The Comprehensive School Planning Review (CSPR) is a collaborative process that will assess the District’s neighborhood enrollment, school facilities, and educational program offerings, to help us plan for the future in a way that ensures our students have access to a great school close to where they live.

MEETING OBJECTIVES:

- Preview preliminary options development based on one to two key solutions
- Provide feedback to direct further refinement

INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW

The meeting began with brief reflections on feedback from previous meetings, some reminding and reframing of overview information previously shared about the process as a whole, as well as new information about what would be shared tonight.

MEETING 3 HIGHLIGHTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Agreement on a scale of 1-5 (1 is strongly disagree - 5 is strongly agree)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Study Area 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Area 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Area 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Anecdotal Feedback Included:
- More talk & work time
- Still somewhat confused, but it was a better meeting
- Desire for a more expansive conversation about systematic change
- Too focused on problems, not solutions
- Education should be more talked about, that should be #1

GUIDING PRINCIPLES
The CSPR team reminded planning committee members of guiding principles and process guidelines.

- Make Pre-K available in as many elementary school locations as possible
- Provide a clear PreK-12 continuum for families in their neighborhoods with preferred grade configurations: PreK-5, PreK-8, 6-8, 6-12, 9-12
- Provide all children access to any needed educational programming (i.e. SPED, ESOL, gifted, PreK)
- Direct resources in an equitable - not equal - way to meet the needs of neighborhoods

Process Guidelines
We will also consider, to the extent possible, the following process guidelines. These are not prioritized or in any particular order.
- Balance utilization to relieve overcrowding and maintain an acceptable utilization level based on facility capacity
- Minimize disruption of future attendance area adjustments and established programming
- Promote safe routes to/from schools by considering student travel times, limiting the number of natural and human-made physical boundaries students must cross to and from school, and considering the availability of sidewalks
- Avoid adversely impacting any specific community
- Financial viability
- IS IT GOOD FOR KIDS?

CSPR Parent Survey Update
Survey as previously planned is cancelled at this time.
- Seeking meaningful input alternative
• Needs to be accessible to all parents

**Community Input Forums will allow for public feedback on options**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDY AREA 1</th>
<th>STUDY AREA 2</th>
<th>STUDY AREA 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Philadelphia HS</td>
<td>Roberto Clemente MS</td>
<td>Overbrook HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00 - 8:00 pm</td>
<td>6:00 - 8:00 pm</td>
<td>6:00 - 8:00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 3, 2020</td>
<td>March 4, 2020</td>
<td>March 5, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 21, 2020</td>
<td>April 22, 2020</td>
<td>April 23, 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was also shared that there will be a public input form on the website that all community members can share direct feedback through.

**OPTIONS PREVIEW**

**KEEP IN MIND:**

• The content shared today is for the purposes of discussion and deliberation.
• The options being discussed today are not intended to be the final or complete options.
• The options being discussed today focus primarily on solving issues related to enrollment and facilities, and are not yet inclusive of all potential solutions.

**DATA UPDATES:**

**JANUARY PACKET UPDATES**

Facility table additions
• Facility Condition Index (FCI)
• School Progress Report (SPR)
• Student enrollment vs residence

**SPED information:**
• # of SPED classrooms
• SPED enrollment vs residence

**FEBRUARY UPDATES**
• Historic charter school enrollment trends
• Charter school renewals
• Distance to school
• Residency affidavits
• In-school safety (school safety survey)
• Neighborhood Assets

IN PROGRESS
• Enrollment forecasting
• Residential permits/# of units

POTENTIAL SOLUTIONS
The CSPR team then previewed several options, and provided data for groups to engage in an hour-long discussion. In Study Area 2, the potential solutions that we provided as a basis for discussion were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDY AREA</th>
<th>CHALLENGES</th>
<th>POTENTIAL SOLUTIONS DISCUSSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Study Area 2 (SA2) (North) | • Low building utilization  
  • Grade level transitions | 1. Improve student safety through revised boundaries for SA2 schools  
  2. Change Cramp from K-5 to K-4; Co-locate or reassign Sheppard students to de Burgos; Seek opportunities to repurpose Sheppard building  
  3. Grade level configurations to K-8 for SA2 schools, Co-locate or reassign Sheppard students to de Burgos; Seek opportunities to repurpose Sheppard building |

In addition, input was sought on programming alternatives to enhance student learning opportunities for all students included in this cycle.

Potential solutions discussed were surfaced by both internal and external stakeholders. Feedback has been collected and potential solutions will be revised accordingly and discussed during the next round of meetings (February 5, 2020).

Next Steps & Wrap Up

The CSPR Team and FLO Analytics will use feedback to update a set of options, and come back to the Planning Committees at the next round of meetings.

Reminder – Updated Study Area Meeting Schedule:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Study Area 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>2/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>3/4 – Public Input Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>4/01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4/22 – Public Input Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>5/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>Bring Recommendations to Board of Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>