

## **Question 1: Should Lange remain a stand-alone building, or should kindergarten be included with the other early elementary grades?**

Steve - FEB 14 2018 9:56 PM

I think it would be better to house kindergarten in each elementary school. After moving to Oakwood, with "no bussing," I was shocked that the most logically intensive day for students is for kindergartners. After the quality of education, I believe the walkable lifestyle of Oakwood is the biggest benefit of living here. It seems quite odd that only the youngest students walk to school, and then are shuttled back and forth throughout the day. In addition, I find the Lange School deficient in many ways (outdoor and indoor physical play space, handicap accessibility, etc.). However, I think South Connection needs to retain a home as quite a few Oakwood parents utilize this service and need a close and dependable before/after-school care program. I think the need for before/after-school care will only increase in the future.

Marti Szumnarski - FEB 12 2018 4:53 PM

Every effort should be made to keep Lange School as it is, it's a wonderful facility. I have heard that it would not be eligible for certain State dollars in its current location/configuration, but would need to learn more about that in order to comment further.

Alex Gusev - FEB 9 2018 10:11 AM

This is an alternative voice to this official web cite. Please check the materials, opinions, and data on the same topics, and think for yourself: <http://oakwoodvoice.com>

Rose - FEB 6 2018 10:19 PM

I don't think it really matters. The Kindergarten being separated at Lange creates what I affectionately call "the happiest place on Earth." The amount of hugs you get in that building are just outstanding! That said, if it makes more sense academically or logically, I see no reason why the Kindergarteners couldn't be combined with the lower elementary grades. Then I wonder what Lange would be used for? It's such an unusual type of building for a school district to have. I'd be interested to hear how Oakwood would repurpose it.

ellen - JAN 29 2018 3:23 PM

If you had these concerns, 17years ago you should have NOT accepted the DONATION of this facility!! If you were not happy with the layout, you should have change this 17 years ago when you spend HOW much money to re-do Lange?? Why question your actions now?

Jen Messaros - JAN 26 2018 10:58 AM

This is a bizarre question. Lange has to remain a stand-alone building. There's no way to attach it to another Oakwood school. If I understand the intent of the question, it's whether we should move the children out of the building and into another Oakwood structure. There simply isn't room. My children went to kindergarten half days, so my input is out of date, but they were very happy there.

Justin Shineman - JAN 25 2018 8:02 AM

Based on the physical limitations of the current Lange School (size, traffic, outdoor space, etc.), it seems more cost effective, safer and a better use of operating funds to combine the kindergarten with the other elementary grades. Maintaining a separate building for such a

small number of students doesn't make sense when we have so many significant issues with the rest of our school buildings.

Although I understand the desire to have a specialized school for a child's first year, the vast majority of schools in the US house kindergartens in the same building as elementary students. Separation from older students is accomplished physically within the building and through scheduling that allows the K students eat or have recess in their own time spot.

Co-locating K with 1-5(6) also provides the district with greater flexibility and efficiency to provide for special needs students. A separate K school requires specialists to travel between schools throughout the day, adding wasted time.

Nadja - JAN 23 2018 11:01 PM

The Lange building has too many limitations and weaknesses, and few advantages. The classrooms are too small, the site is awkward and has little play space and poor traffic flow. The building is not easily ADA accessible and is poorly arranged from a security standpoint. Its not even in Oakwood. My son went to kindergarten in an interior room with no windows and therefore no visual connection to the out-of-doors (something shown to improve learning). Currently one room serves as the cafeteria, gym, music, art, and after school care space. I don't see any advantages to the Lange building as a learning environment. My family uses South Connection, an excellent and necessary program for working parents! Please make sure to consider the space needs of SC in the planning as well. As my kids have gotten older, Lange's small playground, cramped rec room, and blacktop space has proven less and less accommodating as they play at SC (bigger kids are simply told they can't do things). I see no advantages to our kindergarteners and the after school care program by keeping Lange. It would be ideal to serve these children in the same buildings with the rest of the elementary populations, given the space to do so. Kudos to the kindergarten and SC staffs for doing such a great job despite the many limitations of the Lange building and site!

Kirsten Halling - JAN 20 2018 5:27 PM

Yes. Leave kindergarten at Lange. It is very healthy for the kids to have their own building and specialized attention during their transitional year to school. I believe this is one of the things that makes Oakwood unique and cutting edge.

Lynn Behnke - JAN 18 2018 9:51 PM

Lange is such a wonderful learning site for kindergarten. I am not opposed to incorporating the K level into the elementary however there is just something so special about Lange as a stand alone building.

Alex - JAN 17 2018 12:21 PM

Lange should remain a standalone building. Kindergartners learn to be full time students, without the fear or distraction of older children. It is a wonderful Oakwood asset.

Alex Gusev - JAN 17 2018 11:23 AM

PLEASE think about not what we WANT, but what we can AFFORD at this time. Please think and ask the City's officials (every time during this Facility Plan discussions) by how much our tax payment will be increased for every \$10 million capital spending amount (than calculate based on 30-50-75 million proposed). Please think if we, the residents, will be able to re-sell our approx \$300-350K on average houses with a potential \$10-12K property tax bill per year attached to it in the next 5-10 years (excl. County's increases every 3 years on top). Please think

if it is better to move elsewhere and send kids to Miami Valley School in lieu of paying so much in taxes in Oakwood (the City's tax bill is steadily pushing some in this direction). Please think that with every tax increase we, the residents, will be investing less in the upkeep and remodel of our old aging houses (think about re-sale values, deterioration, maintenance neglect, etc. in light of re-sale values). Please think that this is about the buildings only, not about the quality of teaching and education, teachers' ability (know-how, creativity, knowledge) to teach, or overall quality of the materials. Please think about the City's capital investments pipeline (what kind of projects are coming next, how many, the reasons, such as rejected "Library Project" last year) and ask the City for the list with the capex costs. Again, PLEASE think what we can AFFORD and not what we WANT to do at this time in order to preserve the values of our houses assuming increased tax burden for years to come. This is not only about the EDUCATION here, but the survival of the CITY itself, community, house values, tax burdens, among other things. Thank you, Alex Gusev at alex.gusev@ipaper.com

Brent Mackintosh - JAN 17 2018 10:18 AM

I would rather see Lange take in the pre-school and South Connection kids and incorporate the Kindergarten in Lange and Harman as was once done in the past. Pre-school as well as "before and after" care will become more of a necessity as time goes on.

Cara Kite - JAN 17 2018 9:48 AM

I would be open to having Kindergarten included with the other early elementary schools or as a standalone building. However, if the preschool is at Smith, why can't kindergarten be at the grade school, too? The city should work to put the preschool and the kindergarten together. This only makes sense.

While on the subject of Lange, we need more space for before and after care. I find it interesting that the school district wants a new performing arts center and a new health and wellness center, but South Connection is at capacity and there is no space for more kids. How do you expect all of this new stuff to be paid for? If you want more tax revenue, then the moms who currently stay at home need to go back to work. This will create the need for more kids in daycare.

Seriously. I cannot believe no one is considering South Connection capacity!

Sarena Kelley - JAN 17 2018 7:28 AM

I also prefer the stand alone building where children can slowly transition to school. It is also a necessity for how fast our community is growing, and we will have to consider accommodating more students at Lange in the future and how to do so.

DS - JAN 16 2018 7:04 PM

With the current space restrictions in the elementary schools, I think a stand alone K in Oakwood is a necessity. Even if space permitted, a stand alone K has advantages, too (eventual Smith and Harman kids together, separation from older kids as they adjust to school, their own playground). I would still support stand alone.

Kent Miller - JAN 16 2018 5:17 PM

Lange school has some safety issues in the dropping off of students and the parking lot separating the building from the playground. If this can be resolved it is a fine facility.

Alex Gusev - JAN 16 2018 1:34 PM  
Stand alone bldg

Lena White - JAN 12 2018 6:14 PM  
Stand alone building

Jessica - JAN 12 2018 11:10 AM  
Lange is great as its own building. Very special thing Oakwood has going on with Lange. Would be great if the building were in Oakwood.

Ralf Kircher - JAN 11 2018 9:20 PM  
While I was surprised to return to Oakwood after 30 years and see the Kindergarten is in the old casket factory just outside Oakwood's borders — Kindergartens were contained within Harman and Smith when I was in school — from what I've seen of the current system, it seems wonderful. Kids from Harman and Smith actually get to intermingle prior to 7th grade, while also learning the way to the elementary schools they'll wind up attending. I think it's an inspired solution the way it is, and I view it as one way Oakwood schools have improved during my time away.

Kimberly - JAN 8 2018 11:15 AM  
Lange needs to move to be incorporated into our elementary buildings. Ideally...a primary building where developmental needs can be met through building design, instruction, and culture. K teachers/staff should not have to remain on an island.

Amy Korab - JAN 5 2018 10:26 AM  
I like the stand alone Kindergarten. I like the idea of the gradual introduction to school without the intimidation/distraction of older kids. And while Lange is technically "outside" of the city of Oakwood, it is only by a few blocks.  
Kindergarten "Villages" are becoming more and more popular and have seen great success. Why would Oakwood change such a wonderful thing?

Shelly D- JAN 4 2018 11:02 AM  
If space allows, have kindergarten incorporated into elementary schools. If preschools moved to Lange would it allow the fit?

Shelly D. - JAN 4 2018 10:52 AM  
I am neither for or opposed. Our children were older when we moved into Oakwood school district. I like the idea of kindergarten included in the school buildings but understand that space is the issue.

Elizabeth - DEC 30 2017 11:42 PM  
Lange should remain a stand alone building.

Jack A. - DEC 18 2017 10:33 PM  
The building is least suitable for the purpose (classroom sizes, cafeteria, playground). The location outside of the city does not support the neighborhood feel we are so proud of. I'd prefer integration of both pre-school and Kindergarten into two or three elementary schools around Oakwood that support walking to school - with older sibs, if possible.

Robyn - DEC 14 2017 1:41 PM

Face it, even with near universal pre-school/daycare, kindergarten kids are still apprehensive of big kid school. The separate campus lets them get used to going to school without the added stress of intimidating 'big kids'. It was a welcoming easy transition for my kids to attend Lange. They developed friendships there that they picked up in junior high.

Additionally, don't Harman and Smith already have crowding issues?

Melanie - DEC 14 2017 9:38 AM

I thought it was nice having a year where the classes of Harman and Smith were integrated.

Lisa - DEC 13 2017 12:14 PM

My kids loved Lange when they were in kindergarten and I think they have a nice community there. I know they are out of space or I would suggest putting preschool and kindergarten together. I am not in favor or opposed; I would love to hear pros and cons.

Molly - DEC 11 2017 9:59 PM

Kindergarten students used to be in the elementary schools in the past. If the students can be accommodated in the elementary buildings again, that would be OK with me....then they can walk with their parent or siblings to school again. They wouldn't be forced to stay for lunch (as they are at Lange now).

evelyn - DEC 11 2017 6:45 PM

Lange should be in Oakwood. I think it should be near (e.g. Walking distance) to an elementary.

Tracy - DEC 8 2017 4:12 PM

What serves the children best? A stand alone kindergarten seems to meet some needs and they have a strong community there; however, if moving the Kindergarten students to Smith and/or Harman was part of a bigger plan I would be willing to consider it.

Kathryn- DEC 8 2017 3:30 PM

I do not have strong opinions on either as I see positives in both. I went to kindergarten in the elementary building and was glad to have learned just one building and one way school. My child attended Lange and was able to develop friendships across district, which is valuable for when they come together again. Plus, she loved taking the bus. However, I am not sure what moving the kindergarten "solves." There's not a plethora of unused space at the current buildings. As such, I would rather keep kindergartners in a separate facility than move the 6th grade.

Ellen - DEC 4 2017 9:43 PM

The goal should be to optimize the best learning environment for students, while being affordable and accountable to Oakwood residents. (My children attended both ways and both worked beautifully.)

Seth - DEC 4 2017 8:48 AM

As a student who attended kindergarten in an Oakwood elementary before Lange School existed, I would be fine to have kindergarten return to the elementary schools.

Don O'Connor - DEC 3 2017 11:15 AM

I think that a child's "world" should gradually expand. From the family to the neighborhood to the district to college/real world. Combined kindergarten brings the whole district together at 5 years old (for only one year), and puts siblings in separate buildings outside of their smaller neighborhoods. Our family has had a great experience at Lange, but if I had to choose I would vote for moving kindergarten back to Harman and Smith. I prefer families together in their neighborhood school during the younger years.

E F Mende - DEC 2 2017 6:30 PM

Lange was established to reduce crowding at the elementary schools. Now you want to nullify the prior solution and compound the crowding at the elementary schools ? All day kinder-garten will further complicate the situation. What would happen to Lange - Make it a performing arts center ? Were there any restrictions by the Lange donations ?

Jennifer- NOV 29 2017 9:13 PM

I think having Lange as a stand alone kindergarten only center creates more change for the littles than needed or helpful at that age. If they do preschool first they go to Smith for maybe two years, then lange for one, then maybe back to Smith or over to Harman. That is a lot of moving around in a few years. But I do like that the whole district is together in one school even if it is just one grade.

Pam Stephens - NOV 29 2017 3:33 PM

The concept was unusual at first, but it seems to be working very well. I think the idea of the all-day kindergarten being separate from the two elementary schools is appealing, and the fact that all of the district children start their school career in one building and are able to develop friendships with children from both elementary schools is very appealing.

Judy Payne - NOV 24 2017 3:41 PM

The Lange School has solved a space problem and seems to be working well (I have no children that age, so I do not speak from experience). If you are considering moving the 6th graders to make room for the kindergarten in order to save money by not maintaining a separate buidling, then it might make sense.

Steve Walters - NOV 24 2017 3:14 PM

Either option works (and I had kids attend both). If it is more cost effective to move kindergarten back to the elementary schools, then that would be a good approach.

Eric - NOV 23 2017 7:14 AM

This should remain as a stand alone facility to allow the children time to adjust to school.

Colleen - NOV 21 2017 9:21 AM

Lange allows the children to meet before being divided into Smith and Harman for elementary. This creates a bigger community. If it makes more economic sense to have Lange dissolved and the Kindergartens moved to their respective Elementary than I would be in agreement.

Peter - NOV 21 2017 8:16 AM

Kindergarten is a transitional time for children and there is enough for a small child to deal with just getting used to the experience of going to school. Going to a larger school with older

students would be even more daunting. I would prefer a stand alone kindergarten but am also sensitive to cost issues. The Lange building, although charming, is not optimal for modification.

Becky Weaver - NOV 20 2017 12:21 PM  
Move kindergarten to the two elementary buildings.

