved in an issue focused on/benefiting 9th graders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver public schools attempted K-5 and is reverting back to K-6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th loses self-contained classroom – 9th exposed to open campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of Art/Music/PE content &amp; those teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emptying out already small schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No options minimize transitions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th grade better in elementary for community</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drop enrollment in elementary schools</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puberty + school transition might negatively affect test scores</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixing one problem and creating a new one</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition from school for special education will be much worse</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If decrease elementary school population, specials will be cut due to funding</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke University study – <a href="http://www.pubpol.duke.edu/research/papers/SAN07-01.pdf">www.pubpol.duke.edu/research/papers/SAN07-01.pdf</a></td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Already too big, need smaller high schools</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th grade on bus forever, keep them at elementary</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New high schools in 3-5 years, use $ elsewhere</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris Elementary losing a year of language, a critical year; Irish – dual language program</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th graders not mature enough for high school, caught up in 12th grade issues</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The transition will be difficult for the 6th graders and 9th graders.</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We don’t know the effects on elementary schools – with closings, from the district</td>
<td>PJH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th graders not mature physically for middle school</td>
<td>PJH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special issue needs to be addressed</td>
<td>PJH</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small elementary schools getting smaller</td>
<td>PJH</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th graders going to junior high concern for parents (protection, maturity), 9th grade as well</td>
<td>PJH</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of choice: how can we balance it out</td>
<td>PJH</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No space exists – displace students in order to make room for 9th graders</td>
<td>PJH</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lose last year of bilingual education</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is school of choice still going to be an option?</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change would punish those who are successful now</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inefficient use of current space</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible school closure</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke-Berkeley study statistics of 6th graders in elementary v. middle school</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed campus (monitoring high school students over lunch)</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worried about 9th grade access to open campus</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No need to change what works</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limiting choices</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior high school infrastructure will still be full and this will limit efficiency</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase need to re-evaluate fixed costs</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficult to fully staff elementary</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change budgeting formula</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th graders physical immaturity/development</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th grade socially unprepared to be in junior high</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lose full time special teachers for elementary</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What would the impact be on the IB program?</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is/or classify as a middle school?</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel increased</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moving 6th grade to middle school</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle school concept – may lose academic rigor</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How are we going to do it?</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls are ready, boys are not</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would 6th lose on eco week?</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why conform if higher quality already?</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers may not want to move</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of choice options decrease</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only pro b/c of more space, not better for 6th grade students</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hidden costs, ex. Lunch periods, teacher transition costs</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complicates transition process for students moving rooms</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th and 7th double transition</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worried 6th graders recess cut</td>
<td>FRHS 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More traffic/buses</td>
<td>FRHS 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle school option does not let you use facilities for other uses</td>
<td>FRHS 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>FRHS 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disruptive/culture clash</td>
<td>FRHS 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitions can be prepared for, though might force to close schools</td>
<td>FRHS 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some schools already over capacity by 300 students</td>
<td>FRHS 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No room for growth</td>
<td>FRHS 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money for 9th and 10th full schedule</td>
<td>FRHS 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropout increases if not full schedule</td>
<td>FRHS 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of seats to support 9-12 in high schools, special concerns</td>
<td>FRHS 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students need support and guidance not available in jr. high in 6th</td>
<td>LJH 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student based budgeting may not work</td>
<td>LJH 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social development will be impacted, the whole child needs to be considered</td>
<td>LJH 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many schools are already at capacity</td>
<td>LJH 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of peer support</td>
<td>LJH 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imbalance caused by reconfiguring boundaries will impact students negatively</td>
<td>LJH 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art/Music/P.E. are not framed as academic, but these are necessary curriculum for fully rounded development</td>
<td>LJH 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age difference between 9th &amp; 12th graders. Could have negative social consequences not yet considered (i.e. rape)</td>
<td>LJH 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There’s not a middle school format that supports development</td>
<td>LJH 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-based budgeting and this issue are too close of a change</td>
<td>LJH 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone needs to step up and make these schools work</td>
<td>LJH 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to determine if it’s a middle school or high school configuration</td>
<td>LJH 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need that time to grow</td>
<td>LJH 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiently utilize elementary schools?</td>
<td>LJH 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cut backs at middle school level</td>
<td>LJH 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work more difficult for teachers</td>
<td>LJH 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertainty of grade configuration within grade levels</td>
<td>LJH 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff shuffling</td>
<td>LJH 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualification to teach grade levels</td>
<td>LJH 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prerequisites change between schools</td>
<td>LJH 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lots of money</td>
<td>LJH 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimidation factor between 6th and 8th grade</td>
<td>LJH 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of taking out large population of 6th graders and the effects on them</td>
<td>LJH 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth rates of kids – girls v. boys</td>
<td>LJH 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of buildings combined with population loss</td>
<td>LJH 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will eastside school slowly take on kids?</td>
<td>LJH 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where would RMHS/PHS put the kids?</td>
<td>LJH 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools may be so small, cuts will be made</td>
<td>LJH 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equitable transition process</td>
<td>LJH 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could lose $, full staff</td>
<td>LJH 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary changes?</td>
<td>LJH 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundaries and choice need to be addressed, and caps</td>
<td>LJH 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Already have 20 under-enrolled elementary schools</td>
<td>LJH 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th grader teacher certified? (can’t teach science in non-sci classroom)</td>
<td>LJH 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would be cutting out year of bilingual program for 5th graders</td>
<td>LJH 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underpopulated SE high schools will have large influx of students in 4-5 years without any change in grade configuration</td>
<td>LJH 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seems main drive is to fill just 2 schools, instead just offer more attractive options at those underpopulated schools (however the AP programs take time to grow)</td>
<td>LJH 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning time would be negatively impacted if go to K-5</td>
<td>LJH 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most people are certified K-6 → people won’t be as qualified if have to move schools → temp</td>
<td>LJH 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impacts 6&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; grade ELL’s → may increase dropouts of ELL’s</td>
<td>LJH 5 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Also pulling out kids from some schools will make some schools not economically able to stay open</td>
<td>LJH 5 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security issues</td>
<td>PHS 6 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of choice limitations</td>
<td>PHS 6 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition of Poudre current- why change?</td>
<td>PHS 6 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open campus for 9&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;, controlling/enforcement</td>
<td>PHS 6 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to look at majority, not only advanced students</td>
<td>PHS 6 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moving 6&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; up, teacher certification (K-6) hurts teachers ability</td>
<td>PHS 6 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High possibility to close/consolidate elementary</td>
<td>PHS 6 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disruptive boundary changes</td>
<td>PHS 6 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes don’t show positive outcome in data, 6-8 can be detrimental</td>
<td>PHS 6 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We need specifics</td>
<td>PHS 1 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation issues, time consuming</td>
<td>PHS 1 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rocky Mountain High school can’t have a closed campus for 9th graders</td>
<td>PHS 1 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential competition problems for 9th graders</td>
<td>PHS 1 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Look at all 3 major issues</td>
<td>PHS 1 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could impact 9th and 6&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; grade teachers</td>
<td>PHS 1 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation → redistricting</td>
<td>PHS 2 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threatening specials in elementary level</td>
<td>PHS 2 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems can be solved within current system</td>
<td>PHS 2 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ for new high school (but may need new school anyway)</td>
<td>PHS 2 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents move kids to increase rank, schools with low performance will have lower enrollment</td>
<td>PHS 3 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t see this filling classes up north, not equalize distribution/unseen consequences</td>
<td>PHS 3 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doesn’t address student achievement in small classes</td>
<td>PHS 3 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern for IB current students making choices/work harder for what they get</td>
<td>PHS 3 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad move for 6-7&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; first year</td>
<td>PHS 3 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th graders won’t fit, schools are full</td>
<td>PHS 3 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study cited 6&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; at middle level creates discipline problems</td>
<td>PHS 4 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open campus for 9&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; a concern</td>
<td>PHS 4 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on mountain schools (multi-grade)</td>
<td>PHS 4 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course selection / variety may be limited</td>
<td>PHS 4 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern about class sizes in fuller schools</td>
<td>PHS 4 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Still two transitions</td>
<td>PHS 5 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immature kids most hurt</td>
<td>PHS 5 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forces students out of a SLC (small learning community) at an earlier age</td>
<td>PHS 5 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During transition year having 9&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; and 10&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; coming in at the same time</td>
<td>PHS 5 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current sixth grade transition process works well</td>
<td>PHS 5 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th grade is right of passage year</td>
<td>PHS 5 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student vs. Protégé.</td>
<td>PHS 7 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not satisfy necessary academics.</td>
<td>PHS 7 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determined by nonacademic economic questions</td>
<td>PHS 7 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The maturity process of the student is not taken advantage of (older students)</td>
<td>PHS 7 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not promote school activities for the intermediate</td>
<td>PHS 7 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divides the Latin community</td>
<td>PHS 7 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotes division/separation – North/South.</td>
<td>PHS 7 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where are the PHS and RMHS students going to go?</td>
<td>PHS 8 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no sufficient space for science classes.</td>
<td>PHS 8 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeping 6&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; thru 8&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; together is like junior high schools</td>
<td>PHS 8 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The change will cost alot of money</td>
<td>PHS 8 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeping special programs alive, would more students change these programs? Or less?</td>
<td>PJH 1 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change from jr. high to middle school needs to be addressed with philosophy</td>
<td>PJH 1 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oversimplifies dropout problem</td>
<td>PJH 2 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Written Comments on Disadvantages of Option B  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(K-5, 6-8, 9-12 Configuration)</th>
<th>Dots</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>P/ S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Concern option B=-enough time before implementation to get it right as well as enough money. Middle school transcript common planning time.. 9th and 10th students fully scheduled. No open campus for 9 and 10  
Suggested lead time. 4 years as the data driven decisions from 90-91 study. | FCHS | 2 | P |
| Concern Option B- How long before the High Schools are full? Do we need to build another HS soon? They are very expensive, can we afford this? Changing every school to fill 2 high schools, get real | FCHS | 2 | P |
| Option B disadvantages  
-the overcrowding of the high schools – how going to resolve?  
-6th graders not mature enough for Jr. High nor strong enough to participate in sports.  
-access to proper reading material in the respective libraries | FCHS | 4 | P |
| The academic advantages for the 9th graders moving into the 9-12 options are not clearly spelled out. Drop out rates, academic performances and student maturity levels are not fully addressed. | FRHS | P |
It seems that the reason for realignment is simply to fill the desks at FCHS and FRHS and transitional advantages for 9th graders are afterthoughts. There may be real advantages but the arguments in favor of moving the 9th graders to the 9-12 models are not compelling.

