

APPENDIX B

Demand Subcommittee Results: The Hillcrest Pre-Kindergarten Survey

The purpose of the survey was to try to assess the extent to which the recent trend for increased levels of applications to kindergarten at Hillcrest is likely to continue in the near future.

It is noted that another goal that we could have added to such a survey would be to collect data on the demand for enrollment into grades other than kindergarten. However, given the limited timeframe in which the study was conducted and the limited amount of resource available for conducting it, the Demand Committee decided to focus exclusively on kindergarten enrollment, which is a primary driver of the overall size of Hillcrest. Information on older applicants would be a valuable addition but remains to be collected.

When considering how such a survey might be conducted two general scenarios were considered:

1. Random sampling – In principle it should be possible to get an accurate estimate of the number of future applicants to kindergarten by taking a random sample of a few hundred homes from the list of ~1660 homes residing within the Hillcrest attendance area and extrapolating rates estimated from the sample to the neighborhood as a whole. A challenge in this approach is making every effort possible to get a complete response rate from all the homes identified to be sampled, having non-responders can significantly bias the results. However the ultimate reason that this approach was not pursued was because of the relatively low precision that would result from even a fairly large (300+) sampling of homes – under various reasonable assumptions the resulting confidence interval would be plus-or-minus 10 applicants, which is a very large margin of error relative to the likely number of applicants.
2. Expansive survey to establish a lower bound – We ultimately opted instead for an approach whereby we would attempt to survey as many homes as possible, targeting in particular homes where it was known by personal contacts that young children resided. The disadvantage of such an approach is that the highly non-random nature of the sampling makes it impossible to do anything better than guess at what estimates to extrapolate to the homes not surveyed, however it does allow for the establishment of a relatively firm lower bound. The logic was that if it were established that the lower bound were already at a level consistent with the concerns about large enrollment then that would be useful enough information for the current survey.

After careful deliberation with all members of the Long Range Planning Committee it was felt that a more traditional survey involving door-to-door polling or some other form of cold calling could be negatively viewed by some members of the community unless conducted with some form of written forewarning and/or other documentation establishing authenticity of purpose. There not being sufficient time available to get such communications in place, the LRPC agreed instead on a more “word-of-mouth” strategy whereby the LRPC members would reach out to the

members of their caucuses to request their help in gathering together information about future pre-K applicants among friends and neighbors that they knew personally and from whom information could be collected without concerns about the process being invasive or unwelcome.

We made a list of all residential addresses contained within the Hillcrest attendance area by a process of scouring online maps of the area (using <http://www.zillow.com>) in conjunction with cross-checking each address against the OUSD online school-finder application (<http://mapstacker.ousd.k12.ca.us/>). The resulting list of 1664 homes has worked well – there was a handful of addresses subsequently pointed out to refer to empty lots with no building underway but other than that the list has proven highly accurate.

After the meeting with the caucuses on June 24, 2007, we reached out to ask parents to volunteer to collect information from their friends and neighbors. The response from the community was excellent, with a total of 41 parents stepping forward to volunteer. In the subsequent weeks these volunteers returned information for roughly 600 of the 1664 homes in the Hillcrest area.

To help ensure as high a response rate as possible and to reduce potential concerns about invasion of privacy a very minimal level of information was sought. The requested data consisted of

- Address of household (required for tracking and resolution of cases of the same data coming in from multiple sources)
- Whether or not the household would be making an application Kindergarten at any school in the future.
- Whether or not the household would be mapping an application for Kindergarten at Hillcrest in the future.
- Whether or not the household would have one or more children enrolled in Hillcrest in the 2007-08 school year.
- For each child that would be applying to Kindergarten in any school in the future:
 - Month & year of birth (to enable estimation of likely year of application, where year of application was not supplied).
 - In what year would the child apply to Kindergarten
 - Would the child apply to Hillcrest
 - If admitted to Hillcrest, would Hillcrest be the first choice among the various schools to which the child applied.

Information was collected with varying degrees of specificity. Some of the questions had excellent response rates among homes surveyed, some were very poor. For example, we got a yes/no/maybe response to the question about whether or not an application would be made for kindergarten at Hillcrest for the vast majority of respondents, but we got quite poor response rates for the questions related to the year & month of birth. This is related to the important point of the accuracy of the survey - volunteers were instructed to feel free to fill in information on behalf of their neighbors (to allow for the possibility, for example, that someone supply

information for a neighbor they know well but who is on vacation at the time). Instructions were supplied that volunteers should take particular care to omit information where they were not confident of the answer, and it is certainly reasonable to question the degree of accuracy that such a method of gathering information will have.