Kate - NOV 19 2017 10:29 PM  
Happy with Lange as it is but I'm open to both options.

Harrison - NOV 19 2017 9:16 PM  
The Lange site and location make it a difficult kindergarten building. The site does not have enough room. I think kindergarten should be included with other early elementary grades.

Leigh Ann Fulford - NOV 19 2017 2:27 PM  
I LOVE Lange, and I am very proud of our family's contribution to its conversion into a kindergarten village. However, if we can fit the kindergarten students/classrooms in our other buildings, I am totally for that. Lange was a godsend at a time when our schools were overcrowded, but I am not sure of the need now. The Lange campus is cramped with difficult access, especially for walking. If we could save money by consolidating campuses, I am all for it. Busing students to and from Harman and Smith as well as the maintenance and the additional building should be looked at long and hard for the long-term financial viability of our District.

Cindy - NOV 18 2017 10:23 AM  
Lange seems to be working well. Let us continue as is.

Christopher Morris - NOV 17 2017 6:28 PM  
I would have no objection to combining kindergarten with early elementary grades in the same building. It would be ideal if Harman and Smith both could have a kindergarten class - but current facilities probably are too small. Current arrangement works reasonably well logically.

Kathy - NOV 17 2017 6:22 PM  
Kindergarten should stand alone! It works well as it is.

kathy - NOV 17 2017 6:19 PM  
Keep the kindergarten stand-alone!

Dave - NOV 17 2017 10:00 AM  
Stand alone

Wendy - NOV 16 2017 10:43 PM  
Lane should remain! In fact, I'd support putting on a second story and doing a combined k-1 except there's no way to accommodate for an increased faculty and traffic for more students. As is, Lange is a neat place for kids to start school and make lifelong friends. The fact that the building is also used for South Connection means that it helps support itself! Keep Lange!

Linda - NOV 16 2017 6:01 PM  
I think Lange should remain a stand-alone building. It is a beautiful building and allows the kindergarten kids to have a wonderful experience.

nancy - NOV 16 2017 10:03 AM

I think the Kindergarten needs to be in Oakwood.

The District should purchase the Wright Library and turn it into a PK/Kindergarten/South Connection facility.

It should also offer an area for tutoring and learning after school for those who use the library as this sole purpose.

Sarah Q- NOV 16 2017 7:47 AM

I think Lange should remain a stand-alone building. It is beautiful and nice that the kids can start together. I strongly feel that the district set up should remain the same.

Mike Ruetschle - NOV 15 2017 10:03 PM

Stephanie - Lange currently serves Kindergarten and South Connection. Preschool used to be housed in Lange however when the District changed to all day Kindergarten PK moved back to Smith. Some other points to consider, hopefully adding more context to the conversation and prompting additional dialogue. Lange is too small by State Standards (since it is below 350 students) and would not qualify for any State matching funds. The principal is only there part time due to the size of the building and shares those duties along with being the Special Ed Director district wide. The location of the building (technically in the City of Kettering) requires bussing. If Kindergarten were to be moved to Smith, Harman, or both Smith and Harman - then age appropriate space would be created for them. Additions to Smith and Harman would not be needed if older grades were moved out of Smith and Harman to provide the space.

Dante Connell - NOV 14 2017 6:12 PM

Yes. Lange School provides an opportunity for all students in the district to come together to attend Kindergarten. My girls have been involved in girl scouts since kindergarten and our youngest is still in a combined Smith/Harman troop. The girls enjoy seeing each other at monthly meetings and outings, because they are not in classes together during the school day.

Lucy - NOV 14 2017 11:25 AM

I think that Kindergarten should be included with the other early elementary grades. There are most opportunities for these students and teachers to collaborate with other grades (Kindergarten buddies, programs, etc.). They would be able to acclimate themselves with a building they will stay in for awhile, versus only spending one year there. It is helpful to parents to have their child in a building with their possible older siblings as well.

Stephanie - NOV 13 2017 11:30 PM

Lange Kindergarten and Preschool is a special place for our Kindergarteners. It was a special initiative brought to the Oakwood Schools Education Foundation by Richard Lange. Richard wanted to memorialize his parents, Julian and Marjorie Lange, who were lifelong advocates of education. So yes, this building was built for the kindergarteners and was made possible through this amazing donation. We should respect this and not change it.

Meredith - NOV 12 2017 1:56 PM

We were thrilled to have our children attend school at Lange, it is a very special place. That being said, all of our buildings are special places. Currently the class levels get to come together again in 7th grade, but having them together even longer (1-6) might be even better. How do we know if we do not consider all of our options?

Colleen Smith - NOV 10 2017 5:44 PM

I don't see how squeezing another grade into the other schools is feasible without additions and I don't support adding on to our schools. Lange is a special place for Kindergarteners. Why move them in with older kids? The busing system works and it keeps the kids with their own age group.

Michele morgan - NOV 9 2017 12:05 PM

Lange is perfect. It's a beautiful building. I wouldn't change a thing.

Barbara Erbe - NOV 9 2017 7:29 AM

If Smith and Harman cannot currently accommodate Kindergarten due to space restrictions, it makes sense to continue to have Lange as a stand-alone building. Kindergarten is the ideal grade to have separate. It certainly doesn't make sense to move some other grade to Lange. Plus, Lange is a very special place.

Matt - NOV 6 2017 3:20 PM

Keep Kindergarten separate and at Lange.

Tami Whalen - NOV 6 2017 2:54 PM

Lange should remain a stand alone kindergarten village. It is working well and is taking pressure off the limited space of our elementary schools.

Kristin - NOV 4 2017 9:56 AM

Regardless of the building, it has been a great thing in our family for all of the kindergarteners of Oakwood to start school together.

Heather Jackson - NOV 3 2017 9:00 PM

Absolutely Kindergarten should remain separate from elementary school. It provides such a wonderful opportunity for our youngest learners to explore their world independent of

Sharon Kelly - NOV 3 2017 12:56 PM

Yes, kindergarten should remain at Lange. While at some level it makes sense to have kindergarten at Smith or Harman, it does not make sense to move another grade to Lange. The building is unique and special and should remain kindergarten only.

John Hadley - NOV 3 2017 10:24 AM

I would keep the feel and special uniqueness of Lange separate from grades 1-12. Its physical separation (whether on Dorothy Lane or 1 block away from Smith or Harman) is an attribute that is worth the investment in inconvenience.

## **Question 2: Would you support separate primary and intermediate school buildings?**

**Marti S - FEB 12 2018 5:13 PM**

I agree with most that keeping Oakwood a 'walkable school district' is important and what makes our town unique and desirable. Every effort should be made to keep it that way and it should be a last resort to change Oakwood to a 'school bus district'.

**Alex Gusev - FEB 9 2018 10:12 AM**

This is an alternative voice to this official web cite. Please check the materials, opinions, and data on the same topics, and think for yourself: <http://oakwoodvoice.com>

**Rose - FEB 6 2018 10:14 PM**

Yes. I think primary and intermediate grades benefit from being with teachers who can focus on their specific needs and from being with students at their developmental level. For example, the school libraries could curate better collections. Currently the libraries have many books that are inappropriate for about half the kids in the school, either because the books are too mature or too young. Teachers could more easily plan special events, such as speakers, that would appeal to the age group. I can only imagine that it is currently very hard to bring in speakers/events that appeal to grades 1-6. I also think it would help erode the "Harman kid" "Smith kid" division that I see in Oakwood, even with my kids only being in 2nd grade. I am not from this community originally, so I see no reason to continue separate schools as a "tradition" when this "tradition" seems to create a divide. In regards to walkability, kids would still be able to walk easily during half of their elementary years or they could just walk/bike a bit further for half of the years. A mile or two is still walkable, if you're bent on doing that. So yes, I support the separate of primary and intermediate grades for educational and social reasons.

**ellen - JAN 29 2018 3:26 PM**

NO! Please leave the 2 primary schools and the 1 junior high. This is a walking community. Don not make kids on Corona walk to Harman and vice versa! This is ludicrous. Please leave the campuses as they are. Work within the existing footprint. We are not growing in population or enrollment!! You know this!

**Sarah - JAN 29 2018 1:32 PM**

Being a walking to school community is one of the big reasons we moved to Oakwood. Having primary and intermediate schools separate would impact that dramatically. Also, as kids get older it is good to have a new "group" of kids to meet. Although, many of the kids from both schools already know each other through sports, DI, etc. - it is still good for them to have some new faces and friend potential when then start in the teen years.

**Jen Messaros - JAN 26 2018 10:53 AM**

No. Many people have brought up transportation as an issue, and I agree with them. Keeping all the first graders in one building isn't a priority for me. Continuity is, though. I have a child who has dealt poorly with transitions. Going from elementary school to junior high was difficult. Having children transition again and again is an unnecessary stress.

**Justin Shineman - JAN 25 2018 8:11 AM**

Yes, I would support this concept, primarily because it would give the district the opportunity to tailor the facilities to the different learning modalities for those age groups. Transportation becomes the bigger issue, depending on where the schools are located. Having K-5, and even 6-8 to a certain extent, centrally located in Oakwood facilitates 'walkers'. More HS students drive, and can reasonably be expected to walk farther to school than the elementary students, so physical location is less of an issue.

**Nadja - JAN 23 2018 11:07 PM**

Yes, I would as long as kids K-5 can continue to walk to school. If that can be achieved, I would have no problem having separate primary and intermediate schools. I think its important to the quality of life in Oakwood to maintain "neighborhood" schools and not have parents/buses driving kids across the city.

**Kirsten Halling - JAN 20 2018 5:32 PM**

Separate schools for 1-3 and 4-6 is a very interesting idea. It would provide for a more specialized educational environment. However, I agree with other comments about transportation. Oakwood should remain a walking district.

**Lynn Behnke - JAN 18 2018 9:47 PM**

No. Although the idea is interesting, I feel that the negatives far outweigh the benefits. Many families strategically try to purchase their home near a specific school as we are a walking district. It just does not seem logical to change to a primary/intermediate school profile. I think the traffic alone would be a logistical nightmare.

**Amy Askins - JAN 18 2018 9:09 PM**

No, because it would make walking to school much less of a viable option for many. One of my favorite aspects of Oakwood living is that our kids can get themselves to and from so many activities. It teaches them responsibility and independence, is good exercise, and makes our busy lives much easier. I would hate to see a large increase in idling cars along our beautiful city streets every day at dismissal because of increased distances from school and older and younger siblings spread out to various locations. Generally speaking I believe Oakwood students are well prepared for college not because of their physical surroundings but because of the high value the community places on education. We must be fiscally responsible regarding our aging school buildings while not losing focus on what factors most significantly affect our children's education and development.

**Alex Gusev - JAN 17 2018 11:24 AM**

PLEASE think about not what we WANT, but what we can AFFORD at this time. Please think and ask the City's officials (every time during this Facility Plan discussions) by how much our tax payment will be increased for every \$10 million capital spending amount (than calculate based on 30-50-75 million proposed). Please think if we, the residents, will be able to re-sell our approx \$300-350K on average houses with a potential \$10-12K property tax bill per year attached to it in the next 5-10 years (excl. County's increases every 3 years on top). Please think if it is better to move elsewhere and send kids to Miami Valley School in lieu of paying so much in taxes in Oakwood (the City's tax bill is steadily pushing some in this direction). Please think that with every tax increase we, the residents, will be investing less in the upkeep and remodel

of our old aging houses (think about re-sale values, deterioration, maintenance neglect, etc. in light of re-sale values). Please think that this is about the buildings only, not about the quality of teaching and education, teachers' ability (know-how, creativity, knowledge) to teach, or overall quality of the materials. Please think about the City's capital investments pipeline (what kind of projects are coming next, how many, the reasons, such as rejected "Library Project" last year) and ask the City for the list with the capex costs. Again, PLEASE think what we can AFFORD and not what we WANT to do at this time in order to preserve the values of our houses assuming increased tax burden for years to come. This is not only about the EDUCATION here, but the survival of the CITY itself, community, house values, tax burdens, among other things. Thank you, Alex Gusev at alex.gusev@ipaper.com

**Alex Gusev - JAN 17 2018 10:41 AM**

NO, I do not support this idea.

**Brent Mackintosh - JAN 17 2018 10:20 AM**

No, I believe the current set up is quite suitable. K-6 or 1-6 has served well over the years.

**Cara Kite - JAN 17 2018 9:51 AM**

Yes, I would support separate primary and intermediate school buildings IF transportation was resolved. For example, a kid on Volusia can't be expected to walk to Smith and a kid on East shouldn't be walking to Harman.

I think there would be a benefit to having all first graders in one building, and all fifth graders in one building. I always wonder how much difference there is between Smith and Harman and the synergies that could be gained by being in one location.

Anyways, I support it either way IF transportation is resolved.

**Sarena Kelley - JAN 17 2018 7:34 AM**

With the increasing numbers of students, I believe it would be beneficial to split up age groups especially at the middle school level. This would open up room at both Harman and Smith. I believe the biggest issue is not Harman and Smith however when looking at the master plan, but the Oakwood JH and HS. This building needs extensive preservation and interior renovations. It may be worth considering building a new HS at a different location, (if only we had buildable land next door that wasn't the stadium), and then turn the newly renovated HS/JHS into a collective 5-12 building, or 6-12.

**DS - JAN 16 2018 7:42 PM**

No! I like the current setup. Assuming this refers to having Smith be 1-3 and Harman 4-6, or vice versa... Splitting primary and intermediate would mess with the walkability of our community. I love that, over 15 years so far, I have never driven my kids to school. We have always walked or biked. I don't know if that would have been possible had I needed to get young kids to 2 separate buildings. We even have kindergarten transportation from the "homeschools" that supports children/families walking to school. Traffic around the buildings would worsen as driving kids to school may become a necessity for families that can currently walk to a single building. I know a number of "intermediate" grade students that walk their younger siblings/neighbors to/from school. Our family also loves the open lunch concept. Surely, that

would also be difficult to maintain if the elementary age students of a family are attending different buildings.

**Kent Miller - JAN 16 2018 5:22 PM**

Yes, using the current buildings as a basis for this change with an additional facility if needed.

**Kristopher Andrew Miller - JAN 16 2018 10:39 AM**

I would support the existence of a separate middle School. As someone who went to Oakwood schools from k-12, I can say from experience that I don't care for the 1-6 elementary, 7-12 Jr/Sr High model. As 5th and 6th graders, we were regularly collectively scolded for intimidating the younger children. As a 7th and 8th grader, sharing a building with the highschool was like being a minnow in a shark tank. As a high school student, sharing the building with the junior high wasn't much fun either; having to share space with immature children at their most obnoxious age. Being stuck in the same building for such a long time also made the whole educational experience seem futile, like you never advanced.