| Impact on next years 5th and 8th grades who will never be “Big Man on Campus.” Impact on Eco Week, Graduation, Special Activities. If no implementation plan is known until later this year, the current 5th graders are already in transition without knowing what the “plan” is. | FRHS | P |
| Option B/Hybrid – concerned about impact on art, music, PE, counseling, etc. | LJH | S |
| Option B – Concern – What about 6th grade teachers? They are often not certified to teach 7th and 8th? How would that affect staffing? What will PHS and RMHS do with those students? | LJH | S |
| Option B – 9th grade girls no protection from 12 grade boys | LJH | S |
| Please see attached Duke University analysis on this type of configuration (6-8). If you go to the website (www.pubpol.duke.edu/research/papers/SAN07-01.pdf), you can get the entire report. Quite alarming! If other states (i.e. North Carolina) are finding that 6th graders in junior high has not been working & that there are negative consequences. Why would we choose to go down that path? (abstract of the report was attached which is available on the website) title of paper is “Should Sixth Grade be in Elementary or Middle School? An Analysis of Grade Configuration and Student Behavior.” Philip J. Cook, Robert MacCoun, Clara Muschkin, Jacob Vigdor NBER Working Paper No. 12471, Issued in August 2006 | PHS | P |
| Abstract: Using administrative data on public school students in North Carolina, we find that sixth grade students attending middle schools are much more likely to be cited for discipline problems than those attending elementary school. That difference remains after adjusting for the socioeconomic and demographic characteristics of the students and their schools. Furthermore, the higher infraction rates recorded by sixth graders who are placed in middle school persist at least through ninth grade. A plausible explanation is that sixth graders are at an especially impressionable age; in middle school, the exposure to older peers and the relative freedom from supervision have deleterious consequences. | PHS | P |
| One disadvantage to option B would be the maturity level of 6th graders and how they would handle the transition from elementary to junior high. Would they follow the model of the 6th graders at Kinard where they were in their own subsection? | PHS | P |
| I want the board to understand that special programs (specifically Harris Bilingual) would severely suffer by losing 6th grade. Our 6th graders not only provide leadership and language models, but they leave our school better equipped in English and solidly bilingual/confident in Spanish. | PHS | P |
| Disadvantage for B – Impact on mountain schools would be negative | PHS | P |
| There are not enough facilities for the high schools | PHS | 8 | P |
| Option B Neg – 6th graders and 9th graders staying in lower grades helps protect them more. No pressure to grow up, no dating between grades. The changes will cost more money, regardless of money we must focus on what’s happening academically with the kids | PHS | P |
| If you add 9th grade to Poudre, they’re going to separate Hispanic communities and there is going to be conflict, people will fight to stay together | PHS | P |
| A possible separation between North and South is also problematic (ethnic division) | PJH | S |
| New building cost with 4 year high school program. | PJH | S |
| Putting 6th graders in the same building with 8th graders is a bad idea! 6th graders are not mature enough (physically or emotionally) to handle mixing with 8th graders | RMHS | P |
| Problems with 9-12 high school | RMHS | P |
| Special education topics | RMHS | P |
| District programs will change dramatically but these topics have not been addressed | RMHS | P |
| ED (affective) programs will require major procedural changes | RMHS | P |
| Very difficult to have effective programs in the high school that include possible 14 year old boys with 19 year old boys. | RMHS | P |
Possible students who are in school through 21 years (possibly in high school 7 years)

6th grade kept in grade school allows children to focus on school rather than the junior high thing. Where the 6th grader in the junior high would have a different focus.

6th graders are not mature enough for junior high. 9th graders are not mature enough for high school.

2014 or 2015 v. 2030 to build a new high school?

I don’t have $100,000,000 to spend in 2014! Get real. Solve the issue --. Find ways to attract students to FCHS and FRHS.
- control school of choice at RMHS and PHS
- inspire a more positive attitude at FCHS to attract students
- start new programs at FCHS/FRHS to attract students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spoken Comments on Advantages of Option C (K-6, 7-8, 9-12 Configuration)</th>
<th>Dots</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Rm</th>
<th>P/S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6th graders remain in elementary school</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep 6th grade in elementary</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No drastic change for the 6th graders</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th in high school but 6th remain in elementary, nice balance</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longer time in elementary school leads to greater security</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior high is not the greatest, could be tailored to their specific needs (7th and 8th)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less transition</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th grade remains in elementary and 9th move up, alleviates 6th concerns</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smaller middle school decreased 8th grade dropout rate</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary keep specials, enrollment will be there</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More time with the schools that matter (Elementary and High schools)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th grades advantages of high school</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better option than B if A wasn’t an option</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addresses primary issue of 9th graders moving up</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PJH</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeps 6th graders in K-6 and 9th graders move on</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PJH</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Dots placed on top supporting option C advantages in general)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary schools are not affected, less likelihood to lose special programs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decreased 9th grade dropout rate, they get to move on</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All high school advantages of option B</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-8 grade good place to work out personal issues before high school</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on transitional stages</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeping #s in elementary is good for employment/staffing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual/personal attention from teachers in 7th and 8th with smaller schools</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th and 8th less maturity differences</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimizing junior high</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good transition to make all schools K-8 and have advantage of 9-12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school advantages from option B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Won’t impact 6th graders</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State curriculum better suited to this option</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See advantages of option B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-8th get more individual attention</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>PJH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longer continuity 9th – 12th</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>PJH</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See option B for 9th grade</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See option A for 6th grade</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boutique high school – spare junior high school space</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased opportunity for 9th graders</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More time to offer support for 9th graders and improve CSAP scores, more than a year to work</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th grade still in elementary</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addresses concern of options A and B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PJH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater involvement at critical age</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PJH</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal change for 6th graders – low impact</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More time to prepare special needs for kids for life after school</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Later starts: more sleep for growing kids (k-6)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More flexibility in 7th/8th grade curriculum</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>½ school population changes every year, less community</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less opportunity for students to go into leadership roles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th graders advantages of elementary school</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advantages and disadvantages of 9th grade going up</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potentially easier to close a junior high than a high school or elementary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th working with counselors looking toward graduation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining elementary special staffing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less upset, less change, less re-education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less upset from elementary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuum of specializes curriculum at elementary level</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doesn’t impact elementary system</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LJS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studies support this model</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow setting scheduling structure better</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suited for 7-8, no worry about 9th schedule, ex.cohort, more transitional and focused</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-6 at bilingual schools has a set curriculum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th grade in elementary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-building restructuring could keep moves at a minimum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-6 would allow 6th graders to stay</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PJH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fewer grades, fewer bodies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PJH</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chance for 9th graders to be leaders</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PJH</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advantageous for kids to be in elementary school longer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less impact on specials in elementary schools</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This shifts less students and teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminates transitions in 6th grade in elementary school</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can be a good time to help with transition – more prepared for high school, smaller school environment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-8 in future?</td>
<td></td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain students from charters and private schools at 9th grade</td>
<td></td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free up junior high school bldgs for other uses (smaller high schools, k-8, etc)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solve crowding problems in junior highs</td>
<td></td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers are certified to grade 6</td>
<td></td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce school size, class size</td>
<td></td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Way junior high sports designed</td>
<td></td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers don’t move</td>
<td></td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specials teachers stay</td>
<td></td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No school closings for elementary because of decreasing students</td>
<td></td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No 9th grade student drivers</td>
<td></td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fewer junior high disciple problems</td>
<td></td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditto for 9-12 and K-6 strengths</td>
<td></td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puts kids in awkward stages together</td>
<td></td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More concentrated support</td>
<td></td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lines high school up with rest of state</td>
<td></td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frees up extra junior high</td>
<td></td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship strengths most prominent in last 4 years and first 7 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jr. high students feel they are not “treated as adults” with 6th graders present</td>
<td></td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-middle school v. jr. high mentality</td>
<td></td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits 9th graders</td>
<td>FRHS 4 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th still in elementary</td>
<td>FRHS 4 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th not mature enough</td>
<td>FRHS 4 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeps 6th grade where it belongs</td>
<td>LJH 1 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In theory, lose less of 6th grade program</td>
<td>LJH 1 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go on with Jr. High model</td>
<td>LJH 1 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmentally 7th &amp; 8th go better together</td>
<td>LJH 1 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication for teachers to support 6th grade students</td>
<td>LJH 1 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alleviates concerns about 6th grade</td>
<td>LJH 1 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary strengths of option A</td>
<td>LJH 2 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 year elementary school</td>
<td>LJH 2 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socially – good, more bonding</td>
<td>LJH 3 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less cost</td>
<td>LJH 3 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior high – very spacious, smaller class sizes</td>
<td>LJH 3 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It works but it is necessary to have right number of teachers</td>
<td>LJH 3 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could have boys and girls schools (Option E?)</td>
<td>LJH 3 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7+8 is only time necessary to separate genders</td>
<td>LJH 3 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only moving 9th</td>
<td>LJH 4 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not impacting elementary schools</td>
<td>LJH 4 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeps junior highers participating at own schools</td>
<td>LJH 4 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easier to close jr. high than elementary or senior high</td>
<td>LJH 4 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All benefits from B concerning 9th being in high school</td>
<td>LJH 4 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advantage for elementary to stay 7 grade levels</td>
<td>LJH 4 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Might close a Junior High but that facility may be converted to a high school alternatively (as an alternate solution to overcrowding)</td>
<td>LJH 5 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible boundary changes</td>
<td>PHS 6 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th addresses athletic, academic college prep</td>
<td>PHS 6 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationwide and Colorado – 9-12 is the norm (but need to indoctrinate 9th into high school culture well)</td>
<td>PHS 1 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower dropout rate</td>
<td>PHS 1 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stay inline with research that says 6th graders should stay in elementary</td>
<td>PHS 2 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement of vertical alignment</td>
<td>PHS 2 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns for option B are solved by this</td>
<td>PHS 2 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In and out</td>
<td>PHS 3 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th grade teachers wouldn’t have to get recertified</td>
<td>PHS 3 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 worst years of your life are short</td>
<td>PHS 4 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More room at junior high buildings</td>
<td>PHS 5 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus/attention on 7th/8th graders</td>
<td>PHS 5 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary schools stay the same and still have money</td>
<td>PHS 8 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They stay at the school for 7 years with less teachers</td>
<td>PHS 8 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination of advantages of option A and B</td>
<td>PJH 2 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best of both worlds</td>
<td>PJH 2 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevents dropouts</td>
<td>PJH 3 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior high school is already a transition time</td>
<td>PJH 3 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the 9-12 configuration</td>
<td>PJH 3 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletes will excel</td>
<td>RMHS 1 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school: Advantages of B</td>
<td>RMHS 2 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary school: advantages of A</td>
<td>RMHS 2 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility in way can be scheduled</td>
<td>RMHS 3 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addressing dropout – 8th graders with extra attention</td>
<td>RMHS 3 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th, 8th – good to be together, concentrated attention</td>
<td>RMHS 3 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitions in 7th and 9th, close transitions</td>
<td>RMHS 5 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Might be able to have specialized programs (ex. Bilingual)</td>
<td>RMHS 5 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Might allow for flexibility of K-8</td>
<td>RMHS 5 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fewer years of junior high, which can be a really challenging time | RMHS | 5 | P
Doesn’t address over/under population in elementary school | RMHS | 5 | P

### Written Comments on Advantages of Option C
(K-6, 7-8, 9-12 Configuration)

| Advantages of Option B & C with 9th graders at HS (some mentioned and not recorded) | Dots | School R m | P/ S |
| - 9th graders can connect to a school at a critical time | | | |
| - students have continuity for all 4 years at a critical time for them | | | |
| - students have additional extra curricular opportunities in 9th grade- today PSD 9th graders cannot participate in some state activities (eg music) | | | |
| - 9th graders belong in the high school | | | |

Option B & C: 9th graders absolutely should be in the high school setting | FRHS | P
Option C is by far the most desirable. 6th graders are not mature enough to handle things kids are exposed to in jr high/middle school that they do not manage in elementary. Taking them out of elementary one year earlier is forcing them to deal with things they lack the maturity to effectively handle. You are essentially “robbing” them of a year of innocence. I am also very concerned that removing 6th graders will have a detrimental effect on funding for “specials” in the elementary schools. Children thrive on these specials- they tremendously enrich their education.