After the first round of the survey was complete we had information from 655 (39%) of the 1664 households in the Hillcrest attendance area. In order to further boost the response level we also conducted a web-based survey and reached out via email distribution lists. This follow-up effort contained a streamlined version of the questionnaire, comprising the subset of questions for which the response rate had already been good enough to make useful inferences. After resolution of duplicate respondents, the final number of household responding totaled 707 (42% of households in the Hillcrest area).

Table B-2: Survey Results. The first three columns present the raw data as collected, the last three columns attempt to apportion a year and likelihood of application to Hillcrest to the 25 respondents who did not specify such information. The rationale for this apportionment is outlined in the text.

Year of entry	Number of applicants to any school	Number of applicants who say they will apply to Hillcrest	Number of applicants who say they might apply to Hillcrest	Number of applicants to any school, adjusted	Number of applicants who say they will apply to Hillcrest , adjusted	Number of applicants who say they might apply to Hillcrest , adjusted
Fall 2008	47	40	6	55	47	7
Fall 2009	36	33	3	42	39	4
Fall 2010	26	23	3	30	27	4
Fall 2011	26	22	4	30	26	5
Fall 2012	9	7	2	11	8	2
Fall 2013	1	1	0	1	1	0
Not specified	25					

The data from the 707 homes responding are presented in table 2. The first 3 columns present the projected number of kindergarten applicants to any school, then breaking it down into applicants who say they **will** or **might** apply to Hillcrest. An immediately apparent trend is that the number of projected applicants drops off sharply the further into the future one looks. This phenomenon may be driven by one or more of the following factors, it is beyond our current scope or capabilities to comment on the relative validity of these hypotheses:

1. Given Hillcrest's outstanding reputation, homes for sale in the neighborhood are more likely to be sold to families with children that will soon be applying to other kinds of families. Such a factor would mean that pre-K applicants tend to move into the

- neighborhood shortly before applying, and would explain the apparent future decline in enrollment.
2. The survey was intentionally conducted in a non-random fashion, aiming merely to establish a lower bound on enrollment. Furthermore, families involved in the survey are more likely to know other families with children of a similar age than they are to know families with much younger children. This would lead to an under-representation in the survey of families that will be applying to kindergarten farther in the future.
 3. Future enrollment to kindergarten actually will decline (though it does not appear to be reasonable to explain the degree of decline predicted by the numbers in table 2 by this hypothesis alone).
 4. Some other factor.

Another salient feature of the survey data is that there are 25 or 15% of the 170 future applicants reporting with no year of application specified. It is possible that this category may have consisted of parents who were not sure of which exact year they would apply - we note that 15% uncertainty does seem reasonable for the proportion of children born at a time of year where it might be uncertain as to which year they might actually end up enrolling.

It is not absolutely clear how best to treat these individuals. What we did for the purpose of this survey was to split up the 25 applicants of unknown year into the categories of 2008-2013 applicants in the already-known proportions for those years. For example, of the 145 respondents who will be applying to kindergarten in the future and who specified the year in which they will apply, 47 stated they would apply for fall 2008. Accordingly, we compute the "adjusted" figure for 2008 applicants by taking $47/145$ or 32% of the 25 future applicants of unknown year and add them to the 47, yielding an estimated 55 applicants for fall 2008. The values for the other years are computed in the same fashion.

In order to break down the number of future kindergarten applicants for each year into those who say they will, might and will not apply to Hillcrest, we used proportions derived from those who responded with indication as to their intentions and applied those proportions to those who did not state their intentions. This is based on an assumption that those who did not state their intentions will behave similarly on the whole to those who did, an assumption that is certainly open to question but one that we nevertheless made in order to attempt to come up with an estimate. So for example among the 47 respondents who stated that they would apply to any kindergarten for entry in fall 2008, 40 or 85% said they would apply to Hillcrest, 6 or 13% said that they might and 1 or 2% said that they would not. We used these proportions to split up the adjusted estimate of 55 kindergarten applicants for 2008, estimating that 47 would apply to Hillcrest and 7 might.