**Jessica - JAN 12 2018 11:12 AM**

Yes. Seems weird that 7th graders mix with seniors, and nobody has room to eat lunch.

**Ralf Kircher - JAN 11 2018 9:06 PM**

No. While it's not ideal for 7th and 8th graders to be mixed with older kids, there are some benefits that come from it as well. Speaking from experience, you wind up growing up a lot that 7th -grade year, and a lot of that comes from being immersed with older kids, most of whom are surprisingly good role models for the younger kids.

**Kimberly - JAN 8 2018 11:12 AM**

Yes...I love this idea.

**Amy Korab - JAN 5 2018 10:35 AM**

I LOVE our current set up. The ONLY reason we live in Oakwood is for the schools. I love the TEACHERS, the ARCHITECTURE of each building, the walkability of the schools. That being said, while I like the convenience of two elementary schools, 1-6, I sometimes feel that it would make better sense to make one of the elementary schools 1-4 and the other one 5-8 or some similar configuration rather than splitting the kids after kindergarten and rejoining them in 7th grade. Removing grades 7-8 from the high school also frees up space to modify/spread out/reappoint classrooms and facilities to better serve the students without demolishing the beautiful and unique buildings we currently have.

**Shelly D - JAN 4 2018 10:58 AM**

I support the current setup with 6th graders being at the elementary school. There is a marked difference in maturity between 6th and 7th grade. Part of Oakwood's charm is a child's ability to get to school by their own steam. Our 6th grader became confident this year to walk by herself to Smith (1/2 mile) but would not be confident enough to ride to Jr. High building at this age. Older kids are intimidating, by no fault of their own.

**Shelly D - JAN 4 2018 10:58 AM**

I support the current setup with 6th graders being at the elementary school. There is a marked difference in maturity between 6th and 7th grade. Part of Oakwood's charm is a child's ability to get to school by their own steam. Our 6th grader became confident this year to walk by herself to Smith (1/2 mile) but would not be confident enough to ride to Jr. High building at this age. Older kids are intimidating, by no fault of their own.

**Elizabeth - DEC 30 2017 11:45 PM**

Yes. Kids at these ages don't need to be integrated with older kids.

**Kathryn - DEC 19 2017 9:18 AM**

Not really. It all comes down to walkability. Walking from 1-3 is good, but if that goes away in 4-6, what good does that do? Lunches will have to be completely re imagined because the only way the cafeterias work now is because of open lunch. My child will not have time to go home to eat if they have to get to the other side of the city for school. Or this adds even more traffic to the roads by the schools at lunch, which is also not great.

**Jack A. - DEC 18 2017 10:42 PM**

I definitely support and emphasize the walking to school concept. It was a strong selling point for my family in moving to Oakwood. Fifth and sixth graders should be able to handle a slightly longer way to school by using a bicycle, gradually increasing their independence. It is allowed beginning at third grade now.

If room needs to be created at the elementary schools and such room is not available at the current site, a central intermediate School is a valid option. I would NOT support designating one of the current Elementary Schools an Intermediate School and only having one Elementary School for the entire District.

**Robyn - DEC 14 2017 2:03 PM**

I would support this if it would take some space pressure off of the elementary schools. But remaining a walking district is paramount to building independence and autonomy in our young citizens.

**Lisa - DEC 13 2017 3:47 PM**

I think we should maintain the two elementaries and keep grades 7 and 8 as they are now. There is a big change in mindset and maturity with jr. high children and I think our 6th graders do well as leaders of our elementary schools. Let's keep them age appropriate as long as we can.

**Lisa - DEC 13 2017 12:01 PM**

I love our current setup. I love the multi-ages in the elementaries for programs like GRIT/HARMANIZE, and class buddies. I like the feel of the neighborhood schools and the ability for students to walk. Oakwood Schools are unique in many ways and the neighborhood elementaries are a special feature of this unique place.

**JP - DEC 13 2017 8:40 AM**

No

**Megan Gilbert - DEC 12 2017 2:07 PM**

No, the current arrangement allows for most students to walk, which is great for health and building communities, not to mention better for the environment!

**Mychaelyn - DEC 12 2017 9:28 AM**

There is so much emphasis and pride in Oakwood of being a walking community. It is important to me that my children be able to walk to school every morning. Walking to school is a time for reflection, a time to clear your head and prepare your mind and body for the activities of the day. I do not wish to participate in a hurry to rush to catch a bus or drive to a school jockeying for position in a drop off-line. If you separate the primary and intermediate schools how would it be possible for Oakwood students to still be able to walk to their neighborhood school?

**Molly - DEC 11 2017 9:44 PM**

I do not support a separate primary and intermediate school if that means only 1 primary and 1 intermediate school building for the district. I can't imagine where the primary school would be set up to provide walking distance to all students.

**evelyn - DEC 11 2017 6:49 PM**

yes

**Kelly - DEC 10 2017 5:26 PM**

I question the need for this. Will any increased efficiencies be offset by the cost of providing transportation? Parents would have to drive back and forth OR the school district would have to provide transportation. Very costly. I like the idea of having two elementary schools so children have a small grade size and can walk home at lunchtime.

**Daniel - DEC 9 2017 9:53 PM**

No, leave the schools as they are.

**Seth - DEC 4 2017 8:46 AM**

In the absence of compelling evidence to change the status quo, I support the current and historic arrangement of two separate elementary schools and one combined OJHS and OHS building.

**Don O'Connor - DEC 3 2017 11:25 AM**

Not if this meant one district-wide primary school and one district-wide intermediate school. I think keeping separate neighborhood schools for the younger kids is important. And this would hurt the walkability of our community, which is one of Oakwood's most important assets. No other community in the Dayton region comes close to the walkability of Oakwood. That is one of the main reasons we are in Oakwood and not a newer suburb. We want our kids to walk to school with their friends, not get dropped off at a school "factory" on the outskirts of town.

**E F Mende - DEC 2 2017 6:04 PM**

How does this question differ from 6-7 Intermediate School and 7-8 Junior High ? If different. what is the rationale ? Without a compelling explanation the answer is No. Same arguments apply: Lack of land/space, why tear down existing buildings and replace with less desirable architectural design, how does this improve student learning, etc.

Jennifer - NOV 29 2017 9:19 PM

Possibly. If you could get preschool and kindergarten included and then they move to a new school for intermediate grades that might be less disruptive.

Pam Stephens - NOV 29 2017 3:39 PM

No! What we have now seems to be working well, and continues to preserve not only traditions but excellence in learning.

Judy Payne - NOV 24 2017 3:24 PM

Probably not. I assume you would use our current buildings, and this would require busing which is expensive and cumbersome. I think a major advantage of our Oakwood schools is that no busing is required because of easy access to the schools.

Steve Walters - NOV 24 2017 3:06 PM

NO. We have the kind of arrangement of primary and secondary schools and community involvement that other cities would kill for. There is no reason to change or even consider changing. The people asking these questions don't appear to understand the Oakwood community.

Bill Sherk - NOV 24 2017 12:01 PM

Absolutely not. First, we will hear that it makes some economic sense to build new versus repair. Yes there are subsidies on the construction of new facilities versus renovations but the analysis will not be an apple to apples comparison on structural components that presently reflect the beauty and charm of the present facilities. The charm of a new facility will be minimal. Most of the new buildings funded by the government look like psuedo prisons (Lebanon, Brookville, Eaton as examples). It is correct that one cannot build new Tudor buildings. Yes the HVAC system needs repair but previously there was no a/c in classrooms and we survived.

Second, you will hear that this will help student scores and achievement. This may be the biggest fallacy of the argument. If you look at the top schools in Ohio and compare their facilities to say, Stebbin's beautiful new school/prison, you will note that there is no empirical evidence that newer schools improve test scores.

Third, this is a walking community and it may be unfair to families that are on the edges of the community. Has anyone considered the potential real estate value reduction to homes on the periphery boundaries.

Fourth, my brothers and sister "endured" the social hardship of going to Smith versus Harman. So did our sons. The social impact is noting less than a ruse.

Finally, we donated to the funding of the new stadium. It was based on the commitment that Mack Hummon Stadium would remain....just putting this on the record.

Eric - NOV 23 2017 7:19 AM

Why push change for the sake of change. The charm of Oakwood and the draw for many families with younger children is the walkability, community feel that the current set-up allows.

william - NOV 23 2017 6:43 AM

no, would not support

**Debbie M Price - NOV 22 2017 8:53 AM**

Our daughter attended Harman. We walked every day. I love that school and the community within and around it. It's also a marvelous building full of wonderful teachers and staff. I know the parents of Smith feel the same. Having neighborhood elementaries is extremely important -- and if you move, teardown, consolidate these schools, you destroy what is best about Oakwood.

**Colleen - NOV 21 2017 9:23 AM**

Agree with other comments, we like walking to school and the history of Smith and Harman.

**Peter - NOV 21 2017 8:20 AM**

I prefer the current set up.

**Amanda - NOV 21 2017 8:06 AM**

Mike Ruetschle, what about walkability? Many of the proposals I've seen in these questions eliminates some of the things that make Oakwood special, like the ability to walk to school as a family, a child being able to come home for lunch, or children going to practices at MacHummon instead of having their parents drive them to Lane. We were moving back for these things. As I mentioned in one of my other comments... we can get an excellent education elsewhere, in a community with lower property taxes, and we would be living in a newer, larger home with less maintenance. We are moving back to Oakwood in January for the unique experience Oakwood provides. We were coming to look at homes next week, and we have a specific home that we were planning to make an offer on, but we've changed our minds now. Because of what I see here we will probably rent and see how this all plays out... we will not invest in Oakwood during the period of instability and unfortunate change in direction I see indicated by your questions.

**Leigh Ann Fulford - NOV 20 2017 7:16 PM**

Yes I support this idea for the reasons I gave in other responses to questions.

**Denice Moberg - NOV 20 2017 6:19 PM**

Absolutely! I have long believed that this is the way to provide the best services for our children.

**Becky Weaver - NOV 20 2017 12:45 PM**

No. I support two neighborhood K-5 elementary schools.

**Amanda - NOV 20 2017 12:37 PM**

No. Combining Smith and Harman eliminates walkability for a significant number of elementary students. Walkability is one of the charms of the Oakwood experience. Also, the school we are moving from is a giant elementary school with 8 classes, and we feel it is harder to maintain and build young friendships when there are 6-8 classes for each grade level. Chances are less that your child's friends will be in their class each year, and because the grade levels are so large they cannot even be on the playground for recess at the same time. Bigger is not better.

**Tricia - NOV 20 2017 12:27 PM**

No. I like having 2 elementary schools with a separate Junior High. Walking to school is a great asset.

**Becky Weaver - NOV 20 2017 12:23 PM**

No. I would support keeping two K-5 neighborhood schools.

**Kate - NOV 19 2017 10:31 PM**

Yes, open to this idea if there is a compelling reason for it.

**Harrison - NOV 19 2017 9:21 PM**

Yes

**Cindy - NOV 18 2017 10:26 AM**

No.

**Christopher Morris - NOV 17 2017 6:32 PM**

No, I do not support separate primary and intermediate school buildings. I strongly prefer keeping two elementary schools and the junior high separate. Oakwood grade schools are wonderful - especially the ability to walk to school for 80%-90% of the kids.

**Dave - NOV 17 2017 10:05 AM**

No.

**Wendy - NOV 16 2017 10:45 PM**

I think this is an interesting idea! If love to get more details before I could decide for sure, but as long as we used existing buildings, I'm open to this change.

**Linda - NOV 16 2017 6:07 PM**

No, I will not support this. We have had wonderful success with our education system in Oakwood.

**Sarah Q - NOV 16 2017 7:51 AM**

I would not support this. I like that my child is in preschool and smith and has a "buddy" which is an older kid that comes into the class to help. They have mentors and are able to look up to the big kids. When you have multiple kids this would be challenging for the parent to get your children to school and not allow the students to walk together as a family.

**Mike Ruetschle - NOV 15 2017 10:30 PM**

Some other points to consider, hopefully adding more context to the conversation and prompting additional dialogue. Lets say there are 3 sections of 5th grade at Harman, and 4 sections of 5th grade at Smith. In a PK-2, and 3-5 building, all 7 sections of 5th graders would be in one building. This would facilitate greater teacher collaboration across each grade level. Fluctuation in grade sizes, and the disruption this places on teachers having to often change what grade they teach each year, would be lessened by being able to distribute the student numbers more evenly across more sections in the same building. Sometimes our District only needs 1/2 a teacher to accommodate an influx of unexpected new students, but is forced to hire an additional full time teacher to cover these enrollment swings. Having a greater pool of 5th grade students across the learning spectrum in one school (more top level kids, more average kids, and more special needs) would allow greater focus of resources towards all students. Socially, the "Harman" and "Smith" kids feel a very real distinction that lasts through 12th grade,

and actually their whole life. Is this a good thing socially? Is this artificial? Or conversely, in a PK-2 and 3-5 all students would go to Harman and Smith. A larger student pool would also provide greater diversity and more likelihood that each student would find there place among a larger group of friends to choose from. Special Ed could also be at both buildings instead of only at Smith.

**Dante Connell - NOV 14 2017 6:15 PM**

No. I think there is a benefit for students in the upper elementary school grades to mentor the younger students in the building. The younger students look up to the older students and look forward to special programs and traditions that are grade-based. One of our children served a math tutor last year and it was very positive experience. The Harmanize program provides a diverse group of students with all grades represented.

**Lucy - NOV 14 2017 11:28 AM**

I do not support separate buildings. I love there being a mix of ages at the elementary level. I also think it allows students and teachers to collaborate together across grade levels. I think it makes it difficult for parents to have their children at different buildings and possible farther away than there neighborhood schools.

**Stephanie - NOV 13 2017 11:51 PM**

I do not support separate buildings. We moved back here because we loved the group dynamics of the schools. The grade configurations work great!! No reason to change it!

**Meredith - NOV 12 2017 1:59 PM**

If it keeps the grade levels together throughout their entire school career, then we would consider supporting the idea.

**Laura Lee John - NOV 10 2017 9:23 PM**

Yes, I believe it would be best to have 1st - 5th in one building/ 6th-8th in a second building/ 9th-12th in a third building

**Colleen Smith - NOV 10 2017 5:48 PM**

I don't support separate buildings. To do this would be a major project to build new schools and move athletic fields. Keep Oakwood schools the way they are!

**Barbara Erbe - NOV 9 2017 7:21 AM**

No. I strongly believe that elementary grades should be located close to home to encourage a walking environment. I also think that there are benefits of having siblings in the same school building (benefits for them and their parents).