I support Option C. This is what I believe is best for kids. I see Option D as fall back. | PJH | S
If we have to change, the best option is C. | PHS | P

### Spoken Comments on Disadvantages of Option C
(K-6, 7-8, 9-12 Configuration)

| Will increase amount of student transitions, if we’re doing this strictly for economic reasons we’re not paying attention to the fact student excel in smaller communities currently (supported by research) | 6 | LJH | 5 | S |
| 6th are mature enough in middle school, large maturity | 4 | FRHS | 4 | P |
| More core, less electives and AP | 4 | PHS | 6 | P |
| Too much too quick | 4 | PHS | 1 | P |
| In-out is a negative, transition years are difficult, no stable year | 4 | PHS | 3 | P |
| Only 2 grades is a stopping off place | 4 | RMHS | 1 | P |
| Kids in constant transition in 7/8 option, don’t get to know teachers | 3 | FRHS | 2 | P |
| Lower # of students/staffing | 3 | LJH | 3 | S |
| Could lose community (ex CLP, dr. (lose school, lose town) | 3 | LJH | 4 | S |
| Future of IB programs | 3 | LJH | 1 | S |
| What are we really trying to solve? | 3 | RMHS | 1 | P |
| Too many transitions (2 in less than 3 years), hard to build a true culture | 3 | RMHS | 3 | P |
| Placing students in this transitional place, 7th and 8th become more difficult | 2 | FRHS | 3 | P |
| “Band, Beans, and Buses” determine the schedule | 2 | LJH | 3 | S |
| Middle schools too small to operate | 2 | LJH | 4 | S |
| 7&8 only transition | 2 | LJH | 4 | S |
| Research shows transitional lag and not enough recovery time | 2 | PHS | 6 | P |
| Cutting special programs | 2 | PHS | 3 | P |
| Special programs (such as losing funding for elementary music teachers) would be cut | 2 | PJH | 1 | S |
| Kill a lot of electives with only 2 years | 2 | PJH | 3 | S |
| With transitions typically see decline in student achievement | 2 | RMHS | 3 | P |
| 7-8 = coming or going out does not give students a long enough time in a building | 1 | FCHS | 2 | P |
| Under-utilization of junior highs | 1 | FCHS | 3 | P |
| Quick transitions | 1 | FCHS | 4 | P |
| Less students = less socialized teachers (i.e. art, music teachers) | 1 | FCHS | 4 | P |
| Wasted space in Junior Highs | 1 | FRHS | 1 | P |
| Takes money away from other departments | 1 | FRHS | 3 | P |
| Lack of offerings in 7th and 8th, courses, transitions, etc. | 1 | FRHS | 3 | P |
| 2 grade level – means in and out, larger in = better performance | 1 | FRHS | 4 | P |
| Ignoring the recommendation for implementation in 4 years | 1 | LJH | 2 | S |
| 4 years of transition for students | 1 | LJH | 4 | S |
| Will close some junior highs | 1 | LJH | 5 | S |
| Inefficient to teach only 2 grades (7-8) | 1 | PHS | 6 | P |
| Closing (more more junior highs) | 1 | PHS | 6 | P |
| 6th grade lose opportunity staying | 1 | PHS | 6 | P |
| Cost issue | 1 | PHS | 1 | P |
| Boundary issues (Poudre and Rocky) | 1 | PHS | 1 | P |
| Always in transition – no sense of belonging | 1 | PHS | 2 | P |
| Does not utilize existing facilities at middle level well | 1 | PHS | 4 | P |
| Concern about junior highs closing due to low enrollment | 1 | PHS | 4 | P |
| 7th and 8th always in transition | 1 | PHS | 4 | P |
| Limit # of courses offered, HQ issues | 1 | PHS | 5 | P |
| Junior high understaffed, closing a building? | 1 | PHS | 5 | P |
| For 6th graders, it is one more year that students would not be able to take part in opportunities (due to class issues) | 1 | PJH | 1 | S |
| Too many transitions too short of time | 1 | PJH | 3 | S |
| Funding for schools with only 2 grades | 1 | RMHS | 1 | P |
| Stay focused on real reasons | 1 | RMHS | 2 | P |
| No special programs available, not economically feasible | 1 | RMHS | 2 | P |
| Loss of curriculum…boring? | 1 | RMHS | 2 | P |
| Specials at junior high | 1 | RMHS | 3 | P |
| 7th and 8th loss of programs | 1 | RMHS | 3 | P |
| 6th are mature enough to be in middle school, want it if given the opportunity | 1 | RMHS | 3 | P |
| High schools are full and junior high will become smaller | 1 | RMHS | 4 | P |
| Lose funding for programs at junior high level | FCHS | 1 | P |
| Junior high schools lose a grade, less students = less funding | FCHS | 1 | P |
| Impact charters and private schools? (especially at 9th grade) | FCHS | 1 | P |
| Close Jr high schools, which ones? | FCHS | 1 | P |
| All high school disadvantages of A | FCHS | 1 | P |
| 2 years too short for student experience/infrastructure | FCHS | 1 | P |
| Not a cost effective use of space, could lead to school closings (but could be good) | FCHS | 2 | P |
| Less variety and specials for 7-8th | FCHS | 2 | P |
| 7-9 does not have enough money or years for middle school model | FCHS | 2 | P |
| Won’t decrease drop-out rate | FCHS | 3 | P |
| Too much at risk to change (but some change is required) | FCHS | 3 | P |
| May have to close a junior high | FCHS | 3 | P |
| Will have to build a new high school right away | FCHS | 4 | P |
| Libraries reading materials | FCHS | 4 | P |
| Enrollment going down, pure numbers | FCHS | 4 | P |
| Possibility of schools shutting down | FCHS | 4 | P |
| Change too soon, students won’t get to feel “superior” in ‘07 | FCHS | 4 | P |
| Small schools disadvantages for curriculum, not as many classes offered | FCHS | 4 | P |
| Logistics problems from students taking HS level classes | FCHS | 4 | P |
| Limit 7th and 8th class options (math) | FCHS | 4 | P |
| Junior highs may have to close | FRHS | 1 | P |
| Ditto 9th grade concerns from option B | FRHS | 1 | P |
| Ditto 6th grade concerns from option A | FRHS | 1 | P |
| Costs for moving teachers | FRHS | 1 | P |
| Would need to close some junior highs | FRHS | 2 | P |
| Takes from junior highs and gives to high schools | FRHS | 2 | P |
| Limit 7-8 options for curriculum | FRHS | 2 | P |
| Cut/limit rooms for kindergarten or special need programs that pre-K would need | FRHS | 2 | P |
| Maturity v. facility v. academic? Not always complimentary | FRHS | 3 | P |
| Lack of availability for lower level classes, do you bus a 9th grader with a 7th grade math level back to the junior high? | FRHS | 3 | P |
| Junior highs under utilized, space and dollars | FRHS | 3 | P |
| Silly for unutilized space | FRHS | 4 | P |
| Not capacity for all schools for K-6, 9-12 | FRHS | 4 | P |
| Higher costs for small school, unless combined | FRHS | 4 | P |
| Boundary changes will have under utilized and some overcrowded | FRHS | 4 | P |
| Shutting down Jr. Highs | LJH | 1 | S |
| Shift boundaries will effect make-up/climate/population of school. This will impact all schools | LJH | 1 | S |
| Putting Jr. Highs together | LJH | 1 | S |
| Poudre High & Rocky are already overcrowded | LJH | 1 | S |
| Possible closure of junior high | LJH | 2 | S |
| Inequities at junior high are smaller | LJH | 2 | S |
| Inefficient use of space (junior highs) | LJH | 2 | S |
| 2 year model doesn’t allow attachment | LJH | 2 | S |
| Traumatic to move grade levels/schools | LJH | 3 | S |
| Special staffing at higher level | LJH | 3 | S |
| Re-look at research at 6-7-8 junior high v. 7-8-9. | LJH | 3 | S |
| Lose option to explore in middle and high school | LJH | 3 | S |
| Longer in a situation, statistically speaking, better for the students, especially in poverty stricken school districts/areas. | LJH | 3 | S |
| Larger school. Less control | LJH | 3 | S |
| Choice out | LJH | 3 | S |
| Align 9-12 grades, not at elementary level | LJH | 3 | S |
| 7-8 is a short amount of time | LJH | 3 | S |
| Will most likely close schools | LJH | 4 | S |
| What programs will be at the jr. high? Kills music/art because too small | LJH | 4 | S |
| Negative impact 4 small junior highs | LJH | 4 | S |
| In/out coming, no school pride, hard to buy in | LJH | 4 | S |
| Unrealistic to be able to keep 9th graders on campus for closed campus | LJH | 5 | S |
| Restrict economic growth for AP opportunities, 9th graders cost more to educate and facilitate | LJH | 5 | S |
| 9th grade lose leadership responsibilities/opportunity with change | PHS | 6 | P |
| 7-8 doesn’t allow for community not enough focus on relationships building | PHS | 6 | P |
| Special programs (accelerated programs) | PHS | 1 | P |
| Junior high under-enrolled, could force closures | PHS | 1 | P |
| Impacts 7th and 8th grade teachers | PHS | 1 | P |
| Dropout rate questionable | PHS | 1 | P |
| Crowding at Poudre | PHS | 1 | P |
| Can’t attach to junior high culture | PHS | 1 | P |
| Can we attract teachers | PHS | 1 | P |
| Academic performance is impacted by transition | PHS | 1 | P |
| Passing problem-spreading it out and making it bigger | PHS | 2 | P |
| Maturity level | PHS | 2 | P |
| Less contribution from parents, no sense of belonging | PHS | 2 | P |
| Junior highs are already small/under-utilized, lead to closures | PHS | 2 | P |
| 9th graders and “open lunches” is risky (transportation, attendance, etc.) | PHS | 2 | P |
| Run pattern, transitions, flow | PHS | 3 | P |
| Not capable now, but possible in 4 years because of class size | PHS | 3 | P |
| Negatives from B | PHS | 3 | P |
| Need new high school by 2014 under this option rather than 2030 | PHS | 3 | P |
| 9th grade open campus | PHS | 3 | P |
| Written Comments on Disadvantages of Option C  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(K-6, 7-8, 9-12 Configuration)</td>
<td>Dots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option C disadvantage- 7+8 grade schools can lose class offerings since students enrollment may decrease causing funding decreases. Less money for class offerings, art, science, specials,</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Spoken Comments on Advantages to Option D (Hybrid)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Dots</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>RM</th>
<th>P/S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diversity and choice</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K – 8 To have more opportunities available of change in the school.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K – 8 One single transition. (for the 9th graders.)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-8 fits 5 of 6 criteria / priorities</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-8 schools support structure</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not an all at once approach</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least disruptive, no one at Rocky, Poudre are impacted</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings utilized well</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fill up Fossil Ridge and Fort Collins</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving choice for parents and students</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K – 8 The bilingual programs are more successful</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of community/support neighborhood location</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better utilize facilities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The kids succeed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best utilizes facilities without closing buildings</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East side more conducive to movement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficient space utilization</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic diversity addressed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give more choices</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeps options open for the future, future enrollments</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimal flexibility of efficiency</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offers more choices (like K-8)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthens curricula programs such as core knowledge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fix enrollment issues in south Fort Collins</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It’s all about choice – we are doing it now</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K – 8 Money for the elementaries</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realistic transition (transition to other models)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Try it, if it doesn’t work, change</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allows choices</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choice for each child individually</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students to choose regarding maturity levels/readiness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test if 7-12 works then change other schools</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced programs can be structured across the board</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility of configuring special programs individual needs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-5, 6-8 blends with K-8 possibility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More choice + promote public ed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A transition – not all of the sudden</td>
<td></td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allows good transition over a few years instead of enforcing uniformity</td>
<td></td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can choose to move if want to be in a different configuration</td>
<td></td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choice for all town</td>
<td>RMHS 2 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fits with Fort Collins district model that anything goes</td>
<td>RMHS 1 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives schools, families, and neighborhoods opportunity to create ideal configuration</td>
<td>RMHS 2 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good feeder system</td>
<td>RMHS 2 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include advantages of A, B, and C</td>
<td>RMHS 2 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More choices – great variety, make our school system rich</td>
<td>RMHS 5 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports for the kids in 9th that are still at middle school</td>
<td>RMHS 4 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition model</td>
<td>RMHS 3 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety</td>
<td>RMHS 2 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works for geographical in each community variability</td>
<td>RMHS 1 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allows flexibility in facility use</td>
<td>PJH 1 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allows process to happen sooner (good and bad)</td>
<td>PJH 2 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could better the feeder systems</td>
<td>PJH 3 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More options for parents</td>
<td>PJH 3 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space better utilized</td>
<td>PJH 3 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary solution, could serve as a transition</td>
<td>PJH 3 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allows for choice, flexibility for district</td>
<td>PHS 3 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allows for K-8</td>
<td>PHS 1 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choice for each school</td>
<td>PHS 6 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choice would be possible/fostered</td>
<td>PHS 6 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combines options from A,B,and C</td>
<td>PHS 1 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easiest to implement right away</td>
<td>PHS 6 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency and flexibility in building use</td>
<td>PHS 6 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May help the smaller communities (La Porte, Wellington)</td>
<td>PHS 5 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More natural</td>
<td>PHS 1 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not forcing</td>
<td>PHS 1 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity for creativity</td>
<td>PHS 6 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to look at which system is beneficial</td>
<td>PHS 5 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide more choices</td>
<td>PHS 5 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suits individual needs of each school</td>
<td>PHS 1 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports school of choice and programs/curriculum</td>
<td>PHS 6 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use building space more effectively</td>
<td>PHS 5 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are already progressing towards this model</td>
<td>PHS 1 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We do already follow a hybrid in some ways (Poudre, IB, etc.)</td>
<td>PHS 4 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow unique opportunity to study differences between 9-12 and 10-12 configurations</td>
<td>LJH 2 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allows communities to choose</td>
<td>LJH 2 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allows flexibility for transition</td>
<td>LJH 3 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allows variety of choice for families</td>
<td>LJH 4 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Also forcing change may positively increase communication between schools in terms of curriculum</td>
<td>LJH 5 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundaries irrelevant</td>
<td>LJH 3 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doesn’t force two high schools to change, thus negatively impacting school</td>
<td>LJH 4 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual language also benefits with programmatic continuity</td>
<td>LJH 4 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easier to continue with bad decisions</td>
<td>LJH 4 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible – meets the needs of different regions of the school district</td>
<td>LJH 5 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good for initial transitions</td>
<td>LJH 1 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helps bypass need to re-boundary</td>
<td>LJH 4 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to compare schools ? (either A or D)</td>
<td>LJH 3 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increases choice options</td>
<td>LJH 2 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kids score better, less transitions the better</td>
<td>LJH 3 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not taking enrollment away from declining elementary schools</td>
<td>LJH 2 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People already self-select by moving near their school of choice (supported by demographic data)</td>
<td>LJH 5 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research supports K-8, especially in lower socio-economic areas</td>
<td>LJH 4 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools will be able to address their own individual needs</td>
<td>LJH 1 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space available, maximize space efficiency</td>
<td>LJH 2 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under-enrolled high school can increase enrollment and over-enrolled elementary schools can decrease</td>
<td>LJH 4 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can adapt facilities to accommodate the program (flexible)</td>
<td>FRHS 3 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change not easy, but beyond short term (is it short or something else, or variety of grade)</td>
<td>FRHS 4 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easily implemented</td>
<td>FRHS 1 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fewer boundary changes</td>
<td>FRHS 3 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good for school choice</td>
<td>FRHS 1 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good for transitions as demographics change</td>
<td>FRHS 1 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure and financials – efficient</td>
<td>FRHS 3 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Might find kids choosing in</td>
<td>FRHS 4 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruffle fewer feathers</td>
<td>FRHS 3 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student based budgeting/funds</td>
<td>FRHS 4 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports neighborhood schools</td>
<td>FRHS 1 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This model keeps schools from closing and helps with transitions for schools in other areas</td>
<td>FRHS 4 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation issues: only certain kids can make choices</td>
<td>FRHS 4 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilize schools for their full potential</td>
<td>FRHS 3 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is known / comfortable, similar to current system</td>
<td>FRHS 1 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Won’t have considerable tax or boundary interruptions, flexible</td>
<td>FRHS 3 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th grade to Fort Collins and Fossil Ridge</td>
<td>FCHS 3 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allows schools to have less transitions – good for students</td>
<td>FCHS 4 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best addresses competitiveness</td>
<td>FCHS 3 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build in flexibility</td>
<td>FCHS 4 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could be viewed as transitional until demographics are more stable</td>
<td>FCHS 4 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective for #s</td>
<td>FCHS 2 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free up space in crowded junior highs to spacious high schools</td>
<td>FCHS 4 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less painful for overcrowded schools</td>
<td>FCHS 1 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More choice for parents</td>
<td>FCHS 1 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More choice or higher quality for teachers</td>
<td>FCHS 1 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More options and opportunities</td>
<td>FCHS 3 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of choice smooths out bumps</td>
<td>FCHS 1 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set standards for 9th grade</td>
<td>FCHS 2 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strictly transitional</td>
<td>FCHS 4 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We already do option D</td>
<td>FCHS 2 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Written Comments on Advantages to Option D (Hybrid)**