It is based on reasoning of this kind that we arrive at an estimated lower bound of 47-54 kindergarten applicants for fall 2008 and 39-53 for fall 2009. It is very hard to make any useful statement about how much this estimate would increase if we had information for the 58% of homes for which we have no information. It is highly likely that these 58% of homes tend to be dwellings with a much lower proportion of pre-K children living in them, the reasoning being that families with pre-K children to some degree tend to know each other and we probably have decent coverage among the homes surveyed for such families. So, it seems to be very unlikely

that the lower-bound would need increase by more than a factor or two to cover all future applicants. However, it is equally unlikely that the current survey has captured all the future applicants and that the current lower-bound ends up being the actual number. Where exactly to draw the line in between these two unlikely extremes is beyond our capability to estimate, but given that the lower bound is already in excess of a number that can be accommodated to Hillcrest as currently configured it is clear that there will be a continuation of the recent phenomenon of demand exceeding the currently-available supply.

APPENDIX C

DRAFT

APPENDIX D
Supply Subcommittee Enrollment Prediction Model
Based on Retention Survey Results

This version of the Enrollment Projection model uses the following assumptions, which are derived from the Demand Subcommittee's survey of current Hillcrest families' retention expectations.

- Average annual attrition in grades K-4 1.3%
- Average annual attrition in grade 5 5.4%
- Average annual attrition in grades 6-7 0.0%
- Avg. kindergarten class size from 2008 on 40

Based on this scenario, the total school population--which currently exceeds by eight the maximum of 310 students as predicated by square-footage per child guidelines -- will continue to rise annually through 2013, peaking at a total population of 374. This number is an impossible population for the current facility under CSR guidelines.

Under this model, the school population begins to decrease in 2014, as the over-enrolled 2007-2008 K class reaches seventh grade; although by 2021, the last year included in this model, the total school population is still substantially in excess of 310 (it stabilizes at 340 beginning in 2019).

Grade	Fall 2007			Fall 2008			Fall 2009		
	Total Enrollment	No. of Class-rooms @ Hillcrest	Avg. Class Size	Total Enrollment	No. of Class-rooms @ Hillcrest	Avg. Class Size	Total Enrollment	No. of Class-rooms @ Hillcrest	Avg. Class Size
K	52	2.50	21	40	2.00	20	40	2.00	20
1	49	2.50	20	52	2.60	20	40	2.00	20
2	47	2.00	24	49	2.45	20	52	2.60	20
3	32	1.50	21	47	1.57	30	49	1.63	30
4	36	1.50	24	32	1.07	30	47	1.57	30
5	34	1.00	34	36	1.20	30	32	1.07	30
MS	68	2.00	34	78	2.52	31	96	3.10	31
6	28			33			35		
7	17			28			33		
8	23			17			28		
Total	318	13.00		334	13.40		356	13.96	

Grade	Fall 2010			Fall 2011			Fall 2012		
	Total Enrollment	No. of Class-rooms @ Hillcrest	Avg. Class Size	Total Enrollment	No. of Class-rooms @ Hillcrest	Avg. Class Size	Total Enrollment	No. of Class-rooms @ Hillcrest	Avg. Class Size
K	40	2.00	20	40	2.00	20	40	2.00	20
1	39	1.97	20	40	2.00	20	40	2.00	20
2	39	1.97	20	39	1.95	20	40	2.00	20
3	51	1.71	30	39	1.30	30	39	1.30	30
4	48	1.61	30	51	1.70	30	39	1.30	30
5	46	1.55	30	48	1.60	30	51	1.70	30
MS	99	3.19	31	110	3.55	31	121	3.90	31
6	31			44			46		
7	35			31			44		
8	33			35			31		
Total	364	14.01		367	14.10		370	14.20	

Grade	Fall 2013			Fall 2014			Fall 2015		
	Total Enrollment	No. of Class-rooms @ Hillcrest	Avg. Class Size	Total Enrollment	No. of Class-rooms @ Hillcrest	Avg. Class Size	Total Enrollment	No. of Class-rooms @ Hillcrest	Avg. Class Size
K	40	2.00	20	40	2.00	20	40	2.00	20
1	39	1.97	20	39	1.97	20	39	1.97	20
2	39	1.97	20	39	1.95	20	39	1.95	20
3	39	1.32	30	39	1.30	30	38	1.28	30
4	38	1.28	30	39	1.30	30	38	1.28	30
5	38	1.28	30	38	1.27	30	38	1.28	30
MS	139	4.48	31	132	4.26	31	122	3.94	31
6	49			37			36		
7	46			49			37		
8	44			46			49		
Total	374	14.31		366	14.04		356	13.70	