**Tami - NOV 6 2017 3:00 PM**

No, our neighborhood schools are a big reason why Oakwood is such a desirable place to live and raise a family. Kids being able to walk or ride their bikes to and from school and come home for lunch is one reason that makes Oakwood so special,

**Kristin - NOV 4 2017 9:57 AM**

Yes

**Sharon Kelly - NOV 3 2017 1:00 PM**

No, I do not support separate primary and intermediate buildings. From a parent perspective, it would be difficult to potentially have children at multiple buildings (more so than now). I am not sure what the district would gain by separating out the students.

### **Question 3: Would you prefer a 6-8 Middle School or a 7-8 Junior High?**

**Marti S - FEB 12 2018 5:18 PM**

Is there a structural or overcrowding reason to change what is working now? Is there no way to spend some money to update/enlarge and still be able to keep things working basically the same as they are now? We have some of the highest test scores in the state and to change the dynamics doesn't make sense to me.

**Alex Gusev - FEB 9 2018 10:13 AM**

This is an alternative voice to this official web cite. Please check the materials, opinions, and data on the same topics, and think for yourself: <http://oakwoodvoice.com>

**Rose - FEB 6 2018 10:00 PM**

As a former middle school teacher, I believe the 6-8 Middle School is a really important band of grade levels to have together. I absolutely support it. I support a 7/8 Junior High, as well. Mostly, I support any configuration that does not have the 7/8 graders in the same building as the high schoolers. It's just better developmentally for middle school kids to be with their peer group.

**Sarah - JAN 29 2018 1:21 PM**

Please keep the 6th grade with the elementary schools. It is a great time for them to feel like the mentors/role models, while also trying to allow them to learn a bit more before they have to become more independent and self reliant in a larger environment.

**ellen - JAN 29 2018 12:54 PM**

Please leave the junior high as is. This is a tough age, regardless. The 6th graders feel like "big" kids at their grade school. I went to parochial schools which went 1-8 and it was fine. No detriments to being with all the ages. Seventh and eighth together keeps the ages separate from the "large" high school ages kids (size and experience). The traditions are worth keeping also. The school building for junior high, for sports teams, etc. is perfect as is. Do not add another grade to the small building. Do not separate the 7th and 8th graders from the high school proximity. Also, some jr. high students take higher level classes in the high school (math, science, etc.) so they need the easy proximity of the high school building. No trekking across town to go to one math class.

**Justin Shineman - JAN 25 2018 8:21 AM**

Absolutely. Our children will have attended at least eight different schools in six different states by the time they graduate from Oakwood (military family). They have seen nearly every possible combination of grades for elementary and MS/junior high students (Montessori PK-1, K-5, K-6, 4-8, 6-8, 7-9, and Oakwood).

The physical and mental changes happening through the 6th grade year are dramatic. Keeping them with the K-5 students is a mistake. They are ready to change classes and be treated more like their 7-8 cohort.

Likewise, the difference between 7-8 and HS students is dramatic. It's challenging enough to navigate the HS halls as a Freshman, let alone as a 7th grader. This age group of 'tweens' (6-8 grade) presents a unique set of challenges for educators, and they absolutely should provide a separate learning environment.

**Nadja - JAN 23 2018 11:14 PM**

I think 6th graders can thrive amongst younger kids or in a school with 7-8th graders. I do however want to express support for creating multi-age learning environments that support team teaching, differentiated group learning, and in 21st century learning environments, rather than the traditional “cells and bells” current arrangement at the Jr High (and HS too).

**Kirsten Halling - JAN 20 2018 5:34 PM**

I like the current 7-8 Junior High School. The shared building makes it a perfect transitional step toward high school.

**Brad - JAN 20 2018 1:04 PM**

I would support a middle school experience if there was space for it and the walkability of the district wasn't impacted. This would offload the HS space. I would not overthink whether 6th graders will be able to manage being in an environment of 6-8th graders. They are capable of more than we think they are and my initial impression of every Oakwood 6th grader I have met is that they would all do fine.

**Jennifer - JAN 18 2018 10:41 PM**

I like keeping the 7-8 graders separate from the high school students. I do not think they should share the same building. The argument that they are kept in separate parts of the buildings does not hold. The 7-8 graders are significantly influenced by what they see and hear in the hallways and during down time. Some have spoken to the significant developmental changes/differences from 6 through 8th grade, but 7th-12th our youth are changing from children to adults, While I love having 6th graders at the elementary and wanted to keep my own children in the elementary environment longer...somewhat dreading the need to send them on to the 7-12th building, my stance is to keep the high school only high school and the 7-8 graders in a separate building. If that means creating a 6th-8th grade environment, then I am all for it.

**Lynn Behnke - JAN 18 2018 9:56 PM**

I think that the current model of 6 grade at the elementary schools is best. I like the idea of the 6 graders remaining there as long as possible. Jr. high should include 7 & 8 grade.

**Amy Askins - JAN 18 2018 9:14 PM**

7-8 Junior High. Research does not support the benefits of a 6-8 middle school so I don't understand why Oakwood would consider this. Most studies seem to support K-8 education, though we currently do not have the buildings to support that and new, larger structures would likely be cost prohibitive. I believe the current setup of a junior high works fine. I might prefer more of a separation from the HS but in for the most part it works. Generally speaking I believe Oakwood students are well prepared for college not because of their physical surroundings but because of the high value the community places on education. We must be fiscally responsible regarding our aging school buildings while not losing focus on what factors most significantly affect our children's education and development.

**Lesley - JAN 18 2018 4:33 AM**

I support a 7-8 Junior High - I find it disconcerting that the only links you've included on this site are in support of a Middle School, siting a dated 2012 Harvard article, among others...part of the

reason we have moved back to Oakwood to raise our own children in this school system is the unique set-up - it doesn't need fixing.

**Alex Gusev - JAN 17 2018 11:24 AM**

PLEASE think about not what we WANT, but what we can AFFORD at this time. Please think and ask the City's officials (every time during this Facility Plan discussions) by how much our tax payment will be increased for every \$10 million capital spending amount (than calculate based on 30-50-75 million proposed). Please think if we, the residents, will be able to re-sell our approx \$300-350K on average houses with a potential \$10-12K property tax bill per year attached to it in the next 5-10 years (excl. County's increases every 3 years on top). Please think if it is better to move elsewhere and send kids to Miami Valley School in lieu of paying so much in taxes in Oakwood (the City's tax bill is steadily pushing some in this direction). Please think that with every tax increase we, the residents, will be investing less in the upkeep and remodel of our old aging houses (think about re-sale values, deterioration, maintenance neglect, etc. in light of re-sale values). Please think that this is about the buildings only, not about the quality of teaching and education, teachers' ability (know-how, creativity, knowledge) to teach, or overall quality of the materials. Please think about the City's capital investments pipeline (what kind of projects are coming next, how many, the reasons, such as rejected "Library Project" last year) and ask the City for the list with the capex costs. Again, PLEASE think what we can AFFORD and not what we WANT to do at this time in order to preserve the values of our houses assuming increased tax burden for years to come. This is not only about the EDUCATION here, but the survival of the CITY itself, community, house values, tax burdens, among other things. Thank you, Alex Gusev at alex.gusev@ipaper.com

**Alex Gusev - JAN 17 2018 10:43 AM**

No, if these will be separate buildings, and No, if the City wants to build new buildings to accommodate the separation of any kind (change status quo layout).

**Brent Mackintosh - JAN 17 2018 10:25 AM**

I believe the current 7-8 junior high works well and do not see a need for a change. The age (tweens) group is a challenging period and having that group together post-elementary and pre-high school has worked very well, allowing a smooth transition into high school.

**Cara Kite - JAN 17 2018 9:53 AM**

I don't have a preference either way. I think it's fine to move the 6th graders up to Junior High.

**Sarena Kelley - JAN 17 2018 7:20 AM**

This could be a viable option if it addressing the concern of spacing for students. Many schools do a 1-5 E, 6-8 M, and 9-12 H distribution with no impact on the students.

**DS - JAN 16 2018 8:00 PM**

I don't know that I have a preference. I think many in education are over thinking this issue. The best for any district probably has more to do with what works best with their facility limitations. I think the current situation works well in Oakwood. I attended a district separate 7-9 and 10-12 buildings. That is what worked for our buildings, and it worked fine. It is what it is.

**Kristopher Andrew Miller - JAN 16 2018 10:42 AM**

As someone who went to Oakwood schools from k-12, I can say from experience that I don't care for the 1-6 elementary, 7-12 Jr/Sr High model, and would have preferred a separate middle school. As 5th and 6th graders, we were regularly collectively scolded for intimidating the younger children. As a 7th and 8th grader, sharing a building with the highschool was like being a minnow in a shark tank. As a high school student, sharing the building with the junior high wasn't much fun either; having to share space with immature children at their most obnoxious age. Being stuck in the same building for such a long time also made the whole educational experience seem futile, like you never advanced.

**Jessica - JAN 12 2018 11:13 AM**

7-8 Junior High as research shows 6th graders are better off being at the top of an elementary school.

**David - JAN 8 2018 1:38 PM**

We moved to Oakwood when I was in 6th grade, and I went to Harman and then the Junior and Senior High School. The transition between schools can cause anxiety, but I feel that it was best after 6th grade. Going to the same building from 7th through Senior year helped to reduce the added stress of transitioning at a more difficult time.

**Amy - JAN 5 2018 11:37 PM**

I am open to suggestion. I went to a middle school but the 5-6 grade was kept on one side of the building and the 7-8 was on the other. I am sure that there was no mistake in keeping the grades separated. Older kids are super intimidating, and that age group is the wrong one to perpetuate anxiety and insecurity.

**Maura - JAN 5 2018 4:32 PM**

7-8 Junior High. The maturity for many 6th graders to transition isn't strong. An additional year for a 6th grader in elementary school allows them to remain innocent as child a bit longer.

**Shelly D - JAN 5 2018 9:22 AM**

In support of 7-8 Junior High. Agree with others comments regarding maturity and development differences between a 11-12 year old 6th grader and those entering 7 and 8 grades.

**Elizabeth - DEC 30 2017 11:46 PM**

7-8 Junior High

**Jack A. - DEC 18 2017 10:59 PM**

The current break between Elementary and Jr. High appears to work well. I suspect it is historically driven by the space available at the various sites.

If as part of this plan, we'd end up with an additional building, a Middle School grades 6-8 or even 5-8 seems a natural option and we would make that work just as well. The developmental difference between a 6th grader and an 8th grader is similar to that between a 4th grader and 6th grader. They could still have home classrooms. Even 4th graders now transition to different groups based on subject. It should be a gradual transition from the lower elementary classroom family to the groups changing completely every period in HS, no matter the setting.

It would free up space at all the existing buildings to make the changes that are needed there.

This option could have the additional benefit of minimizing the impact of renovations on existing school operations.

**John Donnelly - DEC 18 2017 10:26 AM**

I do not think having sixth graders working with the current 7th and 8th graders is a good plan. The transition to 7th grade is difficult enough and having 6th graders exposed to this without the maturity necessary would make the transition that much more difficult

**Heather - DEC 18 2017 9:55 AM**

I am not in favor of a 6-8 Middle School. The cognitive & developmental differences between 11/12 year olds and 12/13/14 year olds is vast. Social and peer pressures are quite different and more than the typical 6th grade student should be expected to navigate. And what about teachers? Would this require a shift in their classroom strategies? Most 6th grade students aren't quite ready for that leap into self accountability. Most 7th graders are just starting to learn those independent skills, and it's not until 8th grade some of them get good at it. I would be agreeable to a 7-9 Middle School. These ages seem to be pretty on track with each other socially and emotionally. My preference is to keep the split the way it currently is JH as 7-8, and HS 9-12.

**Emily - DEC 15 2017 10:00 PM**

I agree with the points about a lot of mental differences between 6th and 7th graders. In addition, I was a physically small child, and when I was a 6th grader at Harman, I still got to be one of the big kids. Moving to OJHS, I spent the next 2 years feeling intimidated by how much taller everyone I didn't know was than me. I'm not sure how well my self image would have handled being there for 6th grade as well. Even at the time, I remember thinking I was lucky that I wasn't someplace like Centerville that had 6-8.

**Robyn - DEC 14 2017 2:19 PM**

The current break in grades feels right to me. 12 is just a kid, whereas 13 is the beginning of 'teen' angst, rebellion and growth. It is a leap from our elementary schools into the secondary complex, but having said that, I think it's a good thing. The Jr. part of Jr. High is excellent training for our students - they hit the ground running in 9th grade. Heightened expectations (the grading system and less coddling) are a solid introduction into the higher grades and beyond, while the reassurance that transcripts include few (if any) of their courses lets them explore and perhaps fail without permanent ramifications. I like the set up as-is.

**Lisa - DEC 13 2017 12:02 PM**

I do not support a 6-8 middle school; I attended one growing up and taught in a 5-8 building before Oakwood. Our sixth graders do well being in the elementaries. There is a lot of growing and behavior shifts that occur with jr. high students; let's maintain our sixth graders' youth as long as we can.

**JP - DEC 13 2017 8:41 AM**

Junior High

**Mychaelyn - DEC 12 2017 9:31 AM**

It has been proven that sixth graders do much better developmentally when separated from their older seventh and eighth grade peers. It has also been proven that there is less bullying when six graders are separated from junior high children. Therefore I would not be in favor of 6th through eighth grade plan. There is a lot that happens developmentally and hormonally between children in six grade and children in seventh or eighth grade.

**Molly - DEC 11 2017 9:57 PM**

I'd like to add a different perspective...that of a parent who gathers at the schoolyard in the morning or afternoon at the elementary school to chat with other parents, greet my child, and catch up with the teacher. This type of parenting activity happens at the elementary schools, but once a child heads to the Jr. High, parents don't linger in the school yard. Parents don't chat with other parents anymore, playdates aren't arranged, discussions about extra-curriculars, homework, or child development don't happen face to face anymore once kids are in 7th grade. My hope is that the 6th graders can remain in the elementary school buildings so that parents can still be part of that schoolyard experience.

**evelyn - DEC 11 2017 6:51 PM**

I would support a k-5, and a 6-8. Having the Lange be located in another city and at a location that is not walk-able is not ideal.

**Tracy - DEC 8 2017 5:06 PM**

I would like to know the pros/cons of the 6-8 model and the 7-8 model before offering an opinion. I would be interested in learning more about the possibilities.

**Kathryn - DEC 8 2017 3:37 PM**

I will echo Amanda Price's comments (eloquently put!). One of the things I have loved about Oakwood is the almost de-emphasis on "middle" school. I am following Ellen's comment about maximizing learning environment and believe it is best done in the current setup, as a separate but still contiguous space with the high school.