- Option D delivers a solution (say a 4 year hs) to the neighborhoods that need a solution (say the southeast neighborhoods) and keeps the well-working status quo.
- Option D keeps the built-in flexibility the PSD offers. Today, to continually adjust to changing demographics without presuming there is any good configuration across PSD.

```
Dots School R m P/ S
FCHS 4 P
```

Concern with Option A,B,C: one size fits all does not allow choice and does not compete with schools outside the district which do provide alternatives like K-8, etc.

```
FRHS P
```

D (plus) allows lots of research to be done because so many options. Allows core knowledge to operate in most positive manner.

```
LJH S
```

Hybrid – we are already doing this – open the flood gate and let the parents decide.

```
PHS P
```

Option D – Use underutilized junior highs for boutique high schools. Good idea!

```
PHS P
```

**Spoken Comments on Disadvantages to Option D (Hybrid)**

```
Dots School R m P/ S
12 FRHS 1 P
8 FRHS 2 P
```

Create divisions in district

Possible chaos, will split school districts and community
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short term solution for a long term issue</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>2 P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of equity in district</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>2 P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defacto racist and segregation increase</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td>5 S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create unfair choices for certain</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>4 P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doesn’t seem fair, greater divide between have/have nots, inequalities</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>2 P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population that can’t do choice is segregated in north</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>3 P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doesn’t address equity</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td>4 S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of information to staff, teachers, parents about options</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td>1 S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too many transitions, not the best for the kids only the budget</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td>1 S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competition in a negative way</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>5 P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confusing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>3 P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differences in calendars across district</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>1 P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Might create unfair advantages</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>4 P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead time is very important</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>4 P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inconsistency</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>6 P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough info for parents</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>1 P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary changes would be even more problematic if none of the schools are “the same”</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>2 P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific demographics &amp; choice - resources to select?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PJH</td>
<td>2 S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cop-out to making a decision w/ greater implications</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>1 P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaos – extending into everything</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>4 P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too confusing for the town of Fort Collins as a whole</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>4 P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary option</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>3 P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segregation of district</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>4 P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not articulated / defined, what does it look like</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>4 P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who makes decisions?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>1 P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inconsistencies – confusion for students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>1 P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB/Specials programs harmed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>1 P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good for students who can be transferred to special curriculum schools but not others left behind</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>1 P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too messy, people move, could eventually confuse districts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>4 P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creates education disparities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td>4 P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once you do the shift, there’s no turning back</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td>2 S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could pit schools against one another, drive district further apart, east v. west [already doing this with current model]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td>4 S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More competitive than cooperative</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td>5 S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management nightmare – parents and administration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>6 P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of diversity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>6 P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divide more than bring together</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>6 P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating chaos of choices, too fracturing to whole community</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>6 P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under-enrolled high school without 9th graders</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>1 P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logistical nightmare</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>1 P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could segregate kids by parent’s ability/understanding of choice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>1 P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could prolong painful process</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>1 P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Defacto segregation” limited choice to student with the means to make that choice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>2 P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficult to track students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>3 P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficult now to articulate, would impact curriculum issues negatively</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>4 P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Already in place (with some of the district), so not equitable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>4 P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only a temporary solution</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>1 P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bringing in more kids will limit options</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>1 P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial burden to taxpayers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>2 P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elements of this happening currently and we are in chaos, option D will increase school of choice and financial chaos</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>2 P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary changes still have to change, some boundary changes will never work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>4 P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary transition to B or C</td>
<td></td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>1 P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of choice impacted?</td>
<td></td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>1 P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logistics may be expensive on time, $ and risk in making decision</td>
<td>FCHS 1 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to decide which schools?</td>
<td>FCHS 1 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allows schools to make transition when they can</td>
<td>FCHS 1 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative drain</td>
<td>FCHS 1 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th graders want to be in high school</td>
<td>FCHS 1 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focuses on #s at the sacrifice of curriculum and what’s best for the schools</td>
<td>FCHS 2 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could lead to more school choices and more cross-city transit</td>
<td>FCHS 2 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation problems</td>
<td>FCHS 3 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kids could get lost with 9th grade</td>
<td>FCHS 3 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficult implementation</td>
<td>FCHS 3 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What if we get stuck in this hybrid</td>
<td>FCHS 4 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>FCHS 4 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too much movement</td>
<td>FCHS 4 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only delaying the process</td>
<td>FCHS 4 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No cohesiveness</td>
<td>FCHS 4 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How will this be implemented</td>
<td>FCHS 4 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality</td>
<td>FCHS 4 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools out of sync</td>
<td>FRHS 1 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would force some teachers to teach 6 classes</td>
<td>FRHS 2 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design &amp; implementation linked</td>
<td>FRHS 2 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease instructional efficacy, lower moral, lower test scores</td>
<td>FRHS 2 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfair in relation to peers, from the kids perspective</td>
<td>FRHS 3 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underprivileged kids ➔ greater disadvantaged</td>
<td>FRHS 3 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitions within district and outside district</td>
<td>FRHS 3 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not a model</td>
<td>FRHS 3 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No universal plan ➔ potentially hurt real estate value</td>
<td>FRHS 3 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No stake that 9-12 remain in high school</td>
<td>FRHS 3 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many different teaching models</td>
<td>FRHS 3 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental strain – too much driving</td>
<td>FRHS 3 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defeats purpose of being equitable</td>
<td>FRHS 3 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration inefficiencies (management of 4 systems in 1)</td>
<td>FRHS 3 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“band-aid” not long term solution</td>
<td>FRHS 3 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Super-overcrowded, or people move when 10th and 11th unfair</td>
<td>FRHS 4 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Might be difficult to adjust without major changes</td>
<td>FRHS 4 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is possible to merge fast?</td>
<td>FRHS 4 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid schools need time</td>
<td>FRHS 4 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How will it affect facilities?</td>
<td>FRHS 4 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Either decision: not enough time, need 4 years</td>
<td>FRHS 4 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambiguity to how hybrid will break down</td>
<td>FRHS 4 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/6th exposure to older (in some, not others)</td>
<td>FRHS 4 P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would fragment community even more</td>
<td>LJH 1 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only good in transitional phase, not long term</td>
<td>LJH 1 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not equal education</td>
<td>LJH 1 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No real change will take effect, only talk, due to lack of info to parents</td>
<td>LJH 1 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of consistency</td>
<td>LJH 1 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families moving within district areas to different models</td>
<td>LJH 1 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not address 9th grade</td>
<td>LJH 1 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There needs to be a split school board</td>
<td>LJH 2 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short term fix for a long term problem</td>
<td>LJH 2 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School choices create more movement to follow grade configuration</td>
<td>LJH 2 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If we do it temporarily, could disrupt kids</td>
<td>LJH 2 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t have room (concern B&amp;C)</td>
<td>LJH 2 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unintended consequences</td>
<td>LJH 4 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation issues</td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too many things going on</td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seen as option that makes all happy</td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School choice for those who can, can’ts lose out</td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No clean feeder system, not clear for feeders</td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moves away from professional learning community that district is trying to create</td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harder to have communication ability</td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It could get really complicated (district curriculum articulation)</td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have / have not system → creates more need for choice so makes this even larger of a problem</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn’t balance in long run (9th grade would choose to go to high school and those could over-enroll)</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation issue (cost) opportunity</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-economic split</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of choice would be enhanced to bad level (too scattered)</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship maintenance</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lose sense of community schools due to different choices and options</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disadvantage for transportation</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cap on school of choice</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not a long term solution</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs to be addressed on site</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior highs split</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficult for curriculum</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confusing for newcomers to district</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnitude of chaos?</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inequity</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imbalance of community as a whole</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment of curriculum would be difficult</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too complicated</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper work nightmare</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inconsistent, too much transition</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divisive in community</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficult to level field for consistent path</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC nightmare</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over time possibly more inequities</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of cohesiveness</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families &amp; students moving getting tossed around within system</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confusion with students</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern for HQ 6th grade teachers</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-12 – once you go there you can’t go back</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To promote smooth transitions if one changes neighborhoods.</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation obstacles</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expensive in both time and money</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The construction of other schools not necessary. (high schools)</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain to whom this program will serve</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The choices will continue benefiting the middle class. Example - transportation</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How long with this option last?</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaos and disorder continuing in our school system</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitions can take a long time</td>
<td>PJH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solution is not long term</td>
<td>PJH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does this address best needs for kids?</td>
<td>PJH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could create a rift in community</td>
<td>PJH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quick implementation = reduced time to refine plan</td>
<td>PJH</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaying the inevitable</td>
<td>PJH</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Written Comments on Disadvantages to Option D (Hybrid)</th>
<th>Dots</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>P/ S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concern Option D-short term solution for long term issue- ie sending Wellington junior high 9th graders to Fort Collins. Short term solution not wise.</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think we must have consistency with grade configuration throughout the school district to ensure equal opportunities for students and to make sure teaching standards are met.</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option D: very concerned how this addresses equity across the district. School choice is only a choice for those who have the ability to make a choice- it is a scam for our under-privileged families.</td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option D- concerns about equity north and south. (9-12, north and 10-12, south) Limit school of choice #’s</td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option D – Unequal = goes against reasons for doing any change</td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option B/Hybrid – concerned about impact on art, music, PE, counseling, etc.</td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The hybrid model scare me because we work and work and work on curriculum alignment across the district, and this seems to defeat that whole process. Let’s be united in the decision for the district.</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D- Disadvantage – As a transition, this would be a disruption for both teachers and students over a period of at least a few years.