Grade	Fall 2016			Fall 2017			Fall 2018		
	Total Enrollment	No. of Class-rooms @ Hillcrest	Avg. Class Size	Total Enrollment	No. of Class-rooms @ Hillcrest	Avg. Class Size	Total Enrollment	No. of Class-rooms @ Hillcrest	Avg. Class Size
K	40	2.00	20	40	2.00	20	40	2.00	20
1	39	1.97	20	39	1.97	20	39	1.97	20
2	39	1.95	20	39	1.95	20	39	1.95	20
3	38	1.28	30	38	1.28	30	38	1.28	30
4	38	1.27	30	38	1.27	30	38	1.27	30
5	38	1.27	30	37	1.25	30	37	1.25	30
MS	110	3.55	31	109	3.52	31	109	3.52	31
6	37			36			36		
7	36			37			36		
8	37			36			37		
Total	343	13.28		341	13.23		341	13.23	

Grade	Fall 2019			Fall 2020			Fall 2021		
	Total Enrollment	No. of Class-rooms @ Hillcrest	Avg. Class Size	Total Enrollment	No. of Class-rooms @ Hillcrest	Avg. Class Size	Total Enrollment	No. of Class-rooms @ Hillcrest	Avg. Class Size
K	40	2.00	20	40	2.00	20	40	2.00	20
1	39	1.97	20	39	1.97	20	39	1.97	20
2	39	1.95	20	39	1.95	20	39	1.95	20
3	38	1.28	30	38	1.28	30	38	1.28	30
4	38	1.27	30	38	1.27	30	38	1.27	30
5	37	1.25	30	37	1.25	30	37	1.25	30
MS	108	3.48	31	108	3.48	31	108	3.48	31
6	36			36			36		
7	36			36			36		
8	36			36			36		
Total	340	13.20		340	13.20		340	13.20	

Enrollment Prediction Model based on achieving steady optimal total enrollment by limiting K enrollment

The next version of the model works backwards: It proposes one answer to the question, "If Hillcrest is to ultimately arrive at a steady-state school population that does not exceed a maximum of 310 students, how might we have to limit future kindergarten enrollment?"

This version uses the following assumptions:

- Average annual attrition in grades K-4 2.0%
- Average annual attrition in grade 5 5.4%
- Average annual attrition in grades 6-7 0.0%

To arrive at fairly steady school population that hovers in the vicinity of 310 students with these rates of attrition, kindergarten enrollment must be limited as follows:

- Avg. Kindergarten Size 2008-2010 30
- Avg. Kindergarten Size 2011-2015 36
- Avg. Kindergarten Size 2016 and on 38

Grade	Fall 2007			Fall 2008			Fall 2009		
	Total Enrollment	No. of Class-rooms @ Hillcrest	Avg. Class Size	Total Enrollment	No. of Class-rooms @ Hillcrest	Avg. Class Size	Total Enrollment	No. of Class-rooms @ Hillcrest	Avg. Class Size
K	52	2.50	21	30	1.50	20	30	1.50	20
1	49	2.50	20	51	2.55	20	30	1.50	20
2	47	2.00	24	49	2.45	20	50	2.50	20
3	32	1.50	21	47	1.57	30	49	1.63	30
4	36	1.50	24	32	1.07	30	47	1.57	30
5	34	1.00	34	36	1.20	30	32	1.07	30
MS	68	2.00	34	78	2.52	31	96	3.10	31
6	28			33			35		
7	17			28			33		
8	23			17			28		
Total	318	13.00		323	12.85		334	12.86	

Grade	Fall 2010			Fall 2011			Fall 2012		
	Total Enrollment	No. of Class-rooms @ Hillcrest	Avg. Class Size	Total Enrollment	No. of Class-rooms @ Hillcrest	Avg. Class Size	Total Enrollment	No. of Class-rooms @ Hillcrest	Avg. Class Size
K	30	1.50	20	36	1.80	20	36	1.80	20
1	29	1.47	20	30	1.50	20	36	1.80	20
2	29	1.47	20	29	1.45	20	30	1.50	20
3	49	1.63	30	29	0.97	30	29	0.97	30
4	48	1.60	30	49	1.63	30	29	0.97	30
5	46	1.54	30	48	1.60	30	49	1.63	30
MS	99	3.19	31	110	3.55	31	121	3.90	31
6	31			44			46		
7	35			31			44		
8	33			35			31		
Total	331	12.40		331	12.50		330	12.57	