**Ellen - DEC 4 2017 9:52 PM**

The goal should be to maximize the learning environment with the best possible space, recognizing enrollment has always fluctuated in the past and always will

**Sam Dorf - DEC 4 2017 9:10 AM**

7-9 or 7-8 junior high is best, but I prefer K-8 schools.

**Seth - DEC 4 2017 8:34 AM**

7-8 Junior High as it is today.

**Masha Kisel - DEC 3 2017 9:16 PM**

I echo the preference for a 7-8 Junior High.

**E F Mende - DEC 2 2017 5:03 PM**

Prefer 7-8 Junior High over 6-8 Middle School for reasons addressed by many others.

**Pam Stephens - NOV 29 2017 3:41 PM**

The 7-8 Junior High works well - it used to be 7-9 Junior High. NO need to add 6th graders, and, besides, where would they be put???

**Judy Payne - NOV 24 2017 3:10 PM**

If you need more space at the grade schools, then I think moving the 6th graders to the Junior High makes sense. I think you could more easily add space to the Junior High than to the grade schools - perhaps add a second floor to the Junior High. Since I think 6 graders switch to different teachers already, they would fit into the Junior High environment rather easily. For those who object to having the 6th graders no longer being the "king of the hill" in grade school, that role would be passed on to the 5th graders.

**Steve Walters - NOV 24 2017 2:51 PM**

I feel strongly that the current 7-8th grade junior high arrangement is best because 6th grade is really needed to complete elementary education and to prepare for the next step. I believe it is also best that it continue to be physically co-located with the senior high to ease the transition into high school.

**Eric - NOV 23 2017 7:22 AM**

Keep the current set-up in place with 7-8 junior high.

**Amanda Price - NOV 22 2017 9:52 AM**

7-8 junior high is perfect. As many have said the change between 6th and 7th grade is a big change. It is important for the 6th graders to be able to stay in a more safe less grown up atmosphere for that one more year. That last year in elementary school they are able to develop a better sense of self before going to school with kids who are 6 years older than them (as junior high and high school are combined in our building). A seven year age gap between kids in the same building would just be too much. I love that junior high and high school is in the same building and would not want to change that but a 7 year age difference is too much.

**Debbie M Price - NOV 22 2017 8:57 AM**

We were so happy with the 7-9 Junior High and loved the way that the 6th graders are groomed to become leaders. 6th grade is such an important year. Keeping the 6th graders in elementary school enables them to mature and acquire more self-confidence while they're preparing for more difficult academic material and the new social landscape. We have a really good thing here with the 7-8th grade junior high. Don't mess it up.

**Colleen - NOV 21 2017 9:25 AM**

Undecided. Both options are fine with me.

**Peter - NOV 21 2017 8:23 AM**

There's a big jump developmentally and socially between 6th and 7th grade. Please leave the current arrangement in place.

**Denice Moberg - NOV 20 2017 6:21 PM**

I totally support the idea of middle school being 6-8.

**Amanda - NOV 20 2017 1:15 PM**

Please keep the 6th grade in the elementary schools. I remember 6th grade at Smith... we were the "big kids", but we were still kids. The minute we walked into OJHS everyone was trying to act older than we were and impress the older kids. Let kids remain kids during 6th grade.

**Becky Weaver - NOV 20 2017 12:24 PM**

I prefer a 6-8 Middle School.

**Carole Judge - NOV 19 2017 11:27 PM**

I appreciated that 6th grade was kept in the elementary schools (I attended 6-9 middle school and the age spread too wide with regard to development). Providing 6th graders with a sense of leadership is valuable. I also wished high schoolers did not walk through the junior high to get to the high school. Students in that age spread having to share halls didn't seem appropriate.

**Kate - NOV 19 2017 10:34 PM**

I think both can be good options.

**Harrison - NOV 19 2017 9:29 PM**

I like our junior high model. It works for our community. Our children are very fortunate to have so many freedoms. I love seeing kids walking to school, parks, business district stores, the pool, and more. These freedoms grow as you get older and the junior high is the beginning of another kind of independence. Junior High students participate in school sports and students are more in control of their day-to-day schooling.

**Leigh Ann Fulford - NOV 19 2017 3:50 PM**

Students need to be in age-grouped buildings for many reasons. I love the beautiful historic academic buildings we have and believe we should use them to their best potential. If it means regrouping students, i.e. a building for Grades 1-3 (Harman?) and another for 4-6 (Smith?), we should explore that. Younger students shouldn't be exposed to the shenanigans of older students during unsupervised times (lunch, class changes, etc). I love older students working with students on reading, math, PE, etc, but those would be supervised activities. There is so much unsupervised time in the OJH/OHS building that I don't think we want to move younger students over there, esp with the Open Lunch policy we have now.

**Leigh Ann Fulford - NOV 19 2017 3:29 PM**

I believe a lot of scheduling and space headaches could be solved if we had a 1 - 3 building (Harman?) and a 4 - 6 building (Smith?). By having all the older elementary students in one building, the "Specials" teachers (art, music, PE, Spanish) could teach children of similar ages. Currently, these teachers have to completely reset their spaces (in a 5 or 10 min window between classes) to change equipment appropriate for 1st graders to 6th graders. It's hard to understand until you have experienced removing all hot glue guns and permanent markers and replacing with crayons and round-tip scissors in the short window between a 1st and 6th grade class. We have AMAZING teachers who are capable and willing to make these adaptations several times per day; however, I wonder how much more effective they would be if they could concentrate on and develop new lesson plans, musical arrangements, art installations, etc. Another benefit would be having our instrumental teachers instructing ALL elementary orchestra and band students at one time in one place, preparing them for future performances.

We could even have add performing arts options, such as theater, set building, etc, so ALL students could participate in the arts in some way. This idea would not require new campuses. Students could be grouped in appropriate buildings based on sizes of children and facilities without having to build new facilities. If we moved all 1-3 graders to Harman, the gym would accommodate their size (teaching older students in the Harman gym is a BIG challenge with limited options because of its small size). Likewise, Smith with its large gym could accommodate the older students and more older age-appropriate full court games. The big drawback to this plan is disrupting Oakwood tradition and requiring students to walk farther distances to school. Walking is great exercise and walking an additional 10-20 min would not be a bad thing, and in reality many kids are driven to school anyway. We could offer the same bus option we have for Lange, where students walk to the closest campus and take a bus to their school building. This would be a BIG change and change comes hard in Oakwood. It would be a big adjustment, esp for the multi-generational Oakwoodites, to say the least.

**Cindy - NOV 18 2017 10:29 AM**

I agree with Kathy. Keep the junior high as is.

**Chris Morris - NOV 17 2017 6:24 PM**

I prefer a 7-8th junior high. Our current 6th graders get a phenomenal educational experience at Harman and Smith. 6th graders benefit as being the leaders of their grade school. As kids enter puberty, physical and emotional development accelerates at different paces - so a mature 8th grader is considerably different than a immature 6th grader.

**Kathy - NOV 17 2017 6:18 PM**

Keep the junior high the way it is!

**Thomas Baggott - NOV 17 2017 12:19 PM**

No. I am unaware that the present system needs fixing. If, however, Oakwood schools need an excuse to tear down buildings, construct an aluminum sided box, and ask for more tax dollars to accomplish that goal.my response is "double no"

**Stephanie - NOV 16 2017 10:52 PM**

I agree with Nancy. Children grow up "too fast" these days. Having 6th graders with 7/8th grade just promotes this and honestly they should grow at their own pace and not be influenced to grow up faster. Children would hear and see things they really are too young to be exposed to and they're too young to have to handle it. As a former teacher that taught at a school that was rebuilt and reconfigured I witnessed:

\*Most sixth graders were better off in the protective environment of an elementary school than in a 6th, 7th and 8th grade school. Some sixth graders were too small/young to be pushed that hard socially/academically.

\* Sixth graders lost the benefit of being a leader/role model in the elementary school program and were not available for student council and other leadership roles. Its fun to be a sixth grader in an elementary school/ it builds confidence/self-esteem/etc

\*There was a scaling down of standards in our K-5 school (i.e. chorus, band, the musical, and physical education) because the sixth grade was absent.

Most 6th graders LOVE and thrive in the elementary school setting. I asked my daughter about

this tonight and she agreed 100%! Sixth grade was awesome because it was her last carefree year to be a child!

**Liam - NOV 16 2017 10:16 PM**

As a student at the oak wood junior highschool I think that having a 6-8th grade junior high would be much better because there would be more options for 6th graders as the exact opposite at the elementary schools where you are told what to do 100% of the time this lets kids get ready for highschool better. But there would. Be one problem, there is barely enough room for the junior high kids. So I think the Mack humor stadium could be moved down to where lane stadium is at and then there could be a knew middle school where the stadium once was, this would lead to less crowded halls and a better learning environment.

**Linda - NOV 16 2017 6:09 PM**

Keep the 7-8 junior high the way it is.

**Nancy - NOV 16 2017 9:51 AM**

Keeping the current 7/8th grade JH is essential.

Children do not need to be pushed into "growing up" faster than they already are. 6th graders into the 7/8th grade mix would not be a great flow. Especially when JH sports are not inclusive of a 6th grader.

**David Laatz - NOV 16 2017 9:24 AM**

Yes. 6-8th Jr. High & 9-12th High School

**Sarah Q - NOV 16 2017 7:51 AM**

7-8

**Mike Ruetschle - NOV 15 2017 10:36 PM**

For those who feel like 6th grade is too young to add to the current 7-12 Junior High / High School, would you feel different if grades 6-8 were in a completely separate building than 9-12, but near each other on the same campus so 6th, 7th and 8th graders can benefit from taking the advanced courses like they do today.

**Steven - NOV 15 2017 8:55 PM**

I think 7-8 JH is good.

**Lynn Hartman - NOV 15 2017 8:33 PM**

I feel a 7-8 Junior High is much more appropriate.

**Dante Connell - NOV 14 2017 6:16 PM**

I prefer the 7-8 junior high. Since OJHS and OHS share some of the same areas and classrooms, I prefer that 6th grade students are still in the elementary school.

**Lucy - NOV 14 2017 11:30 AM**

I think a 6-8 middle school would be great idea. The sixth graders seem so old at their elementary schools and could be better suited in a middle school setting. Maybe Kindergarten

can take the place of the sixth grade classrooms at the elementary level and the sixth graders could join the seventh and eighth graders?

**stephanie - NOV 13 2017 11:54 PM**

No. Grade configurations are perfect the way they are in the buildings they are in!!

**Meredith - NOV 12 2017 2:04 PM**

It is not the location of the student, but the manner in which the student is being taught as well as keeping their surroundings appropriate for their age.

**Laura Lee John - NOV 10 2017 9:26 PM**

I would prefer a seperate 6th - 8th, Middle school.

**Colleen Smith - NOV 10 2017 6:02 PM**

Neither, if it means separate buildings and paying for it. Part of the beauty of Oakwood is the walkability of our schools. For the majority of people, the school district is laid out to support Smith and Harman locations for elementary kids walking to school and a centralized location for the older grades who can walk further, drive or get dropped off. My recent graduate who started at Lange and went all the way through high school said the space is fine the way it is. Having the fields close to school allows the kids to walk to them after school for practice. Moving facilities or athletic fields will cause more driving to and from and increase car traffic and the walkability of our community.

**Barbara Erbe - NOV 9 2017 7:23 AM**

Would I support 6th grade moving to the existing Jr. High/High School complex? NO. Would I support 6-8 grades being at Harman and all students in 1-5 attending Smith? NO.

**Tami - NOV 6 2017 3:01 PM**

Absolutely 7-8 Junior High.

**Erin Pryor - NOV 3 2017 8:27 PM**

I have said many times to friends and family over the past 18 months how glad I am that our kids don't start Jr High until 7th grade. I feel it's better for the kids in their developmental stages to be beyond ready to make that transition, versus sending them before they are ready thinking they'll eventually adjust.

**Sharon Kelly - NOV 3 2017 1:05 PM**

Absolutely would prefer a 7-8 Junior High!!! While 6th graders might feel "old" in the 1-6 buildings, introducing a 6th grader to the current jr high/high school is a mistake. I think the curriculum/activities are not the same as in 7/8 grade. They cannot participate in school sports. Block time segments are used in 6th grade, not the traditional changing of classes every period. Do not have a 6-8 building just because that is the new "norm",

## **Question 4: What do you think about having a single PK-12 campus?**

**Steve - FEB 14 2018 9:56 PM**

I think this is a horrible idea. After the quality of education, I believe the walkable lifestyle of Oakwood is the biggest benefit of living here. This includes the locations of Harman, Smith, OJH, and OHS, which ensure that we really do have a walkable community. I also think there is developmental benefit in our children independently walking to and from school, extra-curricular activities, etc., this helps them grow independence, and even responsibility for taking on additional activities. Oakwood needs to stay a unique community where all kids can walk to and from school.

**Steve - FEB 14 2018 9:23 PM**

No, this is not good idea, it will mess our community. I will vote against it.

**Marti S. - FEB 12 2018 5:32 PM**

Definitely not! For all of the negative reasons already listed in the other postings, especially the unique walkability of our district and the charm of the schools' architecture playing off of our similarly-aged homes.

**Alex Gusev - FEB 9 2018 10:13 AM**

This is an alternative voice to this official web cite. Please check the materials, opinions, and data on the same topics, and think for yourself: <http://oakwoodvoice.com>

**Kjirsten - FEB 8 2018 11:33 AM**

The thought of our beloved schools being destroyed breaks my heart. I would vote against any measure or levy that would support such a move.

**Rose - FEB 6 2018 10:01 PM**

That would be interesting! Not sure how that would look... I'd really need to see some good plans and rationale to be convinced this was the way to go.

**Jill - JAN 29 2018 6:47 PM**

I think the idea is fiscally irresponsible. We just invested millions of dollars to make substantial renovations to all four schools in 2002. Had I known those plans would have such a short shelf-life, I would not have been so quick to support them. It makes me disinclined to trust the administration when it talks about making "necessary" changes.

In addition, the current schools contribute mightily to the character of the neighborhoods. We should be doing everything we can to encourage kids to walk to school--a combined campus would make that unreasonable for many kids.

**ellen - JAN 29 2018 3:19 PM**

NEVER! Do not do this! You will have mass exodus of Oakwood. You think there are problems now, you will never meet your tax base. Never!

**Jen Messaros - JAN 26 2018 10:32 AM**

Absolutely not. This would require abandoning the existing schools. Plus, it would be difficult for many children who walk to school.