A disadvantage to Option D would be that it would not be equal for all students because some actually many families cannot get their kids across town to their “choice” school. Most middle to upper class families again would have all the advantages.

Option D (neg) – Promotes division of community between north and south, if they change schools, or move houses, they’ll have problems with transitions.

Option D- doesn’t solve anything, fixes disparity in enrollment.

Hybrid model is not a good idea! It would be too costly to administer. It would disintegrate all sense of community both in the schools and in the neighborhoods.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spoken Comments on Advantages to K-8, 9-12 configuration</th>
<th>Dots</th>
<th>School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K-8 and 9-12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fewer transitions for students overall</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PJH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent with what is best for student achievement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PJH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes the district more competitive with charter school models</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PJH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes collaboration easier</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PJH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handles transition issues</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PJH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic continuity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PJH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilize SE,NW schools better</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PJH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengths from option B for high school</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PJH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space utilization (possibly)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PJH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less transition</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PJH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better test scores because of less transition</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PJH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides more special programs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PJH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allows for moving 9th graders</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PJH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a scenario that was never mentioned K-8, 9-12. It has the advantages of moving 9th grade to HS while having fewer transition in the middle years. The K-8 could even be done in just a few places where facilities and need for student achievement warrant it. It would be a great way to provide choice to those whose kids need a safe familiar environment in the middle years.</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What happened with K-8 option? How would you implement these options?

What about K-8 option? How are you going to implement all of this?

Why did we drop K-8 from the options? This option has real benefits and would seem to resolve many problems with the current configuration. We could fit 2-track K-8 in all elementaries and 3-track K-8 in Jr Highs with 2 Jr. Highs left over (HS of choice or admin offices?) Huge benefits- possibly higher cost, but all have costs. This one may be worth the expense.


---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spoken Comments on Disadvantages to K-8, 9-12 configuration</th>
<th>Dots</th>
<th>School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Space utilization (possibly)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>LJK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why is a K-8 9-12 configuration not being presented as an option?”</td>
<td>LJK</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Given that one of the major stated reasons for reconfiguration is to address the lag in achievement that occurs during transition years why is the district not considering a K-8 configuration?”</td>
<td>LJK</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too many “ifs”</td>
<td>LJK</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time issues/constraints</td>
<td>LJK</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social problems</td>
<td>LJK</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction of teachers</td>
<td>LJK</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical facilities</td>
<td>LJK</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>Dots</td>
<td>School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elective selection limited</td>
<td></td>
<td>LJH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disparity in facilities across district</td>
<td></td>
<td>LJH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td></td>
<td>LJH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility changes would be difficult</td>
<td></td>
<td>PJH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings/programs appropriate for what they are ready for</td>
<td></td>
<td>PJH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Miscellaneous Spoken Comments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th – 12th high schools district wide in connection with enforcing</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>caps at full or near full high schools, would balance students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>popular and maximize equity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundaries will have to change no matter what</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should have 4 year transition periods, not 2 (2010 implementation)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional K-8/9-12 discussion</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity of opportunity district wide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-8 option should be focused on for research</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional K-8/9-12 discussion</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reach small schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School consolidation, redrawing boundaries</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PJH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Collins not familiar with anything but junior high model</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional K-8/9-12 discussion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FRHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce transitions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What would it take to fully implement system?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LJH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money</td>
<td></td>
<td>FCHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Collins / Fossil Ridge go to 9-12, keep Rocky and Poudre 10-12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those who want 10-12 can go to Rocky/Poudre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those who want 9-12 can go to FC/Fossil Ridge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropout rates – How do you compare across the state</td>
<td></td>
<td>FCHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the hybrid even work?</td>
<td></td>
<td>FCHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creates segregation, not all can transfer</td>
<td></td>
<td>FCHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money is always a concern</td>
<td></td>
<td>FCHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>But won’t be able to solve all population problems</td>
<td></td>
<td>FCHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider the creation of an IB school</td>
<td></td>
<td>FCHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced placement opportunities move available by keeping 9 yrs of</td>
<td></td>
<td>FCHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students in the same building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No school closures</td>
<td></td>
<td>FRHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where is research coming from?</td>
<td></td>
<td>LJH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where did implications wheel go from committee?</td>
<td></td>
<td>LJH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As long as inequities are addressed, need more time to explore</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ljh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>solutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality teachers will always be in the district regardless of grade</td>
<td></td>
<td>PHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>configuration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One year? How is that possible?</td>
<td></td>
<td>PHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation!</td>
<td></td>
<td>PHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How systems are implemented is most important</td>
<td></td>
<td>PHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary changes in all options</td>
<td></td>
<td>PHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No consideration for magnet school</td>
<td></td>
<td>PHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern with how forums set up, administration needs different</td>
<td></td>
<td>PHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>type of forum with community members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can use ID system for closed/open campus</td>
<td></td>
<td>PHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do we do to include 9th graders in high schools and bring</td>
<td></td>
<td>PHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>equity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We currently have 9th graders in high school</td>
<td></td>
<td>PHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Look at program and school to see why some are full and “not so full”</td>
<td></td>
<td>PHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 transitions no matter what model</td>
<td></td>
<td>PHS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Written Comments Concerning the Process of the Forums

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>RM</th>
<th>PS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 3-way too many members of our group are PSD employees. Parent viewpoints were watered down</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The students started out great with keeping people on track but lost control when started on disadvantages of Option B. Somewhat back on track towards summary.</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The facilitators were awesome- they seemed comfortable with the process. They were not afraid to interrupt to keep things moving. Did a good job of reflecting back what was being said.</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| -My concern A – the parents in this room, at least the ones talking the most, seem to have high achieving kids, influencing their advocating Option D  
-Since this forums goal is to make the best of the situation for the most students, it is nor clear Option B is better for most kids, the average-achieving ones.  
-As a parent of an average kid I’m pleased with current configuration A. | FCHS   | 4  | P  |
| -I think we should have professional facilitators for this type of forum.  
-I think that there are many unsubstantiated reason for the changes. No discussion was allowed on these issues/reasons.  
-This whole process was amateurish. | FCHS   | 4  | P  |
| CSU students were wonderful- note taking was tough with the speed of discussion. | FCHS   | 4  | P  |
| We are not here to argue our points, the purpose of facilitation should do a better job at sticking to agenda. Our group did not feel comfortable all the time. It felt a bit too confrontational. | FRHS   |    |    |
| This room consisted of 25 people. 19+ participants were Poudre School District employees who dominated the discussion. More about teachers and not focused on kids! | PHS    |    | P  |
| Recorders didn’t catch essence of remarks  
Recorders didn’t catch all remarks  
Format of advantages then disadvantages did not let conversation flow naturally  
Did not pass out these cards. | PHS    |    | P  |
| Input on the process – I really appreciate the way this process has gone. Breaking out in smaller groups with a truly unbiased party facilitating was a great idea. I also appreciated the use of the note cards and dots and I hope the district truly listens to the feedback they receive. | PHS    |    | P  |
| I was disappointed that so much of the conversation was around opinions not much about real research. | PHS    |    | P  |
| Will there be another open community forum once the data has been compiled and presented to the school board? Will the parents/community have an opportunity for input? | RMHS   |    | P  |
| When will community members be able to express a specific preference for one of these options? Will community preferences be considered in making these decisions? | RMHS   |    | P  |
| This format has stifled consideration of community opinion or other ideas. | RMHS   |    | P  |
| There is a group of people that have organized to attend each session at each of the schools, making sure they have a representative in each break out room. They are speaking against the changes. I believe their efforts would possibly skew the data recorded. They clearly impact the discussions and the direction they take. | RMHS   |    | P  |
| My biggest concern – there was no opportunity to offer other alternatives beside grade configuration to the district. Do you want real input beyond your choices? | RMHS   |    | P  |
| I came here to hear from the district the facts, figures and rationale behind the possible configuration change. Every time someone would try to discuss the how and why we were cut off and told to stay on track listing our concerns and advantages. Just knowing the pros and cons does not answer the logistics of the how and why. | FCHS   |    | P  |