Grade	Fall 2013			Fall 2014			Fall 2015		
	Total Enrollment	No. of Class-rooms @ Hillcrest	Avg. Class Size	Total Enrollment	No. of Class-rooms @ Hillcrest	Avg. Class Size	Total Enrollment	No. of Class-rooms @ Hillcrest	Avg. Class Size
K	36	1.80	20	36	1.80	20	36	1.80	20
1	35	1.76	20	35	1.76	20	35	1.76	20
2	35	1.76	20	35	1.73	20	35	1.73	20
3	29	0.98	30	35	1.15	30	34	1.13	30
4	28	0.95	30	29	0.96	30	34	1.13	30
5	28	0.95	30	28	0.93	30	28	0.94	30
MS	137	4.42	31	120	3.87	31	101	3.26	31
6	47			27			27		
7	46			47			27		
8	44			46			47		
Total	330	12.62		317	12.20		303	11.75	

Grade	Fall 2016			Fall 2017			Fall 2018		
	Total Enrollment	No. of Class-rooms @ Hillcrest	Avg. Class Size	Total Enrollment	No. of Class-rooms @ Hillcrest	Avg. Class Size	Total Enrollment	No. of Class-rooms @ Hillcrest	Avg. Class Size
K	38	1.90	20	38	1.90	20	38	1.90	20
1	35	1.76	20	37	1.86	20	37	1.86	20
2	35	1.73	20	35	1.73	20	36	1.82	20
3	34	1.13	30	34	1.13	30	34	1.13	30
4	33	1.11	30	33	1.11	30	33	1.11	30
5	33	1.11	30	33	1.08	30	33	1.08	30
MS	81	2.61	31	86	2.77	31	90	2.90	31
6	27			32			31		
7	27			27			32		
8	27			27			27		
Total	289	11.35		295	11.59		301	11.81	

Grade	Fall 2019			Fall 2020			Fall 2021		
	Total Enrollment	No. of Class-rooms @ Hillcrest	Avg. Class Size	Total Enrollment	No. of Class-rooms @ Hillcrest	Avg. Class Size	Total Enrollment	No. of Class-rooms @ Hillcrest	Avg. Class Size
K	38	1.90	20	38	1.90	20	38	1.90	20
1	37	1.86	20	37	1.86	20	37	1.86	20
2	36	1.82	20	36	1.82	20	36	1.82	20
3	36	1.19	30	36	1.19	30	36	1.19	30
4	33	1.11	30	35	1.17	30	35	1.17	30
5	33	1.08	30	33	1.08	30	34	1.14	30
MS	94	3.03	31	93	3.00	31	93	3.00	31
6	31			31			31		
7	31			31			31		
8	32			31			31		
Total	307	12.00		308	12.03		310	12.09	

Appendix E

Title E-5 Summary for Elementary Schools*

Grade	Required Area	Other Considerations	Title 5 Reference
Kindergarten	1,350 Square Feet Area includes restrooms, storage, and preparation and wet and dry areas.	Designed to allow easy supervision of classroom and play areas Toilets within complex	14030(g)(2)(A) ; 14030(g)(2)(B); and 14030(g)(2)(A)
Grades 1-6.	960 Square Feet.	Some classroom should be easily alterable in size and shape. Conduit/cabling and outlets are available for technology.	14030(g)(1)(A); 14030(g)(1)(3) ; and 14030(g)(1)(4)
Special Education	Equal to a standard classroom at the site and appropriate to serve the needs of the students assigned to the classroom.	Distributed throughout the campus	14030(g)(3)(D); and 14030(g)(3)(F)

*The above summary should be used for reference only. Please refer to Title 5 to ensure compliance with all regulations. A copy of Title 5 may be requested by calling the School Facilities Planning Division consultant assigned to your county or on the School Facilities Planning Division Web site: www.cde.ca.gov/ls/fa/index.asp

Section 14030(2)(G) - Restrooms must be self-contained within the kindergarten classroom

Title 5 - UBC Section 805: (www.cde.ca.gov/ls/fa/sf/toiletrequire.asp)
Grades 1-8