**Justin Shineman - JAN 25 2018 8:35 AM**

Depending on the physical layout and how the school day is structured, this makes a lot of sense fiscally for a district Oakwood's size. You can reduce operating costs by combining locations, as well as redundant/overlapped staffing, by combining locations.

A single campus does not have to be connected buildings, but could consist of three buildings on the same grounds. I attended a K-12 from 2nd through 8th grade, and the elementary students never saw the MS or HS students, because start/end times were staggered and we had separate cafeterias, gyms, etc.

I've always been surprised by Oakwood schools all having the same schedule. This is one of the reasons we see so much traffic congestion at 8 AM and 3:15 PM. Starting the elementary students earlier allows working parents to drop students off. Starting the HS later is better for teen students' diurnal cycle (multiple studies have shown teen's shouldn't start before 9 AM), and they are better suited to getting themselves to school on their own.

In the end, however, this may not be physically/fiscally possible due to the existing schools and lack of sufficient land to build a campus like this.

**Nadja - JAN 23 2018 11:25 PM**

I'm not in favor of the idea for several reasons. I can't see how Oakwood could remain a walking school district for our elementary aged children with a single site PreK-12 campus. I also do not like the idea having small children mixing with teenagers (and worse, teenage drivers). I do think our community could think creatively about other siting synergies. For example there are wonderful examples of senior living and Pre-k/K schools being collocated to great effect. Co-locating functions such as the community center, South Connection, a teen center, the library and/or HS athletic facilities makes a lot of sense. I don't see synergistic advantages to a PK-12 campus, whereas other creative ideas for siting new combined community resources could hold more promise.

**Kirsten Halling - JAN 20 2018 5:38 PM**

Terrible idea.

**brad - JAN 20 2018 1:20 PM**

No ... for all the reasons outlined by all the other comments.

**Lynn Behnke - JAN 18 2018 9:59 PM**

No. Just do not see any real support for this model thus far. Would be a logistical nightmare from construction to traffic flow. Thumbs down.

**Amy Askins - JAN 18 2018 9:21 PM**

Eek. No thank you. See previous comments about neighborhood schools, walkability, cost, etc. While I am not as emotionally tied as some to strictly maintaining the current architectural styles of all the schools during renovation (seems very expensive and honestly, don't we have enough Tudor-style architecture in the 'hood? Mid-century modern is sweeping the nation, folks!), I think a single K-12 campus would do great harm to the small-town, neighborly, walkable, community feel that is so unique to Oakwood. Generally speaking I believe Oakwood students are well prepared for college not because of their physical surroundings but because of the high value the community places on education. We must be fiscally responsible regarding

our aging school buildings while not losing focus on what factors most significantly affect our children's education and development.

**Alex Gusev - JAN 17 2018 11:24 AM**

PLEASE think about not what we WANT, but what we can AFFORD at this time. Please think and ask the City's officials (every time during this Facility Plan discussions) by how much our tax payment will be increased for every \$10 million capital spending amount (than calculate based on 30-50-75 million proposed). Please think if we, the residents, will be able to re-sell our approx \$300-350K on average houses with a potential \$10-12K property tax bill per year attached to it in the next 5-10 years (excl. County's increases every 3 years on top). Please think if it is better to move elsewhere and send kids to Miami Valley School in lieu of paying so much in taxes in Oakwood (the City's tax bill is steadily pushing some in this direction). Please think that with every tax increase we, the residents, will be investing less in the upkeep and remodel of our old aging houses (think about re-sale values, deterioration, maintenance neglect, etc. in light of re-sale values). Please think that this is about the buildings only, not about the quality of teaching and education, teachers' ability (know-how, creativity, knowledge) to teach, or overall quality of the materials. Please think about the City's capital investments pipeline (what kind of projects are coming next, how many, the reasons, such as rejected "Library Project" last year) and ask the City for the list with the capex costs. Again, PLEASE think what we can AFFORD and not what we WANT to do at this time in order to preserve the values of our houses assuming increased tax burden for years to come. This is not only about the EDUCATION here, but the survival of the CITY itself, community, house values, tax burdens, among other things. Thank you, Alex Gusev at alex.gusev@ipaper.com

**Brent Mackintosh - JAN 17 2018 10:32 AM**

This idea would ruin the concept of Oakwood and mirror some of the larger suburban metropolitan schools that everyone finds disturbing and distasteful. We moved here for the "old school way of life", i.e. small neighborhood schools, Norman Rockwell-esque scenes, etc. No one wants their children educated in a Soviet-style collective.

**Cara Kite - JAN 17 2018 9:57 AM**

This is a terrible idea!

1. Is it appropriate to have 18 year olds in the same space as 3 year olds? Would small children be exposed to things that are inappropriate - bad language, drugs, etc.
2. If there was a school shooting, now every student in the district is at risk.
3. Where would this campus be located? Would it be walkable from every street in Oakwood, or would we have busing?
4. What is the cost?
5. What would happen to the existing buildings?
6. Would you have one principal instead of 5? I guess we'd save some money there.
7. Seeing that Oakwood is relatively land locked, where would students and teachers park? What would pick-up and drop-off look like? (It's a mess at Harman!)

**Sarena Kelley - JAN 17 2018 7:18 AM**

During this process, I believe it is important to focus on why so many of us move to Oakwood. For some it is the old houses and architecture, the walkability and quaint old/small town feel, and for others it is the schools and community. For most though, it is all three of those aspects.

For us, it is the aspect of old Architecture preserved throughout an entire neighborhood and how wonderful of a community we live in. That being said, as we move forward in this process, I believe that although one K-12 facility and school could work in surrounding neighborhoods, it would take away the most important reasons for why we live here. A building that would accommodate that many students would possibly be so large that it would take up the entire buildable lot of the current Oakwood HS/JHS leaving less room for outdoor activities and a large playground. I also believe that Lange, Harman, Smith, OJH and OHS all give the students a sense of belonging. Their is pride in where everyone attends, even leading to generations wanting to move into certain neighborhoods to be 1. close to a specific school, and 2. to raise their children in the same community they were raised at. This all comes back to the idea of community. Most importantly, I believe it would be extremely crowded with parking, drop off/pick up, and walking to school would be difficult for those who live in the opposite side. I appreciate the value of our input, and hope that as a community we can find the ultimate master plan to preserve what we love about Oakwood for generations to come.

**DS - JAN 16 2018 7:28 PM**

I would not support that at all! We would lose the "homey," small school feel. Transportation to and around the campus would be insane! We would have to lose our wonderful Mack Hummon and green space to do so. The Oakwood Schools' excellence in education has withstood the test of time. Our children thrive in the current situation. Why mess with a good system? A PK-12 campus, modular classrooms, etc, may be more "trendy" than the right fit for Oakwood.

**Kent Miller - JAN 16 2018 4:59 PM**

This sounds like a bad idea more suited to economy than excellence in education. The physical, emotional, and educational needs of young children are dramatically different from older children making separate facilities far more beneficial. Also, putting all age groups together could increase the potential for bullying.

**Alex Gusev - JAN 16 2018 1:41 PM**

Is this idea still alive only because of synergies and cutting costs (e.g., on maintenance) that it creates? Bad idea, I do not support it.

**Kristopher Andrew Miller - JAN 16 2018 10:53 AM**

This is a TERRIBLE idea! Having 7-12th grades in the same building is bad enough. Sharing space with high school upperclassmen would be incredibly intimidating as a young elementary student, and being stuck in the same place for 13 years would feel incredibly hopeless and futile. This sounds like some ill advised, hip modern tend in education that'll eventually prove a disaster, like integrated math.

**Jessica - JAN 12 2018 11:14 AM**

This sounds terrible. It would remove walkability from the equation for many and cost a ton.

**Ralf Kircher - JAN 11 2018 8:58 PM**

Bad idea.

**Lesley - JAN 11 2018 9:06 AM**

Is this a serious question? This is Oakwood. I think NO.

**Kimberly - JAN 8 2018 10:59 AM**

I think this could be wonderful. I taught on a campus like this in Florida and it supported the needs of all ages within its design. Love that so many ideas are being considered.

**Amy - JAN 5 2018 11:42 PM**

ABSOLUTELY TERRIBLE!!!! We live in this area and pay the hellacious taxes for the charm and beauty of the architecture of the old homes and schools, to send our children to a national school of excellence and one of the best in the state and the community of people the mix of charm and excellent education brings. We are proud of our community and our school system is the heart of it. Tear down the schools and old stadium and build a campus and you will successfully kill Oakwood.

**Maura - JAN 5 2018 4:33 PM**

No way...

**Shelly D - JAN 5 2018 9:24 AM**

No, for a multitude of reasons. Traffic congestion, needs differing for different ages and the likely location of said campus. Part of the charm of Oakwood is children's ability to get to school either accompanied by parents, walking with siblings or friends, and by their own steam. A single campus eliminates this ability for a good majority of our residents and will change the feel and charm of Oakwood.

**Elizabeth - DEC 30 2017 11:47 PM**

I think this is the worst idea I have ever heard

**Erica - DEC 28 2017 10:40 PM**

I think it is a horrible idea. People don't move to Oakwood for that type of school experience. Smaller schools with historic architecture within walking distance defines the Oakwood School experience. The thought that this is even in the table for discussion is a disappointment .

**Jack A. - DEC 18 2017 11:04 PM**

That sounds like a nightmare. Walking to the Elementary School is key to the Oakwood experience. Each school has and should have their own character and culture.

**John Donnelly - DEC 18 2017 10:28 AM**

The small school environment that Oakwood has is one of the major reasons Oakwood Schools excel. Additionally, Oakwood does not have the space to create such a campus without destroying both the current buildings and layouts as well as the surrounding community

**Heather - DEC 18 2017 10:00 AM**

I think the population of students is too large for this to be a successful model here. We selected Oakwood as the schools were small. My concern is that what makes Oakwood Schools unique would be lost if there was only one campus. Oakwood schools offers a personal learning environment, and it's this personal touch that we value.

**Abbey - DEC 16 2017 12:36 PM**

I think it is best for younger ages to be separate as they are now. Small children need a nurturing space where they can grow and develop freely. Additionally, the facilities they use would be different from that of older kids. And, messages given at an upper grade level may not be appropriate for kids of a young age. For example, where the dogs were recently brought in to check for drugs, etc. - our littlest kids don't need to be witness to that yet.

**Emily - DEC 15 2017 10:11 PM**

Sounds intimidating to little ones and new students. As much as it could be a good way to share common resources, the walkability aspect is a huge draw to the current configuration.

**Melanie - DEC 14 2017 9:52 AM**

If better space utilization is realized to combine grade levels into current buildings, I would support this concept. For example if all 1-3 graders were at harman and all 4-6 graders were at lange. My concern would be that each year the class sizes are different and may require continuous reorganization to optimize space.

**Robyn Angel - DEC 14 2017 6:21 AM**

I like the separation of age ranges. I especially like that we have a dedicated kindergarten campus.

**Lisa - DEC 13 2017 12:05 PM**

Not in favor of this idea at all. Love our buildings and staffs and different climates for our students.

**JP - DEC 13 2017 8:41 AM**

No

**Mychaelyn - DEC 12 2017 9:15 AM**

Younger children should have separation from older students. They should be given separate facilities where they can grow in confidence.

**Molly - DEC 11 2017 9:15 PM**

Oakwood is unique and special for many reasons including the historical school buildings in which our students learn. It is special because it is a walking community, and we don't require buses. It is special because of the character of the buildings, and that they are nestled into the neighborhoods. The interiors show history, and that's ok and good. Oakwood attracts new families because of the unique community and excellent schools. It also draws back alumni to raise their own families here. We do not support a single PK-12 campus.

**evelyn - DEC 11 2017 6:40 PM**

It would be a mistake. k-6 children have different needs than 7-12. Example Kindergartners and 1st graders need smaller toilets.

**evelyn - DEC 11 2017 6:39 PM**

A single campus would be a mistake. k-6 have different needs than 7-12.

**Kelly - DEC 10 2017 4:54 PM**

I am strongly opposed to this idea. Elementary aged children should have smaller and separate facilities to create a manageable and safe environment.

**Daniel - DEC 9 2017 9:51 PM**

I am opposed. The elementary schools serve an important role in the development of children, and in our community. K-12 would be a nightmare.

**Kathryn - DEC 8 2017 3:51 PM**

While I think the idea of a single campus sounds potentially fine (I imagine this would include ways to keep children more separate in age groups). I do not care for it from a walking standpoint. Currently there are many areas within Oakwood where "walkability" exists to schools, namely because there are 3 separate facilities. A single campus decreases the walkability for many in the community. A 3rd grader cannot walk as far as a sophomore. This factor seems to be valued by the community based on how home prices fare by distance to schools. I prefer to have the schools maintain their current locations for this reason.

**Ellen - DEC 4 2017 9:51 PM**

The big question is why??? I can't imagine a single K-12 campus. Strikes me as unnecessary and absolutely financially irresponsible.

**Cait - DEC 4 2017 3:17 PM**

We love the walkability in Oakwood and would be concerned that this would severely limit, if not completely eliminate, that option for many residents. The neighborhood schools are wonderful especially for the younger ages and allows the City not to have buses- which is good for the budget and for the health of our community.

**Susanne - DEC 4 2017 12:25 PM**

I am so relieved to see consensus here that combining the elementary grades into one building is a terrible idea. We are one of the few communities were children can walk to school! Why in the world would we want to change that?

**Sam Dorf - DEC 4 2017 9:13 AM**

I really like the idea of K(or PK)-8 neighborhood schools, but not one large complex.

**Seth - DEC 4 2017 8:37 AM**

Very much opposed and concerned that this is even being contemplated. What has raised this question?

**Jennifer Speed - DEC 4 2017 7:54 AM**

Terrible idea. Having children in smaller-scale buildings supports relationship building among children AND between children and adults. Having two walkable elementary buildings is good for little bodies and growing minds.

**Masha Kisel - DEC 3 2017 9:06 PM**

I oppose this idea. I think the littler kids need their own spaces to develop and grow. I am not even crazy about the idea of having the Middle School and the High school in the same building.

**Don O'Connor - DEC 3 2017 11:54 AM**

I strongly oppose this option for the same reasons so many have already stated. I think we should keep neighborhood schools instead of following the fad of building education factories.

**E F Mende - DEC 2 2017 5:15 PM**

Not much. Even if land/space were readily available, the idea is not a good one. How does throwing everyone together enhance learning. Some separation allows "tribes" (grades) to develop some bonds and individuality without striving to always imitate the older kids. It is also easier to administer smaller cohesive groups than larger more diverse bodies.