### Spoken Comments during Conclusion Portion of Forums

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>RM</th>
<th>PS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More help/support for the 9th graders in the present system</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We [Spanish-speaking community] want to be part of the decision making in the district</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most opportunities for the most kids (not to cater to small units)</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What’s best for students</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents should get more info by decision</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to do what’s best for students (long term)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>PJH</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The decisions that were taken on “the money for the schools” were not correct and it is not definite.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money and scholarships for the 6th and 9th transition students for Summer School</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happy with the system the way it is</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities? How impacted by growth of northern area &amp; Wellington</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some facilities need renovation, flush it out, cost/impact fully understood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no sufficient community involvement. No one has asked us for our opinion.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give more support to the poorer schools</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student achievement – Will it improve?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>PJH</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than just grade configuration</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>PJH</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership from district to ensure equity, compassion, and thoughtfulness</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>PJH</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too much too quick?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundaries issues</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to look at 9th grade; involvement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PJH</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How will the fiscal budget be affected overall?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PJH</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary issues?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PJH</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is best for all PSD kids</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PJH</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal representation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PJH</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th grade to high school best choice</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PJH</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whats best for students now and in the future</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What best prepares students for the future</td>
<td></td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage parental involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education standards and mandates and how will we fit in with those expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kids roll with the punches</td>
<td></td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How is the change implemented? (room agreed with concern)</td>
<td></td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enough time?</td>
<td></td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choice needs to exist (room did not necessarily agree)</td>
<td></td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is meant by competitiveness?</td>
<td></td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transferring credits</td>
<td></td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student needs v. systems issues</td>
<td></td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No information/correlation in regarding achievement problem</td>
<td></td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs to be practical, and solve existing problems of overcrowding, minimize distribution</td>
<td></td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain special classes</td>
<td></td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helps drop out rate?</td>
<td></td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity</td>
<td></td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many of the strengths/concerns above are applicable in different options, but were not discussed again</td>
<td></td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern that the description of programs/schools described in Option A are not representative of current programs and there is worry about change with those.</td>
<td></td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern that administration is not answering necessary questions that have been asked</td>
<td></td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What’s best for most/more kids?</td>
<td></td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers not being paid what they deserve, can’t recruit, staffing dollars</td>
<td></td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide continuity with all options</td>
<td></td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality of opportunity</td>
<td></td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choice (schools of choice)</td>
<td></td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of kids impacted</td>
<td></td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time line – overlapping implications of this and student based budget</td>
<td></td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff’s ability</td>
<td></td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral positive impact on achievement, efficient budget</td>
<td></td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moving 9th to high school leads to need for new high school, have to ask voters to pay for it</td>
<td></td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Have equal, balanced, well-rounded presentation of for and against

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>LJH</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equity</td>
<td>LJH</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of problem?</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd times a charm</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remember to consider “what’s best for the kids”</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem much bigger than “grade configuration”</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More big problems linked to this “problem”</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If we’re doing well, why change it</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fix the problem where the problem is - ONLY</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision for community as a whole</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern for declining enrollment</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 issues: grade configuration, boundaries/buildings - is what we’re doing one solution to 2 problems? - it appears like we’ve jumped from one to another</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More sports facilities in junior highs.</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better preparation for college.</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The system functions the way it is</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The elementaries should stay open like they are now → “K-6”.</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are we really looking at? What are the real main concerns?</td>
<td>PJH</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There will be advantages/disadvantages to every option</td>
<td>PJH</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smaller solutions</td>
<td>PJH</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money for buses?</td>
<td>PJH</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-8/9-12 option</td>
<td>PJH</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How can we make the high schools equally appealing</td>
<td>PJH</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th graders being held back for English, no grade recovery offered in high school</td>
<td>PJH</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation is major issue for all approaches</td>
<td>PJH</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate a good model</td>
<td>PJH</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anecdotal research needs to be involved (hearing voices from the community) specifically Fort Collins community</td>
<td>PJH</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work on implementation will be done</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is best for the students?</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful transitions necessary</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equitable</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t hear about success, only hear about potential problems solved</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choice Available</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any real value to change?</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affect learning experience and grades? Decline in enrollment and how is this going to solve it?</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-12 academic rigor is better</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain about the repercussions</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have not addressed transitional students</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity of educational opportunities</td>
<td>RMHS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Miscellaneous Written Comments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Dots</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of integration of student based budgeting, re-configuration, and boundary decisions (all six dots were placed on the card)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>PHS</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-8 should be an option. Use elementary and jr high buildings to do all k-8 students</td>
<td></td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Push the issue of voting on the fund to increase the money coming into PSD</td>
<td></td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The grade configuration process has a serious flaw. Design is being done in a vacuum- without</td>
<td></td>
<td>FCHS</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
considering implementation. This has frustrated the design team members. Brainstorming is ok, but design and implementation must be considered simultaneously.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall concerns how this can impact the IB tract. School of choice is blamed for the ineffectiveness of school boundaries. This is unfair. Choice is an excellent tool if the district provides schools that parents want.</th>
<th>FCHS 1 P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K-8 is not one the options being considered. It should be, as the school board wants to hear about it and a number of parents want it. Drop-out rates aren’t as high if students are in high school at 9th grade. Must be something to consider … it keeps coming up, 3 times in 15 years. What % of IB 9th graders continue in IB after 9th grade? Are they making choices to be in high school, no matter what the curriculum is.</td>
<td>FCHS 1 P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 9-12 configuration will fill all 4 high schools. A 5th high school perhaps small will be needed. 30% of school pop is school of choice This can be managed (choice as a tool) Drop-out rate School capacities</td>
<td>FCHS 1 P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This cannot be done cheaply. Please don’t focus on low cost options. Focus on getting the right solutions</td>
<td>FCHS 2 P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My choice (1) k-8, 9-12 (2) k-6, 7-8, 9-12 1- Have you considered relocating entire programs from overpopulated schools, bus south where real estate is available? 2- From a special ed perspective, why are life/adaptive skills programs offered at Fossil, Rocky, Poudre when FCHS our 2 main feeder schools (Bolton, Lesher) cannot advance to Fort Collins HS? Familiar populations (K-9) lost in this transition… -Caps to level populations- utilize what we have rather than building more schools. -Special pops located to available real estate. (Core, IB, AP, Spec Ed) -With regard to declining enrollment, it is imperative that PSD collaborate more with the city. What’s good for PSD is good for the city. -the economic health of the school district and the economic health of the city are linked -the issues that the city needs to address that bear directly on PSD’s enrollment problem are poverty, affordable housing, homelessness, job instability, zoning politics, politics that limit growth -PSD should put more pressure on city govt of Fort Collins to change policies that would address these issues from top down -Collaborating has to be done at administrative level</td>
<td>FCHS 2 P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do your research on what the middle school model should look like. Look to Windsor, Loveland, Greeley to do well. Teacher certification is a non-factor. Yes to Middle School! Yes, need change. Shake up the status quo. Have some heart and make the decision. The kids will adjust to whatever we decide. They are more flexible than adults.</td>
<td>FCHS 2 P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why not focus on our transition difficulties in the present configuration? Will change just move the transition to another grade? Bad planning FRHS built in an unfortunate location robbing FCHS of an appropriate boundary which would offer a more stable population from which to draw enrollment. NCLB accountability for Art/Music/PE are we meeting requirements? Cost analysis for proposals that include facility use fiscal accountability. What is best for our students? If we make a change, we need to transition in a way that has the kid’s smooth transition as the #1 objective. Will community and staff input really make a difference in the outcome of this decision? Why doesn’t Fort Collins look at bringing its own IB program or something that would make it stand out? Professional facilitators</td>
<td>FCHS 3 P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FCHS 4 P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic model</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity was considered an important criteria. I wish equity was given to neighborhood access to Trut.</td>
<td>FCHS 4  P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity of educational opportunities. Curriculum alignment. Transitions between grade levels Preparation for post secondary options</td>
<td>FCHS 4  P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern: Why wasn’t a high school built in the NE quadrant versus building another high school with in a few miles in the SE quadrant? Since this is not an option now, there needs to be thorough proactive planning with the chosen option instead of being reactive.</td>
<td>FRHS  P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option B: comment on the “in support” items under the “junior and senior high schools” section-9th bullet down, I don’t understand the statement “in middle school model, 6th graders would have a single or fewer teachers.” What does this mean? Doesn’t make sense to me.</td>
<td>FRHS  P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How will these transitions take place? How this is handled will have more of an effect on how this is received and perceived than any of these options.</td>
<td>FRHS  P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment: I am very concerned about the fact that our district has been through this type of configuration study twice in the past and implementation never occurred. (I also understand the difference between then and now.) I believe that whatever option is recommended be one that has a strong likelihood of being able to be implemented. Why did K-8 get dropped?</td>
<td>FRHS  P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The high school enrollment projections are likely low because they don’t consider charter/private/home-school influx in grades 7, 9 &amp; 10. Will likely never fit 9-12 into 4 high schools.</td>
<td>FRHS  P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please, if Option B,C, or D is chosen- implementation should be Fall 2010. The committee who made the 1990-91 recommendation stated in that the decision should be 4 years. There was much research and school visitations to support this.</td>
<td>FRHS  P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please consider K-8 option.</td>
<td>FRHS  P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are many variables (priorities) to the correct decision: cost, opportunity, transportation, faculty, admin, building efficiency. But it always comes down to the student- getting them best ready to launch in life.</td>
<td>FRHS  P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is irresponsible to consider grade configuration design without also considering implementation at the same time. Design and implementation are interdependent.</td>
<td>FRHS  P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instead of opening a new high school in 2016, open a small high school in an under-utilized Jr High building.</td>
<td>FRHS  P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation should happen in Fall 2010, that way there is room at Poudre and Rocky for 9th graders</td>
<td>FRHS  P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the Fall of 2008 is the implementation for B,C,D then put PHS and RMHS on split schedules until their numbers allow for 9th graders to be at the buildings full day.</td>
<td>FRHS  P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe high school should include grades 9-12, so those students have the advantages of participating in extracurricular activities and preparing for college or life after high school.</td>
<td>FRHS  P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why don’t you “The school district” drive the 7th, 8th and 9th to be more educationally challenging? Many children are telling me how much easier Jr high is than grade school, here in PSD.</td>
<td>FRHS  P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West side high schools have lots of specialty programs drawing lots of choice students to overcrowded schools and away from undercrowded schools.</td>
<td>FRHS  P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No implementation plan for any of the options.</td>
<td>FRHS  P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like for it to be a middle school model, not a Jr High model.</td>
<td>FRHS  P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is very difficult to discuss changing configurations when there is no guarantee that there will be a smooth transition and there is no implementation plan.</td>
<td>FRHS  P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A concern of mine is that you can have the best plan and lose it in the implementation process. The implementation plan has to be perfect!</td>
<td>FRHS  P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why are we pushing to input our decision to input this system in the fall of 2008 when population projections indicate that the high schools would be better able to handle the influx in 2-3 years?</td>
<td>FRHS  P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timing of any 9 to high school change is of great concern to Kinard’s current grade 6 students. Many of these students feel they have missed out on being the “big kids’ in elementary school</td>
<td>FRHS  P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and want to have a chance in junior/middle high. If the change occurs in school year 09-10 they will be in 9th grade and miss yet another chance to be the “big kids” in a leadership role. If you make the change-make it in school year 08-09.

| Plan A and C are already not options for Zach students due to space availability. It was announced that Kinard has 6th grade but it was not made clear that they are not chosen into Kinard as 6th graders and may not be able to continue there as 7th grade. Please utilize facilities. Options are good. |
| FRHS | P |

If Option B is considered: Please! Research many schools and how they handle/manage/teach 6-8. The ideal, original middle school model from the 1970’s was well thought out and worked! Don’t just round up these kids in 6-8 and make them mini high schoolers.

| If 6th graders are mature enough to be in a middle school setting. I have no concerns about 6th grade being in jr. high. Having a choice for parents who are concerned, such as some schools K-6, might be a good option. Will teachers/staff have time to prepare for the changes needed to implement the grade movement? I think the district should move to a 9-12 high school at ALL high schools, them perhaps a hybrid for elementary and jr high schools. |
| FRHS | P |

As a member of the 90-91 task force, 2 items were left off which were important: (1)Money to put each 9th and 10th grader in a full schedule (no free periods) . (2)Four years to implement – 2010-2011 school year. Those were data driven decisions.

| This hurts North Schools! |
| LJH | S |

Teachers would lose jobs, likely sending committed, excellent educators to other districts in search of jobs. Students would likely lose contact time and exposure to these VITAL content areas. Presents tremendous scheduling challenges to ensure classroom teachers planning time, which is already scarce at the elementary level

| Our current system is the same as the Mexican school system, therefore our growing Mexican immigrant community tends to support current model. |
| LJH | S |

Option B,C, D – Grade level FAQ publication states in #8: “Our goal is to keep all schools open…school consolidation or closure is not a part of the grade configuration study of recommendations.” Don’t we need to assess likely outcomes and impacts on school communities—students, teachers, parents—before making recommendations or changes? My concern is I’m doubtful these changes would not ultimately require or lead to closure/consolidation of schools

| Losing 9th grade at risk |
| LJH | S |

It is impossible to separate grade configuration from financial necessities, i.e. closing schools. Changing grades to fill one/two schools will only serve to empty other schools, shifting the problem. You are only delaying the inevitable, school closure. Why not take advantage of the current climate? (Like combining Putnam and Moore when there is currently no principal of Putnam).

| Concern (with many nods of confirmation) – the decision has already been made to reconfigure, and at this point we are just figuring out the details. Does the community really have input? We are feeling disempowered. |
| LJH | S |

At secondary level, support is built around periods, more grades may not make as great an impact.

| “Will the voices of the teachers be heard? Will these sessions offer significant information from teachers that the superintendent will take into consideration?” |
| LJH | S |

| “When will you close the first north side school?” |
| LJH | S |

| “K-8 options wording of options not clear, representative” |
| LJH | S |
"I feel like the decision has already been made just like student-based funding was made for us.