School Facilities Planning Division - County Assignments

Male Students: 1 urinal / 30 students & 1/toilet / 100 students
 Female Students: 1 toilet / 35 students

K-12 Toilet Requirement Summary

**Prior to 1994
 Code Reference UBC Section 805**

Grade/St	Male	Female
Kindergarten	No reference	No reference
Elementary	1 urinal per 30 1 toilet	1 toilet per 35
Secondary	1 urinal per 30 1 toilet	1 toilet per 45
Staff	No reference	No reference

After 1994

Grade/Staff	Male	Female
Kindergarten (toilets to be within kindergarten complex)	1 toilet serves 1-20 2 toilets serve 21-50 over 50, add 1 toilet for every 50 people	same as for boys
Elementary	1 urinal per 75 1 toilet per 30	1 toilet per 25
Secondary	1 urinal per 35 1 toilet per 40	1 toilet per 30

Staff	1 toilet serves 1-15 2 toilets serve 16-35 3 toilets serve 36-55 over 55, add 1 toilet for every 40 men provide 1 urinal for every 50 men	1 toilet serves 1-15 2 toilets serve 16-35 3 toilets serve 36-55 over 55, add 1 toilet for every 40 women
--------------	---	--

Please be aware these are minimum requirements; more fixtures or toilet rooms may be required to adequately serve students and staff in some facility layouts.

Toilets are to be provided based on the population of each gender at each school site. As new facilities (with additional students and staff) are added, including portables, additional toilet facilities should be added to meet building code requirements.

Acree standards- Small School Site Guidelines, (www.cde.ca.gov/ls/fa/sf/smallschoolsite.asp)

1. Density maximums of the Small School Site Policy

Master plan capacity shall not exceed the maximum number of students as determined on the worksheet. The maximum number of students per acre based is noted below.

Number of Students Per Acre

School Type	Single Track	Multi-track Year-Round Education (Four-Track)
High School	150	185
Middle School (06-08 or 07-08)	150	185
Elementary School (K-05)	185	230
Span School K-08	175	215
Span School 07-12	150	185

Span School K-12	165	205
------------------	-----	-----

DRAFT

Appendix TK

Benefits of the K-8 School Model

One of the reasons that many parents seek out Hillcrest is the K-8 educational model that it offers. The following provides some background information on K-8 schools (although the structure of Hillcrest was not a topic that we addressed, but rather was a premise for our discussions). We include it here for informational purposes only.

Why do school districts adopt K-8 models? There are many reasons cited for the adoption of K-8 models:

Dissatisfaction with Middle and Junior High Schools. Many parents are dissatisfied with the quality of education provided within the traditional models on academic and social grounds.

Desire to Improve Academic Performance. K-8 school models are adopted in an effort to increase academic performance. Again, how do they say it will do this?

Decrease negative behavior. K-8 schools are cited as a strategy for reducing negative individual and group behavior patterns believed to be common at stand alone middle schools.

Choice. The school choice movement posits that schools improve when they compete against one another and when parents have a range of options to choose from. K-8 models are being offered as a way of providing increased choice to parents.

Parental Involvement. Parental involvement has been consistently linked to successful schools. It is also the case that parental involvement generally goes down as students progress through the system. Middle, junior and high schools have lower levels of parental involvement than elementary schools tend to. K-8 schools are believed to provide a mechanism for greater parental involvement in the grades 6-8.

Reduced Transitions. Research is quite straightforward on the point that transitions from one school setting to another are disruptive and carry risks, especially for some students. The risks include drops in academic performance, social disruption or isolation, and problem behaviors. Thus, reducing the number of transitions students have in their school careers is desirable and K-8 schools reduce that number by one.

Longer Term Relationships with Peers and Teachers. The K-8 model provides opportunities for relationships with educators and schoolmates to extend over a longer period of time. It is also argued the older and younger students can benefit.

Pedagogy. Because the middle school programs within K-8 schools are smaller than stand alone middle or junior high schools, they can facilitate a number of pedagogical approaches that can be beneficial including small group instruction, co-teaching, teacher collaboration, and cross-age instruction and tutoring.

What makes a K-8 school work?

Research on achievement. Large national experiments or correlational studies with adequate controls have not been conducted, so the question on the national level is open. There have been studies in several locations which suggest that K-8 models are associated with statistically significantly higher test scores than counterparts in traditional middle schools. Critics of these studies claim that they do not generalize to the larger population.