**Pam Stephens - NOV 29 2017 3:44 PM**

Absolutely not! We don't need kindergarteners attending school with H.S. Seniors, let alone the fact that we don't have a facility large enough to handle all of them. Even the thought of demolishing our lovely, classic, and well-built schools for a building that looks like all of the other "new" school buildings across the state is beyond being a awful thought. Oakwood residents are proud of the architecture and structure of the schools - leave them alone!

**Judy Payne - NOV 24 2017 3:03 PM**

Absolutely not! That would mean long walks for many small students or busing - both bad ideas. It would mix little kids with large kids which could lead to more bullying. It would mean getting rid of the current Hummon stadium and playing fields - also not a good idea. Finally, it would create even more of a parking nightmare in the vicinity of the high school. There is inadequate parking in that area already, and to add more schools with additional parking requirements would be awful.

**Steve Walters - NOV 24 2017 2:56 PM**

Not a good idea! For one thing, there's no where to put it. And, it would create a huge traffic problem. The arrange we have now is perfect. "If it ain't broke, don't fix it."

**Eric - NOV 23 2017 7:24 AM**

Absolutely not!

**william - NOV 23 2017 6:45 AM**

no.

the current lay out works VERY WELL. We are going to change it, why??

**Debbie M. Price - NOV 22 2017 8:58 AM**

Terrible idea.

**Colleen - NOV 21 2017 9:26 AM**

No. Don't like this idea at all. Like the little ones in their own building.

**Peter - NOV 21 2017 8:26 AM**

Would prefer neighborhood schools so kids can walk to school instead of being driven or bused.

**Becky Weaver - NOV 21 2017 7:56 AM**

I favor neighborhood elementary schools and I believe a single PK-12 campus would be too big and impersonal.

Leigh Ann Fulford - **NOV 20 2017 7:27 PM**

No. Not sure where it would go in our landlocked community. My guess is that it would have to be tall to accommodate all students in the footprints currently occupied by schools. And, the character and history of our buildings is a big part of the attraction to our community. I cannot see how a combine campus would improve our education excellence. This question confounds me.

Denice Moberg - **NOV 20 2017 6:30 PM**

Not in favor of this at all.

Amanda - **NOV 20 2017 12:31 PM**

Absolutely not. We are moving back to Oakwood in January just so our children can be educated in Oakwood. We are fleeing giant southern county schools with ridiculously large campuses because we want small schools. A single campus would destroy what people move back to Oakwood to experience. Also, I know several people here who had children in K-12 schools here and pulled them out. Older students sometimes model behaviors that one does not want their children to learn. Please don't build "new" buildings. Maintain what Oakwood has.

Amanda - **NOV 20 2017 12:30 PM**

Absolutely not. We are moving back to Oakwood in January just so our children can be educated in Oakwood. We are fleeing giant southern county schools with ridiculously large campuses because we want small schools. A single campus would destroy what people move back to Oakwood to experience. Also, I know several people here who had children in K-12 schools here and pulled them out. Older students sometimes model behaviors that one does not want their children to learn. Please don't build "new" buildings. Maintain what Oakwood has.

Tricia - **NOV 20 2017 12:24 PM**

I don't like this idea. I like the separate schools.

Carole Judge - **NOV 19 2017 11:37 PM**

No point. Facilities do not make students successful. And a great learning opportunity while growing up is experiencing change (stepping UP to a different building with new/different students is great way to prepare and teach students to accept change and learn social skills). It's enough of a "Dome" with little diversity.

Kate - **NOV 19 2017 10:37 PM**

I don't love this idea; it seems it would be hard to meet the wide variety of needs across such a broad age range. That said, if there is a compelling reason, and good data related to the success of students under this kind of concept, I'm supportive of exploring it.

Harrison - **NOV 19 2017 9:32 PM**

I do not like this idea.

Susan - **NOV 19 2017 1:13 PM**

I completely oppose this idea. It discourages walking to school and is not in the community spirit that is so great about Oakwood.

**Cindy - NOV 18 2017 10:34 AM**

I oppose this idea. there is no place to build such a campus unless you tear down homes in Oakwood. Our children should be able to walk to school. We would also loose the charm of our community.

**Christopher Morris - NOV 17 2017 6:38 PM**

No. I believe a single PK-12 campus is a horrific idea for many reasons. First, I do not believe that combining all the schools into a single campus will improve the educational / academic experience. Second, there is no good location to put the single campus in Oakwood. Tearing down Mack Hummon Field and using the football and baseball fields would be a horrible idea. Third, many fewer children would be able to walk to elementary school and depending on where you locate the campus (e.g. Sugarcamp), it would be a logistical nightmare. Too many cars coming and going in the morning and after school.

**Kathy - NOV 17 2017 6:26 PM**

No I like the school system the way it is... we should not change what is working. Update the interior when needed.

**Dave - NOV 17 2017 10:06 AM**

No, not a good idea.

**Wendy - NOV 16 2017 10:33 PM**

This is a big no. The drop off And pick up lane alone would be an epic nightmare. And destroying our beautiful historic building would be a crime. Not to mention that kids at different ages need vastly different things.

**nancy - NOV 16 2017 9:52 AM**

I think this would be an absolutely horrible idea

**David Laatz - NOV 16 2017 9:01 AM**

Absolutely not. It should be 3 buildings, Bldg.#1 PK-5th in one building (with PK in a secluded location) Bldg#2 6-8th (Jr.High) and Bldg#3 9-12th (High School).

**Sarah Q - NOV 16 2017 7:55 AM**

This idea is absolutely awful and I do not support it at all. I would be extremely disappointed if this is the direction our district takes.

**Steven - NOV 15 2017 8:53 PM**

I will not support the idea for our small, nice community. I doubt the person who thinks by this way has visionary thoughts! Bad idea!

**Lynn Hartman - NOV 15 2017 7:01 PM**

This is the worst idea I have ever heard! I would never support anything of the sort. Really? Five year old children in the same facility as seventeen year old students?

**Dante Connell - NOV 14 2017 6:18 PM**

No. I support keeping separate buildings, organized by grade level, spread throughout the city of Oakwood.

**Lucy - NOV 14 2017 11:30 AM**

I cringe at the idea of a single PK-12 campus. I do not support this.

**Stephanie - NOV 13 2017 11:55 PM**

Absolutely not!!!! Would never support such an idea

**Meredith - NOV 12 2017 2:06 PM**

We would not support.

**Laura Lee John - NOV 10 2017 9:30 PM**

Definitely not! I believe the ideal situation would be for 1st-5th to be in one building, 6th-8th in second building and 9th-12th in a third building.

**Colleen Smith - NOV 10 2017 6:07 PM**

Absolutely positively NO! Save our money and decrease our taxes! Having PK-12 together would be a nightmare and only endanger the younger kids by exposing them to the problems older kids face everyday but less equipped to handle.

**Barbara Erbe - NOV 9 2017 7:24 AM**

NO! I see no real benefit of having everyone in one location but I see several negatives. I know that busing would not be added but having one central location will decrease the number of walkers (because it increase the average distance people must walk). In addition, it will increase traffic, eliminate the uniqueness of our buildings and completely change the feel of the community.

**Tami - NOV 6 2017 3:08 PM**

I would never support such an idea! Please keep the focus on what makes our community so special. These concepts would have an impact on the entire community. I would not want a neighbor tearing down a beautiful old home and plopping a modern looking home in its place. It would impact my neighborhood in a negative way!

**Katie Moody - NOV 4 2017 11:17 AM**

I am not in favor of a single campus. Each age group has its own needs (playgrounds, stadiums, parking) and those will better addressed in separate facilities.

**Kristin - NOV 4 2017 10:00 AM**

I would worry about the little ones. It seems like they might need a place that they feel like is theirs.

**Sharon Kelly - NOV 3 2017 1:06 PM**

I oppose having a single PK-12 campus.

John Hadley - NOV 3 2017 10:25 AM

Would not support.

## **Question 5: What do you think about a new district performing arts center?**

**Steve - FEB 14 2018 9:57 PM**

My children are in elementary school, so I do not fully understand any current constraints. However, I believe academic achievement should overrule any arts or athletic needs. I have to assume the current facilities are adequate for Oakwood students, and I do not support a large investment in a performing arts center. If major modifications occur at OHS, I hope current needs for performing arts are included in that facility.

**Alex Gusev - FEB 9 2018 10:11 AM**

This is an alternative voice to this official web cite. Please check the materials, opinions, and data on the same topics, and think for yourself: <http://oakwoodvoice.com>

**Rose - FEB 6 2018 10:04 PM**

This would be nice, but similar to my comments about the health and wellness center, I'd like to see Oakwood upgrade the classrooms and technology before building something new like this. Those just seem to be more pressing issues than a performing arts center.

**Jill - JAN 29 2018 6:56 PM**

Given the percentage of our students who participate in the arts, I believe the district should focus on making these programs as high-quality as possible. However, I feel that investing in the faculty (adding an assistant Band Director, etc.) and the instruction spaces (horribly inadequate for current band and orchestra) would be a much wiser use of funds than building a new performance venue.

**Sarah - JAN 29 2018 1:44 PM**

Will it help our students have better careers in the long run, particularly for the cost of a new center? I have been to the JR high and HS plays this year and neither time was the theater full. Do we really need a new center? Part of being in elementary school, jr high and high school is performing in a smaller space. Could we spend our money in a better way to maintain the small class sizes and the strong education our kids receive?

**Jen Messaros - JAN 26 2018 10:40 AM**

Right now, the band and orchestra rooms are inadequate and the stage in the High School is barely big enough to fit the students. I see the need for improvement. The noise in the band room must be enough to damage hearing, and I wonder why the band can't rehearse on the stage (for the time being)? I don't know about a performing arts center per se, but some improvements should be made.

**Justin Shineman - JAN 25 2018 8:41 AM**

This would be a great idea, provided Oakwood can afford it and we have adequate space. I would though that it doesn't become a space that is empty more than it's used. The existing band and orchestra rooms are incredibly inadequate and poorly located in the school (visit the school during band practice some time, and you'll hear them in up and down the halls).

IF major renovations are conducted at the current OJHS/OHS, updating and relocating performing arts within the school should be included.

**Nadja - JAN 23 2018 11:42 PM**

I think the HS and JHS building is inadequate in many, many ways and its lack of functional performing arts, music, and practice spaces is one of those many ways. I'd prefer to see a tear down and rebuild or gut renovation of the HS and JHS building, to include bringing these spaces up to standard, than construction a separate performing arts center.

**Kirsten Halling - JAN 20 2018 5:48 PM**

The current auditorium is clearly inadequate, so this sounds like a very good idea. Would this be like the Nutter Center in that it could be used for the school as well as being rented out for concerts and events? Could this potentially be a source of income for the city? Where would this be located? In Old River?

**brad - JAN 20 2018 2:10 PM**

As a parent of two children that will play an instrument through high school, I don't support a new fine arts facility unless it was funded outside regular school budget. However, the auditorium definitely needs updating and some maintenance and from what I saw of band and orchestra rooms, I would also agree these need some work. For larger events, is it possible to partner with other school districts or UD or use outdoor venues?

**Jennifer - JAN 18 2018 10:55 PM**

Definitely something worth talking about. I certainly think something is needed, it is just the scope of the project that would lend itself to necessary discussion....a well used and productive space that is also fiscally responsible.

**Lynn Behnke - JAN 18 2018 10:03 PM**

Refurbishing the current auditorium would be great. The temperature issue should be addressed. The arts are so important. Not sure a new venue is fiscally feasible.

**Amy Askins - JAN 18 2018 9:51 PM**

Hmm, this is a tough one. I am a strong believer in quality arts education for all students. However, I do not believe that state of the arts facilities are absolutely necessary to accomplish this and while a brand new center would certainly be wonderful it does seem like there are many other physical areas which require more immediate attention. That being said, the narrow, packed Harman "auditorium" makes

seeing one's kids at assemblies a challenge-this problem might be best addressed by placing kids on risers on the stage rather than on the floor. I am amazed at the wonderful 6th grade musicals Harman fits onto the tiny stage. The OHS auditorium has serious climate control issues and no wing space. I would love to see the space enhanced and/or renovated. I question whether it is worth keeping the oddly shaped teacher parking lot versus using that space to expand or rebuild the auditorium and possibly the cafeteria.

Taylor Morrissey - JAN 18 2018 2:07 PM

This is a fantastic idea. I would love to see a performing arts center, or at the very least work done to refurbish our auditoriums and performing spaces. It would be an amazing place to put on concerts, as well as provide much needed fine arts classroom space for certain subjects (location providing). As a recent graduate of Oakwood High School, our auditorium is, putting it nicely, pathetic. It does not have space to house everyone for school-wide assemblies, so we had to do assemblies and showcases in shifts. This meant that one assembly took up an entire half of the day, which hardly seems time efficient. The seats are falling apart in the audience, both cushions and arm rests alike. The fans do not help the issue with temperature control in the auditorium, and it is unbearably hot 99% of the year. There is not enough space to comfortably fit the high school orchestra or the band for performances, and instead of having a pit for the orchestra during musicals, more seating needs to be taken out of the audience to accommodate for the instruments when there is already a shortage of seating. As far as the fine arts go when the auditorium isn't being used, there are glaring issues as well. The rooms used for band and orchestra classes are too small to accommodate the large number of students in each period. Often this takes out valuable class time as students have to constantly rearrange the room to fit, or go down to the auditorium to practice (which is not an easy feat with instruments like cellos!) I feel like a lot of people saying that this is not needed, even if it was just reparations to old facilities, don't understand how crucial and important fine arts are to an education. I suspect that several people commenting below, saying that we already have an auditorium have never sat through a single performance in OHS auditorium sweating through their concert attire, or stood in the back of the auditorium for an entire assembly because there were no more seats. It does not fit the needs of the community. We brag about our amazing schools and how excellent our education is, but fine arts, (band, choir, orchestra, art, etc.) are a large part of what makes our education great. Everyone is talking about how important our history is in the comments, and how great our charming architecture is, and I agree to an extent. But there is a difference between "keeping Oakwood charm" and letting buildings fall into a sad condition because we don't want to change anything about them. Oakwood schools aren't great because of the buildings, they are great because of the students inside them. I think more of an emphasis should be placed on helping Oakwood students succeed and thrive academically than worrying whether building different structures will keep our aesthetic consistent.

