

**Parent Key Communicators**  
**“Coffee with the Superintendent”**  
**January 22, 2020**

Jennifer Blake, director of communications and outreach, welcomed all participants to this first Coffee with the Superintendent, hosted by Parent Key Communicators (PKCs). Index cards were placed at the tables for participants to list topics of interest for future coffee events. Attendees were also asked to provide suggestions about how PKCs can enhance communication with parents.

**Parent Key Communicator Sharing**

Parent Key Communicators from each school were introduced and shared how they work with their building principal and with the PKC group to gather and share information.

**About Parent Key Communicators**

Jennifer Blake explained that there are three PKC members from each building (currently some buildings have vacancies) and that she and Dr. Speaker Palubinsky meet approximately every six weeks during the school year with PKC. The meetings consist of information that the administration wants parents to know or that PKC members have asked about (so often a presentation from an administrator may be given). Other times PKC members are asked to gather feedback from parents on certain topics (i.e. the district calendar draft). The PKC members share good news from each building and ask questions. Minutes are prepared and posted on the website for all to access.

School Board President Dave Barratt expressed the importance of this vehicle of communication and appreciates receiving parental feedback.

Superintendent, Dr. Speaker Palubinsky, welcomed attendees and thanked them for participating and sharing their ideas and questions. She then introduced David Schrader and Danielle Hoffer from SchraderGroup, the architectural firm hired by the School Board to complete a feasibility study of the District’s facilities.

**The following notes related to their presentation were provided by SchraderGroup, following the Coffee with the Superintendent:**

The Superintendent’s Coffee meeting was held at the District Administration Building to provide information to the parentkey communicators representing each school and to inform other parent participants of the ongoing Great Valley Facility Study and Master Plan. The following is a summary of the items discussed regarding the review of the later.

- 1.01 David Schrader reviewed the scope and findings to date of the Facility Study and Master Plan. Comments included:
  - 1.01.1 Universal Pre-K (NY State):
    - IU holds the Pre-School agreements
  - 1.01.2 Start Time/Busing Time Changes:
    - When are these items integrated into the discussion?
    - What are the transportation costs?
  - 1.01.3 Costs:

- Administration Support Staff
- Construction Costs
- Busing
- Operational/Maintenance Costs

1.01.4 Redistricting:

- Loudoun County, Virginia (large county school district) redistricts every two (2) years

1.02 Option Discussion:

1.02.1 Elementary Grade Levels

- K-1 option would be a loss of community; primary students not with the intermediate students and other siblings. Developmental considerations and transitioning less.
- K-1 students are very young for transportation.
- In Europe, there are K-8 neighborhood schools.
- With a larger population, the younger students are too young for long bus rides. Bus rides with older students a concern.
- General Wayne – can provide additional space if needed which will increase the capacity of the school.

1.02.2 Intermediate and Middle School Grade Levels

- The current Middle School does not feel overcrowded.
- Grades 6-8: three (3) years where students are changing developmentally.
- 6th Grade Center: Start of transition period delayed if starting in Middle School at 7th grade.
- Two Middle Schools would be too small; better to add onto the existing school; 5- 6 is an option considering 5<sup>th</sup> graders are done with Elementary School at that stage of their lives.
- Flip-side – two (2) Middle School’s may be desirable for some.
- 5-6 Grade Center gives students a place for them to be themselves; opportunity to thrive; special population. K-4 Community/Neighborhood Elementary School is still maintained.
- Consider the implications of multiple grades on one campus.

1.02.3 General

- Space available at existing schools have more challenges at some schools than others including circulation and parking concerns.
- What is the empirical data on grade level structure regarding social and mental health and wellness? Other School Districts have implemented ‘Centers’. What is the result for the student achievement, etc.? Dr. Speaker Palubinsky noted that without baseline data there is no way to measure the results and it is more about what is being done educationally.

1.03 Schedule

- Started the process last year in 2019

- Design/Approvals: 1 year
- Construction: 1-1/2 to 2 years

1.04 Budget

1.04.1 The District has been setting aside money every year for capital improvements.

1.05 Superintendent’s Coffee Workshop Results (selection of preferred Options)

1.05.1 Before convening, the group participated in identifying their preferred option for a school center and a secondary school. Each participant was given 4 dots - 2 to vote for their preferred school center option and 2 for their preferred secondary campus option. The results are as follows:

Options for School Centers:

Option #1	5-6 Center	Total: 38
Option #2	K-1 Center	Total: 2
Option #3	6th Grade Center	Total: 7

Options for Secondary School Configuration:

Option #1	7-8 MS and 9-12 HS	Total: 37
Option #2	6-8 MS and 9-12 HS	Total: 10
Option #3	7-12 MS/HS Combined Campus	Total: 1
Option #4	Two Middle Schools	Total: 2

Dr. Speaker Palubinsky thanked all attendees for participating and indicated the information on the feasibility study can be found on the website at: <https://www.gvsd.org/Page/17486>

Also if anyone has any questions about the feasibility study or Parent Key Communicators, please email: [communications@gvsd.org](mailto:communications@gvsd.org)

The meeting adjourned.