Reliance on Local Data. Because the national data on the topic is sparse, school districts have relied on local data sources on enrollment and achievement to make choices regarding K-8 school options. Of course, at Hillcrest, we have several indicators that all of the factors that drive adoption of K-8 models are at play.

- We routinely see eighth graders interacting with younger children. This is beneficial to both.
- The Hillcrest middle school is a small program that incorporates sixth, seventh and eighth graders in the same classroom. The opportunities for cross grade instruction and interaction are significant.
- The children are with the same two teachers for a three-year period. The teachers know each student well and the students work closely in small group instruction and projects frequently.
- Parental involvement is extremely high.
- While test scores are not indicative of the total school experience, the Hillcrest test scores for sixth, seventh, and eighth grade are the highest scores in OUSD. The quality of the education is reflected in the admission of Hillcrest Students to the Paideia program, the Engineering Academy, and the Computer Academy at Oakland Tech (8 of 20 graduating students opted for Tech from the Hillcrest 2007 graduating class), and to top private schools around the Bay Area.

Appendix E – Bibliography

K-8 Schools

Abella, R. (2005). The effects of small K–8 centers compared to large 6–8 schools on student performance. *Middle School Journal*, 37(1), 29–35.

Alspaugh, J.W. (1998). Achievement loss associated with the transition to middle school and high school. *Journal of Educational Research*, 92(1), 20–25.

Anfara, V.A., Jr., & Buehler, A. (2005). Grade configuration and the education of young adolescents. *Middle School Journal*, 37(1), 53–59.

Beane, J., & Lipka, R. (2006). Guess again: Will changing the grades save middle-level education? *Educational Leadership*, 63(7), 26–30.

- Coladarci, T., & Hancock, J. (2002). The (limited) evidence regarding effects of grade span configurations on academic achievement: What rural educators should know [ERIC digest]. Charleston, WV: ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools. Retrieved April 17, 2006, from www.ericdigests.org/2003-2/rural.html
- Connolly, F., Yakimowski-Srebnick, M.E., & Russo, C.V. (2002). An examination of K–5, 6–8 versus K–8 grade configurations. *ERS Spectrum*, 20(2), 28–37.
- Franklin, B.J., & Glascock, C.H. (1998). The relationship between grade configuration and student performance in rural schools. *Journal of Research in Rural Education*, 14(3), 149–153.
- George, P.S. (2005). K–8 or not? Reconfiguring the middle grades. *Middle School Journal*, 37(1), 6–13.
- Hough, D.L. (2004). Grade span does make a difference [Policy brief]. Springfield, MO: Southwest Missouri State University, Institute for School Improvement. Retrieved April 17, 2006, from http://education.missouristate.edu/isi/Grade_Span_Policy_Brief2004.pdf
- Hough, D.L. (2005). The rise of the ‘elemiddle’ school. *School Administrator*, 62(3), 10–11, 13–14. Retrieved April 17, 2006, from www.aasa.org/publications/saarticledetail.cfm?ItemNumber=984&snItemNumber=950&tnItemNumber=951
- Howley, C.B. (2002). Grade-span configurations. *School Administrator*, 59(3), 24–29. Retrieved April 17, 2006, from www.aasa.org/publications/saarticledetail.cfm?ItemNumber=2672&snItemNumber=950&tnItemNumber=951
- Juvonen, J., Le, V., Kaganoff, T., Augustine, C.H., & Constant, L. (2004). *Focus on the Wonder Years: Challenges Facing the American Middle School*. Los Angeles: Rand.
- Klump, J. (2006). What the Research Says (Or Doesn't Say) about K-8 versus middle school grade configurations: Assessing the Benefits of K–8 Schools. *The Changing Face of the Classroom* 11 (3).
- McEwin, C.K., Dickinson, T.S., & Jacobson, M.G. (2005). How effective are K–8 schools for young adolescents? *Middle School Journal*, 37(1), 24–28.
- Mizell, H. (2005). Grade configurations for educating young adolescents are still crazy after all these years. *Middle School Journal*, 37(1), 14–23.
- Moore, D.W. (1984). *Impact of School Grade-Organization Patterns on Seventh and Eight Grade Students in K-8 and Junior High Schools*. Washington D.C.: U.S. Department of Education Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

Offenberg, R.M. (2001). The efficacy of Philadelphia's K-to-8 schools compared to middle grades schools. *Middle School Journal*, 35(1), 23–29.