This should be about student achievement.
Moving 9th graders to high school could increase class sizes, which would reduce student achievement

Full schools may lose classes due to fewer teachers, and more students

This is a heated, complicated concern that greatly affects a significant portion of the community. I hope that the needs of all North, South, over-enrolled and under enrolled are thoughtfully being discussed. With the option of is this too soon? Is this truly equitable for all schools and students? It appears from the text and discussion that there is a favorable consideration for schools in the south. I am concerned that we may sacrifice an outstanding district to accommodate a few under-enrolled high schools.

There is a great need for an open forum with both school staff and parent/community members voicing their concerns directly to administration.

The materials need to showcase a balanced conversation for each grade configuration!

Implementation is coming too soon. Things will even out so implementation in 2010 would be much better.

There is a great need for an open forum with both school staff and parent/community members voice concerns to administrators, face to face…

The materials presented need to show a balance between each options…and they should be available to Spanish speaking parents/community members from the beginning.

Where are the special ed students? Why has no one mentioned them, included them?

Student achievement is based on great teachers and small classes, and these configurations do not address this factor at all, regardless of the broad statement Dr. Wilson made concerning student achievement.

The comment/thought that “9th grade at PHS works, why not do it everywhere?” is not based on knowing all facts. 9th graders at PHS act as a small learning community. There are only 140 of them and they take all classes together all day long. They have a very close community built by the end of 9th grade because of the close community built through very direct work (AIM, IB, Etc.) and closeness.

Student achievement is a function of small class size and good teachers. The administration says that the children do not want to close schools. This is a distortion of the truth. Ask the citizens the following question: Would you rather your tax dollars pay for teachers or pay for rent?” Close some schools!

Special education students are currently transitioned inadequately from elementary to junior high and then from there to senior high. Changing to any other model multiples the transition, staff, programs, and transportation for this population.

Several people brought up the concern that moving 9th graders would impact specialty classes because lack of teachers. Also what would happen to 9th grade teachers – wouldn’t the money follow the students, especially with the student based budgeting?

PSD should rethink having only one IB high school.

Moving 9th graders to high school would seriously impact AP offering where as IB would not be affected.

Re-aligning grades should be based on long-term growth. Waiting for the down turn in enrollment to start to surface and adjusting feeder school to help fill southern schools.

PSBB+Option D= effectively a school district of charter schools

Overall concern that the driving issue believed the grade configuration issue is school population (FCHS and FRHS underutilized). South elementary schools crowded. Which is more...
appropriately addressed with boundary discussions. Grade configuration change should be driven by lack of educational excellence not a problem facing PSD.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>One big concern: the transition 9-10th grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is a huge lag going from a closed campus to an open campus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is like going from junior high to a junior college!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This would be even worse if 9th graders are suddenly going to such a huge open campus. It is like they are going to a junior college. Please, please, please make the high schools (at least 9th and 10th grades) closed campuses!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| My concern during the presentation it was brought up that the 90-91 committee wanted K-5, 6-8, 9-12 which is true; however what wasn’t mentioned is that the committee said that they wanted this configuration under certain criteria—money to see that each 9th grader has a full schedule-closed campuses for them, if you will. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moving 6th up would it be able to open up room to add headstart into these open class rooms?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is not broken, so don’t fix it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The school district needs 5-10 more truancy officers to help with dropout students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2008 is too soon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can’t see how Option B/C would let elementary and Jr stay open.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High schools move Poudre and Rocky will be way over enrollment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Let’s look at low cost solutions without disrupting every school in the district.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-limit school of choice(enrollment) at RMHS and PHS. Students will stay in home area of FCHS and FRHS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Get programs/personnel a boost at FCHS/FRHS. Ex. The Pioneer school in FRHS is a start.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change the traditional class schedule at FCHS, the students who leave, hate it. Provide opportunities for students to stay at FCHS and FRHS instead of choosing out.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Information is not complete. What’s missing is actual effects on individual buildings if changes were made, and what boundary adjustments would be needed to balance enrollment. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If Kinard has “a 6th grade school within a school” with a separate schedule &amp; teachers, could junior high schools adopt such an idea for the 9th grade schedule? Someone from the design team suggested that there is a problem that the 9th grade schedule drives the school. Couldn’t that be accommodated?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I question the idea that 9th graders would have access to more advanced classes at the high school level. There won’t be as many courses offered at the high school if there is a 9-12 model because of more diverse populations/grade levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would open campus come to an end with 9th grade at the high school?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We love our higher level courses and our special learning communities at our high school levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A concern for the smaller schools is that they don’t have the numbers needed to have the advanced course offerings they would like to have. If we add 9th grade to high school, because we will have more grade levels, it seems to follow that ALL high schools will suffer and not be able to offer many advanced classes and special programs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I like 6th graders in elementary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I think 9th graders in high school is a viable option.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| I feel that the north side is being forced into a change to benefit the south. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open campus with 9th grade in high school will put many more kids at risk.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Having a 6-8 or a 7-8 would allow middle schools to form a sense of belonging which directly impacts achievement. Moving 9th grade to high school addresses at risk needs (40 credits) sense of belonging, and allows kids to have access to higher level courses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District seems to be attempting to decide on 3 major initiatives at once:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. grade configuration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. student based budgeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. under/over enrollment at high school</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>So far, I have seen very little integration among these issues.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There needs to be a more integrated approach to such major issues!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Comment: The IB program is extremely important to the education and the maturity of my |

| PHS | P |
children’s development and learning. This program not only teaches the fundamental and advance education but provide deeper thought processes. It teaches tolerance and culture awareness. Giving my 7th grader opportunity to attend the 9th grade IB program at Poudre will allow her to have 1 whole year to adjust to high school with the mentoring of older IB high school students. IB program output “change agent” to society in tolerance and cultural awareness as our society becomes more of a global society.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice was never considered when looking at enrollments across the district</th>
<th>PHS  P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum inconsistencies are what drive the high school enrollment gap.</td>
<td>PHS  P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big concern- why are we rushing to implement a new model by fall 2008? This is a systemic, huge change. Why in an excellent district?</td>
<td>PHS  P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band? South end elementary school? Empty risk to High school now.</td>
<td>PHS  P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are we addressing a boundary issue with grade configuration? Can we try boundary changes before we impact every school with grade configuration?</td>
<td>PHS  P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Keep the focus on what affects achievement. Which model shows a true advantage in this area?</td>
<td>PHS  P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Would the variety of classes decrease if there are more students (9-12) in order to offer required courses for all?</td>
<td>PHS  P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To help population sizes at the 2 southern high schools, have the charter schools move in for better use of facilities.</td>
<td>PHS  P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instead of helping the 9th graders, these changes would allow them more liberty</td>
<td>PHS 8  P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We don’t want the changes, because it will affect the children; they are not prepared to go to junior high school for another year.</td>
<td>PHS 8  P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instead of spending money for other schools, use this money for safety and security of our staff and students.</td>
<td>PHS 8  P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In case the change is approved and then nothing results, is the one who had the idea to change going to be here to fix the problem</td>
<td>PHS 8  P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t want any closures in any elementaries</td>
<td>PHS 8  P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t want you to close the schools</td>
<td>PHS 8  P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why are you building another high school if it is not necessary?</td>
<td>PHS 8  P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems like these came up when they constructed schools without planning well – there are only 3 miles between 2 high schools in the south, and now they need to fill those high schools but won’t provide transportation</td>
<td>PHS  P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of choice – over 30% may need to look at this in relation to boundary changes. May have to back off allowing choice… Other districts looked at in transitioning to middle school model. Who long did implementation take? How smoothly did it happen?</td>
<td>PHS  P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The problem appears to be size of school and school use related, regardless of which grade configuration option may be best for students. We need to solve that issue in order to move forward. Fort Collins and Fossil Ridge both have beautiful buildings and FCHS (at least) has good athletics – why are they not drawing more students with “choice”?</td>
<td>PHS  P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How can we possibly make a change without ever considering how any of this may occur? It seems illogical and kind of stupid. I know its difficult. But how does that fix our problems? What if we make a decision and cannot figure out how to pull if off?</td>
<td>PHS  P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What effects on student achievement? What are the financial repercussions to the district are there of building a new high school sooner rather than later? Don’t fix one problem and create more for a different set of people and a different school?</td>
<td>PHS  P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’m here because I’m a taxpaying member of this community. I want to see this community perform as such—as healthy as possible. Less interested in special interest problems but what’s best for all and equity for all members of the community.”</td>
<td>PHS  P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why are we talking reconfiguration?</td>
<td>PJH  S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where does money for early childhood programs come from?</td>
<td>PJH  S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What’s the issue?</td>
<td>PJH  S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What does music look like (any curriculum area) for 6th graders in a 6-8 configuration?</td>
<td>PJH  S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What about general music?</td>
<td>PJH  S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We need fiscal impact information. How much money will be needed to make changes to the current configuration?  PJH  S

Usage. Closures, under utilized buildings  PJH  S

The white working document is from a southern perspective. Eg benefits of reducing size of elementary schools is mentioned, but not the risk of under utilization. Filling under-full high schools is mentioned, but not crowding at currently full high schools.  PJH  S

Smaller Ranges- speaking about other schools- how do they have that expertise?  PJH  S

Regarding Option B (which is very viable) Given that two years ago PSD had over 1500 empty elementary seats, and option B will move over 1000 students out of elementary schools. I don’t feel that PSD has been upfront about the effects (closings) on elementary schools. If one of the decision-making criteria is cost efficiency, either the district is being short-sighted or dishonest in claiming there will be no elementary school closures.  PJH  S

PSD gives each school a significant amount of funding for media/technology. I feel concerned that schools still need to have adequate staff to maintain and handle this funding and service. I feel strongly about the importance of media and technology since the district puts so much money into it.  PJH  S

It is very difficult to discuss options B, C, and D for 6th graders when we do not have information on what philosophy, how the middles schools will operate.  PJH  S

If we keep the current system, how specifically will the district work to deal with transitions, at risk kids, drop-out rates, etc?  PJH  S

I would like to see caps of 1500(or whatever relevant #) students at the high schools regardless of the option chosen to decrease the impact of choice on the high schools.  PJH  S

How would the student-based budgeting issue impact the K-5 elementary schools which have declining enrollment?  PJH  S

Hand full? 9th IB numbers  PJH  S

Equity for all  PJH  S

Cost not a transparent item in published info.  PJH  S

Cost analysis if option proposals physical plant?  PJH  S

Closed campus  PJH  S

Band, Orchestra and Vocal opportunities  PJH  S

Balance the numbers in the high schools- cap the numbers. IB can’t be removed from Poudre so Equity, Equity. Stop prioritizing one high school over another.  PJH  S

Assessment- doing well with high stakes tests.  PJH  S

$100 million on new school- where did that stat come from?  PJH  S

What happened to strengthening the feeder system? Have we explored all of the options in our current system grade configuration?  RMHS  P

We should align with other school districts to allow for more academic choices for 9th graders.  RMHS  P

Unanswered questions –

1. FCHS had a closed-campus for 10th graders. How did this work and how could this be applied to 9th graders in high schools?
2. What are the proposed boundary changes and when would they take place? You need to publicize this ASAP because people make life decisions around their kid’s schooling.
3. Can you show the community proof that you have exhausted all other options before making a potential huge change to option B, which would also include boundary changes?