Paglin, C., & Fager, J. (1997). *Grade configuration: Who goes where?* Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory. Retrieved April 17, 2006, from www.nwrel.org/request/july97/

Pardini, P. (2002). Revival of the K–8 school. *School Administrator*, 59(3), 6–12. Retrieved April 17, 2006, from www.aasa.org/publications/saarticledetail.cfm?ItemNumber=2665&snItemNumber=950&tnItemNumber=951

Reeves, K. (2005). Figuring and reconfiguring grade spans. *School Administrator*, 62(3), 16–21. Retrieved April 17, 2006, from www.aasa.org/publications/saarticledetail.cfm?ItemNumber=985&snItemNumber=950&tnItemNumber=951

Simmons, R.G., & Blythe, D.A. (1987). *Moving into Adolescence*. New York: Aldine De Gruyter.

Turner, J.R. (with Protheroe, N.). (2004). *Informed educator: Grade configuration*. Arlington, VA: Educational Research Service.

Wihry, D.F., Coladarci, T., & Meadow, C. (1992). Grade Span and Eighth-Grade Academic Achievement: Evidence from a Predominantly Rural State. *Journal of Research in Rural Education*, 8(2), 58-70.

Wren, S.D. (2004). The effects of grade span configuration and school-to-school transition on student achievement. *Journal of At-Risk Issues*, 10(1), 7–9.

Yecke, C.P. (2006). Mayhem in the middle: Why we should shift to K–8. *Educational Leadership*, 63(7), 20–25.

Year Round Schools

Brekke, N. (1997). Year round education: Does it cost more? *Educational Management*. Retrieved November 1, 2004, from ERIC (ED 408661).

Cherry, S.E. (2003). Technology and school reform. *Education*, 123(3), 29-30. Retrieved October 21, 2004, from Professional Development Collection.

Dossett, D., & Munoz, M. (2000). Year round education in a reform environment: The impact on student achievement and cost-effectiveness analysis. *Educational Management*. Retrieved October 28, 2004, from ERIC (ED 464424).

Glines, D. (1997). Year round education: Understanding the basics. *Educational Management*.

Retrieved November 1, 2004, from ERIC (ED 406731).

Glines, D. (2002). Year Round Education. In *The encyclopedia of Education*. (Vol 7, 2698-2701). New York: MacMillan Reference USA.

Gran, S. (2004, June 16). Year round rewards. *Albuquerque Times (NM)*. pp. A1, Retrieved November 16, 2004, from Lexus Nexus.

Helm, T. (2004, October 16). Intersessions benefited from leeway: School officials say tutoring, activity programs during school break offered variety from math to manners. *Winston-Salem Journal (NC)*. pp. 1B, Retrieved November 16, 2004, from Lexus Nexus.

Kneese, C. (2000). Teaching in year round schools. *Teaching and Teacher Education*. Retrieved October 28, 2004, from ERIC (ED 449123).

McChesney, J. (1996). Year round schools. *Research Roundup*, 12(3), 6-12. Retrieved November 1, 2004, from ERIC (ED 406742).

McLain, J.D. (1973). *Year round education: Economic, educational, and sociological factors*. Berkley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation.

McGlynn, A. (2002). Districts that school year round. *School Administrator*, 59 (3), 34-39. Retrieved September 15, 2004, from Professional Development Collection.

Oberg, S.L. (1999). What we can learn from the data: Toward a better understanding of the effects of multitrack year round schooling. *Urban Education*, 34(2), 125-154. Retrieved September 15, 2004, from Academic Search Premier/ EBSCO database.

Saunders, M. (2004, September 7). Try year-round school: The lazy days of summer may hurt children who struggle in school the rest of the time. *Atlanta Journal-Constitution*, pp. 14A, Retrieved November 6, 2004, from Lexus-Nexus.

Shields, C.M. (2000). *Year round schooling: Promises and pitfalls*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press.

Wildavsky, B. (1999, August 20). Scholars of summer. *U.S. News and World Report*, 127(5), 52-54.

Wildman, L., & Arambula, S. (1999). The effect of year round schooling on administrators. *Education*, 119(3), 465-474. Retrieved September 17, 2004, from Professional Development Collection.

Lotteries

Stasz, C. & van Stolk, C. (2007). *The use of lottery systems in school admissions*. London, UK: Rand Corporation