Stuff that wasn’t mentioned, but that I think is important.

1. Option B & C has the advantage of allowing high schools to build better extracurricular programs. 9th graders can get involved earlier and stay with programs longer. It provides 9th graders more opportunities and makes our district’s schools more competitive in not only sports but also academic activities.
2. Also, it seems like representatives of the west high schools are talking about these things.
merely in terms of what will allow them to maintain status quo, not in terms of what’s best for our kids.

| Since the district is looking at transition for “all” students, I would like to know what steps/strides/funding has been committed to students with special needs who require transitional services to age 21 – 7 years for special ed. Students at the high school is not the least restrictive environment and is inappropriate for students with special education | RMHS | P |
| Please investigate the Board of Education minutes of 2000. I dispute that the district study supported and recommended a 9-12 configuration in 2000. | RMHS | P |
| Option B Block system for 6th graders could be difficult All options – I don’t see any mention of advantages or disadvantages for special education students. | RMHS | P |
| Just to reconfigure the grade levels without looking at educational philosophies makes no academic sense! | RMHS | P |
| It seems that if we don’t change or at least table it for 2-4 years. Then the large number of students in southeast elementary schools and junior highs will begin to fill the southeast high schools. The problem will take care of itself. | RMHS | P |
| If 9th graders are in junior high, don’t they learn to be responsible and school leaders at an earlier age than if they were in high school? I attended a middle school, 6-8. I had no problems there. My son was at Traut for 6th grade. He had 3 main teachers in elementary. I believe the rotation of students from class to class in the elementary setting was exciting for him and it was great preparation for him to go to junior high at Kinard. | RMHS | P |
| Could Core Knowledge curriculum be expanded in the district? More kids could benefit. | RMHS | P |
| IB program continuation is important no matter what option. It is important for families to be able to attend the same school in their neighborhood. That means less travel time and more time in school learning. Consider the environment- less pollution and traffic. | RMHS | P |
| I do not feel the why we are addressing this is adequately addressed. Boundary issue. Feeder system Who’s pushing this agenda. Dr. Wilson? Or empty buildings? | RMHS | P |
| How does an 8th graders drop out? 16 year old 8th grader? | RMHS | P |
| How do 8th graders drop out? My understanding is that students are required by law to be in school until they are 16. | RMHS | P |
| How can it be guaranteed that “equity in educational opportunity” would be maintained (not decrease in quality or opportunity) when no addition of staffing is allowed. AP classes will be downsized or eliminated. How does this promote educational excellence for our kids? Because existing teachers will need to teach 9th grade curriculum and drop some upper level classes, major academic loss and morale problems). Why is school closure, lack of school of choice opportunities, and boundaries changes not being communicated up front to the public? | RMHS | P |
| Helpful to know actual enrollment numbers (current) for schools to clarify underenrollment. Also to list capacity or target enrollment What are 8th grade dropout numbers | RMHS | P |
| Do our comments and concerns really matter, or will the district/school board decide to do what they want to do anyway? | RMHS | P |
| What does “student based budgeting” mean? Disadvantages to K-6 versus 6-8 is no band/orchestra/choir in elementary 6th graders as it as now. | RMHS | P |
| Better understanding & addressing of 8th grade drop out rate | RMHS | P |
| Improve preparation for transitions grade re-configuration not only solution to this | RMHS | P |
| Ask the government for maybe a $1 billion grant for building of schools, because the | RMHS | P |
government spends $61,000,000,000 on war affairs today. The elementary students perspective is being put in account.

As a taxpayer I’m concerned about the $100,000,000 price tag for a solution that is “cost neutral.” $100 million is the cost of an otherwise unneeded new high school

Any of the options we choose except remaining the same (option A) only shift the empty seats that already exist in the district. The empty seats are the problem. The only way to fix the empty seats is to consolidate facilities. Close schools.

The district may have to make decisions that will make some people unhappy.

It does not make financial sense to run the district at a deficit. No matter what the district implies, I think any change will cause enormous upheaval and enormous cost. The district should not continue to minimize financial ramifications.

A couple of comments were made that I need to disagree with here.

1. Someone said that a disadvantage to Option B would be that we’d have to spend tax money on a new high school. My issue with this is: if we are supposed to be doing what is best for our students and we determine that option B is what’s best, wouldn’t that be tax money well spent?

2. Someone said that option A has the advantage of offering more electives. I don’t agree. This depends more on the school’s schedule and teaching schedules. No advantage/disadvantage here.

2 things
1. As a parent, I have made the choice to live here because of the excellent schools and the choices offered.
2. No consideration has been made in regard with “special needs.” Transition concerns are huge for this population and the district.

(typed sheet left with notetakers)

Option A
The current drop out rate is not that much higher than the state average. How does moving 9th grade to high school improve the drop out rate?

“Students retained in 9th grade because they have not passed all 40 credit” this only impacted 30 kids. How is this a valid argument?

6th graders have fewer extra-curricular opportunities…” So what? This is a maturity level issue. 6th graders should probably still be concentrating more on school, than on activities outside of school.

“Due to overcrowding, enrollment at some schools will need to be capped…” Isn’t this a school of choice issue? Shouldn’t the number of school of choice students be limited instead?!

Option B
“Leadership and mentoring opportunities are provided for 5th graders.” If this change is not going to take place until 2008, what about the kids who are going to be in 5th grade next year?

In support – 12 advantages are listed for moving 9th grade to high school, only 4 advantages are listed for moving 6th grade to junior high

“Currently, little space in 2 high school…” If there is little space available, this would create over-crowding issues. Classroom size is a concern. If enrollment numbers are going to drop in a few years to where PHS and RMHS can handle the change, why not wait until then? It wouldn’t be fair for the students or teachers who would incur the overcrowding issues if we made the change now. Or what about changing the school of choice guidelines instead? Wouldn’t that change the numbers enrolled in the schools? Do that first, and see what kind of an impact it has, before you make a grade level change.
How is enrollment flat and declining if people keep moving here?

Option C
I noticed with this option—there are no transition issues for younger children. There may be for the older children, but junior high and high school is a time of transition anyway. ALL of the benefits listed are for 9th graders.

“open campus is a concern….” This is a concern listed in all three options, so it’s null and void.

“7th and 8th graders are always in transition…” yeah, so? They are anyway. Physical and emotional changes abound at this age. Junior high is one of the most challenging times in a student’s life. Making it shorter may be a good thing.

Option D Hybrid model
“Could help balance enrollment short term. Could be a short term solution to district-wide configuration.” If PHS and RMHS don’t have room currently, this is an advantage. However, I feel it could potentially lead to a lot of chaos – going from one option to another. What if someone is in a school of choice and the levels get changed? That student might then change schools. That could also apply to students in neighborhood schools. Only to have to change schools AGAIN in a couple of years?! What a mess this could cause! I think whatever change is made should be all or nothing.

Overall, I see one major trend. With any of these options, the MAIN REASON for the change is to create 4 year high schools. There are many valid reasons to do so. I believe students would benefit highly from this change. But to do this, is it really necessary to change the configuration of ALL of the schools? Why not leave elementary the way it is? Leave elementary schools the same, and only change the junior high and high schools. This way, FEWER schools are affected, FEWER programs are affected, FEWER teachers are affected, and most importantly, FEWER children are affected.
Information on the CSU Center for Public Deliberation

“Dedicated to enhancing local democracy through improved public communication and community problem solving”

Website: www.cpd.colostate.edu

The Center for Public Deliberation (CPD) was founded in August of 2006 within the Speech Communication Department at Colorado State University, and serves as an affiliate of the National Issues Forum (NIF) network. The CPD is non-partisan. Working from a communication perspective, CPD staff and students focus on the process of deliberation, not necessarily its product. Deliberation requires safe places for citizens to come together, good and fair information to help structure the conversation, and skilled facilitators to guide the deliberative process. The Center is dedicated to providing these three key ingredients to Northern Colorado.

The director of the CPD is Martín Carcasson, assistant professor in the CSU Department of Speech Communication. He is assisted by an advisory board consisting of community leaders, including representatives from the City of Fort Collins, Poudre School District, the Coloradoan, and various campus institutions such as the Student Leadership and Civic Engagement office and the Colorado Institute of Public Policy. The primary work of the CPD is completed by a core group of specially selected CSU undergraduates who commit to serve as “Student Associates” for two semesters, during which they receive class credit.

What is Public Deliberation?
Deliberation is an approach to politics in which citizens, not just experts or politicians, are involved in public decision making. Working with trained facilitators who utilize a variety of deliberative techniques, citizens come together and consider relevant facts and values from multiple points of view; listen to one another in order to think critically about the various options before them and consider the underlying tensions and tough choices inherent to most public issues; and ultimately seek to come to some conclusion for action in the form of a reasoned public judgment.

Not politics as usual

The practice of deliberation is the cornerstone of democratic and community politics. Deliberation connects people, even those with conflicting interests, in a way that allows them to make decisions and act in regard to problems or challenging circumstances. Deliberation can also reveal new possibilities for action that individuals alone did not see before

Mission Statement:
To promote the development of a vibrant deliberative democracy in Northern Colorado

Our Three Goals:

Enhance the Local Civic Culture
- Increase citizen participation in community problem solving
- Decrease the sense of polarization, cynicism, and frustration with politics
- Help develop a civic habit of relying on deliberation to address local concerns

Expand Collaborative Decision-Making
- Promote interconnections between local government and citizens
- Expand and improve the role of the public in decision-making processes
- Help incorporate deliberative techniques in local institutions

Improve Civic Pedagogy
- Study and improve methods of developing citizenship skills at all levels (K-12, higher education, citizen education)
- Promote the inclusion of deliberative concepts and activities in curricula
Center Activities:

- Moderate National Issues Forum discussions for university and local community groups using nationally-tested material
- Produce summary material on local/state issues following the NIF model and moderate public forums on those issues
- Host workshops on moderator training, issue framing, and public deliberation
- Develop and host original workshops specifically tied to the needs of organizations and institutions in the Northern Colorado area
- Work with faculty at CSU and the Poudre School District to help them incorporate deliberative activities into their curricula and classrooms
- Assist with special projects for the University, the College of Liberal Arts, Larimer County, the City of Fort Collins, and the Poudre School District
- Explore other activities and projects tied to deliberative democracy and public participation such as deliberative polling, town hall meetings, citizen advisory committees, citizen juries, focus groups, community dialogues, public policy study circles, etc.

Ways to get involved:

- Attend CPD public issue forums
- Attend a CPD moderator workshop, and then plan and host your own public forums or participate in planning ours
- Work with the CPD to help develop materials for specific issues relevant to Fort Collins citizens that you feel our community must confront
- Work with the CPD to help incorporate deliberation into your organization
- For CSU students, apply to serve as a “Student Associate” and earn class credit

For More Information contact:
Martin Carcasson, Ph.D.
Director, CSU Center for Public Deliberation
Asst. Professor, Dept. of Speech Communication
Colorado State University
Email: mcarcas@colostate.edu
Phone: (970) 491-5628
Website: www.cpd.colostate.edu