Alex Gusev - JAN 17 2018 11:25 AM

PLEASE think about not what we WANT, but what we can AFFORD at this time. Please think and ask the City's officials (every time during this Facility Plan discussions) by how much our tax payment will be increased for every \$10 million capital spending amount (than calculate based on 30-50-75 million proposed). Please think if we, the residents, will be able to re-sell our approx \$300-350K on average houses with a potential \$10-12K property tax bill per year attached to it in the next 5-10 years (excl. County's increases every 3 years on top). Please think if it is better to move elsewhere and send kids to Miami Valley School in lieu of paying so much in taxes in Oakwood (the City's tax bill is steadily pushing some in this direction). Please think that with every tax increase we, the residents, will be investing less in the upkeep and remodel of our old aging houses (think about re-sale values, deterioration, maintenance neglect, etc. in light of re-sale values). Please think that this is about the buildings only, not about the quality of teaching and education, teachers' ability (know-how, creativity, knowledge) to teach, or overall quality of the materials. Please think about the City's capital investments pipeline (what kind of projects are coming next, how many, the reasons, such as rejected "Library Project" last year) and ask the City for the list with the capex costs. Again, PLEASE think what we can AFFORD and not what we WANT to do at this time in order to preserve the values of our houses assuming increased tax burden for years to come. This is not only about the EDUCATION here, but the survival of the CITY itself, community, house values, tax burdens, among other things. Thank you, Alex Gusev at alex.gusev@ipaper.com

Brent Mackintosh - JAN 17 2018 10:35 AM

I believe a new performing arts center is totally unnecessary but I would support tax dollars in refurbishing the current auditorium, getting the stage lighting, etc. improved and updated. It would be tragic to allow the current auditorium/theater to fall into disrepair.

Cara Kite - JAN 17 2018 9:43 AM

This is not necessary. It would be better to keep, enhance, and use the existing facilities. Students can always attend Stiver's in Dayton.

DS - JAN 16 2018 7:47 PM

I don't believe there should be a separate performing arts center. I think that updating our performance spaces would be nice down the road. More comfortable seating at the OJH/OHS would be nice, but I think district-wide our needs are served well as is. I don't believe it needs to be addressed at this time.

Kent Miller - JAN 16 2018 5:01 PM

That sounds great.

Alex Gusev - JAN 16 2018 1:37 PM

Maybe, if the residents can afford it. Otherwise, please keep, enhance, and use the existing facilities.

**Jessica - JAN 12 2018 11:15 AM**

For me this is a "would be nice." How about, instead, doing something to existing school infrastructure so that each school has its own DECENT auditorium?

**Ralf Kircher - JAN 11 2018 9:16 PM**

While I admire the comparison made in other comments that if Oakwood can have a new facility like Lane Stadium for sports, it ought to have an equal facility for the arts, I believe in general that too much emphasis is placed on grand, new buildings being the solution for everything. From reading the building assessments, it sounds as if Oakwood schools are going to have enough spending on their hands in the near future, and getting the existing buildings up to (what in many instances sound like ridiculously lavish) codes is more important.

**amy - JAN 5 2018 11:51 PM**

in addition to my previous comment, if the district was able to raise enough money outside of the school budget (as I understand it) to buy a plot of land and build a new stadium; it seems reasonable that the same fundraising may be possible for improvement and development of the arts/performing arts situation within our district. I feel that both athletics and the arts are equally important in developing adolescents into fine human beings.

**Amy - JAN 5 2018 11:46 PM**

I think there is room for discussion. I don't like the idea of making one single facility. I guess it would depend on what was presented and where it falls on the list of priorities...

**Maura - JAN 5 2018 4:19 PM**

The district certainly has a passionate group of students who deserve to have a better facility to demonstrate their talent. Not to mention, a more comfortable one for those who attend the performances.

**Shelly D. - JAN 5 2018 9:29 AM**

I would like to see this in the future, but after reading the building reports, there are a multitude of items needing attention and funds at this time. Current needs are being met with facilities as they are.

**Elizabeth - DEC 30 2017 11:52 PM**

I think it would be nice to have, but I think existing facilities are sufficient. It would depend on location and price as to whether I would support.

**Jack A. - DEC 18 2017 11:23 PM**

I think there are enough "need to haves" listed in the building assessments, that we have to be careful about the "nice to haves".

Facilities at the HS need some upgrades to keep Oakwood attractive for the coming

decades, but flex space (like at Smith) works well for the lower grades. Keeping the arts as part of school rather than separating them out is a plus.

**Emily - DEC 15 2017 10:28 PM**

I think it's important to keep the performing arts within each of the buildings, as much as we can. Taking them out of the building does not address full school assemblies or potential class space, so must only be for extracurriculars.

**Melanie - DEC 14 2017 9:47 AM**

I support the building of a facility that allows for an entire school to gather in one location.

**Robyn Angel - DEC 13 2017 12:20 PM**

I have been to only a few events at the high school where it was standing room only. However, Harman's auditorium facilities are sorely lacking. I suspect Smith has a better set up with using the gym and bleachers. It would be great if a district performing arts center was made available to all schools in the system. This would take some space pressure off of some of the other schools. The fact that kids have to eat lunch in shifts is ludicrous!

**Lisa - DEC 13 2017 11:56 AM**

I do feel like we need improvements for the fine arts. The art rooms are outdated and lack updated equipment, technology and storage. The jr./sr. high band/orchestra/chorus rooms lack enough space for our students. The auditorium is not large enough for many occasions. Do we need a whole new facility? Can our small community finance that luxury? I would think that would be a monumental cost but at the very least, we need improvements because we have a large population of students involved and thriving in the arts.

**Mychaelyn - DEC 12 2017 9:25 AM**

At a time in our country when so much emphasis is placed on the sciences and engineering I do feel that it is equally as important to give opportunities for the arts. I do feel that having the facilities to accommodate the performing arts would be a special jewel for this community. I am in support of giving these programs the opportunity to shine in a facility that can accommodate them.

**Molly - DEC 11 2017 8:48 PM**

Perhaps the question needs more detail in what the center would entail. I know that the current auditorium is not large enough for the student body, it doesn't have A/C when needed, lighting and sound likely need to be updated, along with stage equipment. I would hope the new performing arts center would entail a new and improved band room and orchestra room (very much needed), new and improved choir room, and also art studios for artists. Perhaps the current structure could be expanded into the South

parking lot, which could also perhaps expand the cafeteria to improve cafeteria wait times too.

evelyn - DEC 11 2017 6:38 PM

I do not think we need a new center.

Daniel - DEC 9 2017 10:02 PM

We do not need it. Worry about educating the children and maintaining what we have.

Ellen - DEC 4 2017 9:55 PM

It seems to me that there are enough facilities close by that could be shared. Plus I like the idea of our children getting out and having opportunities to see other environments. Our auditorium seems to accommodate most performances quite well.

Sam Dorf - DEC 4 2017 9:11 AM

Updating auditorium makes sense, but a separate facility is not needed.

Masha Kisel - DEC 3 2017 9:21 PM

I fully support this idea. Of course, I assume that this would be a space where children could also take classes. I don't think that there are nearly enough performing arts facilities in the area, compared to the number of playing fields, stadiums and arenas.

E F Mende - DEC 2 2017 4:47 PM

Not Much. "District Performance Arts Center" sounds like you want to compete with Kettering's Arena. Other than several plays a year, how will it be utilized ? Maybe the auditorium can use some updating, but a totally new center ? No!

VC Claggett - DEC 2 2017 7:26 AM

An unnecessary expense for a small school district, particularly when the greater Dayton area has so many other performing arts facilities.

Jennifer - NOV 29 2017 9:11 PM

Not sure a performing arts center is needed - we have a lot of facilities available in the local area. Definitely not something at the top of the list.

Judy Payne - NOV 24 2017 3:36 PM

If you include enlarging the auditorium in some way, then I probably would be in favor. With the size of the school now, the auditorium is probably too small. Where you would put it and what would be included would be factors that I would need to consider. We do not need something to compete with other communities centers.

Steve Walters - NOV 24 2017 3:13 PM

Sure, it's called the Oakwood High School Auditorium. There is no need for a new facility. There is no justification for the expense.

**Eric - NOV 23 2017 7:31 AM**

If you can provide such a building without coming back to citizens for a huge tax increase, then that is great. Why can't there be a partnership with other local communities to share space for something that is not needed on a daily basis.

**Debbie M Price - NOV 22 2017 8:45 AM**

Oakwood should partner with other institutions for space requirements and focus instead on improving instruction in the arts and music at all grade levels. Teachers are the key. Renovations and maintenance for the current space is needed, but a separate facility is a waste of taxpayer money.

**Colleen - NOV 21 2017 9:27 AM**

I love this idea. If it could incorporate multiple disciplines of art, including visual art.

**Peter - NOV 21 2017 8:29 AM**

It's a great wish but there are other more pressing needs. Might it be possible to share UD's space much in the way the swim team is allowed to train at UD's pool?

**Denice Moberg - NOV 20 2017 6:31 PM**

I do not see this as necessary. Way too many other needs for spending money.

**Becky Weaver - NOV 20 2017 12:19 PM**

Very expensive for the number of students it would serve and the limited time it would be used. I would support development of a more flexible-use space with private funding support.

**Heather - NOV 19 2017 10:18 PM**

I'd love an up to date performing arts space — depending on the impact on our current buildings & classes/ programs.

**Harrison - NOV 19 2017 9:40 PM**

I think it is time we explore some options.

**Dante Connell - NOV 19 2017 9:21 PM**

I would support an arts center if financed with private donations versus tax-payer money. Ideally the arts center would be designed to highlight the visual arts in addition to housing the performing arts. Could we remodel the existing auditorium? If we cannot stay within the current footprint of OHS, could we add on to the northwest corner of the building, pulling the structure out towards Far Hills Avenue? The downtown Dayton Metro Library has a stage/performance space. Would the district consider partnering with Wright Library to add on to the back of the building to create a performance arts

center which is still in the heart of Oakwood, accessible to students and parents. Parking is an issue to consider. I would prefer to have the building in the center of Oakwood, versus down at Old River, where parking is more readily available.

Leigh Ann Fulford - **NOV 19 2017 4:00 PM**

I am not sure where the new performing arts center would be.... Mack Hummon field? I would rather re-imagine the spaces we have in our beautiful historic buildings and make them work better. For example, if we move the OJH/OHS cafeteria, we could create a large space for a pit orchestra, costume and set storage, etc., directly under the current auditorium. The cafeteria could move into one of the interior courtyards at OJH/OHS if we renovate the space and add floor/roof. This newly created space could also be renovated to be shared with band, orchestra, and choir--all of these performing arts are currently housed in less than adequate areas in regards to space, acoustics, and storage.

Cindy - **NOV 18 2017 10:38 AM**

I see no need for this.

christopher morris - **NOV 17 2017 6:44 PM**

the current facilities are cramped and in many respects inadequate for our performing arts. we have a number of talented artists that would benefit from better facilities. I don't have any brilliant ideas on how to accomplish that within our current facilities, but would hate to see a separate performing arts center away from the high school. I would recommend we consider renovating our existing facilities as an option.

Dave - **NOV 17 2017 10:05 AM**

No need. Our current setup is good enough.

Wendy - **NOV 16 2017 10:22 PM**

Either the arts get proper billing as important or they don't. Right now they don't. I'd love to see a similar situation with any arts space as we got with Lane Stadium. Private donors to help! We don't need a whole new building and it certianly doesn't need to be state of the art, but the current facility is insufficient in size and lighting, uncomfortable for the audience and not able to meet the district's needs.

nancy - **NOV 16 2017 9:55 AM**

I would only support this idea, if they put the same amount of money/donations/grants towards a MUCH NEEDED field house for the sporting programs.

Steven - **NOV 15 2017 8:58 PM**

I feel current art activities are good enough, no need build something new.

Stephanie - **NOV 13 2017 11:57 PM**

I support a new performing arts center IF it comes from grants or private donations.

**Meredith - NOV 12 2017 2:17 PM**

The current auditorium is outdated, uncomfortable and requires three separate times for any assembly (7-8, 9-10, 11-12) Wonder how this affects the teachers and their abilities to conduct class, as there are many classes that encompass more than one grade level of students? Currently the only place in OHS that can house the entire high school (junior high not included) is the Pitt, where they are shoulder to shoulder in the stands as well as on the floor. We agree with the needs to control cost, however an updated and larger facility is needed. Could be used for graduation, rented out for concerts, etc.. It definitely deserves our consideration.

**Laura Lee John - NOV 10 2017 9:16 PM**

I know the existing auditorium needs updating especially backstage. More space is needed for an orchestra pit/more seating but this 'space' may not be a priority once all the needs of the Master Plan are known.

**Colleen Smith - NOV 10 2017 5:12 PM**

The school district has been able to get by with the performance space it has and as necessary reaching out to the greater Dayton community to rent space. I don't think the cost is justified. The Dayton performing art venues are struggling financially to survive. Our support of these venues are important to the region.

**Michele Morgan - NOV 9 2017 12:09 PM**

Not necessary. Talent is talent. The existing high school auditorium is more than sufficient.

**Barbara Erbe - NOV 9 2017 7:30 AM**

I agree that our current performance space is not ideal. Due to our size though, it may be difficult to justify a state-of-the-art large performance space, especially since it would only be used periodically. I would need more information (costs and benefits) to better evaluate if a new space is appropriate or if renovation would be a better option.

**Sharon Kelly - NOV 3 2017 12:44 PM**

I feel that Oakwood students are very talented and could benefit from a PA center or expanded space within the OJHS/OHS building. Initial thoughts would be where would you build a performing arts center??

**John Hadley - NOV 3 2017 10:20 AM**

It all depends on getting the entire needs and wants list put together with total costs for each and then doing a trade off towards a total investment level. A district performing arts center costing how much and versus spending that money on new roofing, HVAC or IT-AV assets and power upgrades? On an overall scale a district performing arts center is a low-priority nice to have.

## **Question 6: Would you support enhancements to our athletic facilities and/or the development of a new health & wellness center?**

**Steve - FEB 14 2018 9:58 PM**

I think this is a horrible idea. The city just finished building a state-of-the-art athletic facility, and there are many gyms and fitness facilities (including the Kettering Fitness and Wellness Center – less than 3 miles away for all Oakwood residents) nearby. A fitness and wellness center should not be a part of this discussion. I think the OCC is inadequate for many reasons, but it also supports other community needs. After addressing educational needs, I believe a larger discussion of city needs should occur, including renovations to Wright Library (which could meet teen and meeting space needs better) and OCC renovations (to support education, health and wellness, etc.). In addition, the city recently purchased a tennis club, this again asks the question about the efficiency and needs being met by the OCC (which has several tennis courts). Is there a possibility of relocating excessive tennis and obsolete football facilities/activities to better meet community and educational needs?

**Alex Gusev - FEB 9 2018 10:12 AM**

This is an alternative voice to this official web cite. Please check the materials, opinions, and data on the same topics, and think for yourself: <http://oakwoodvoice.com>

**Rose - FEB 6 2018 10:03 PM**

The high school gym is pretty embarrassing, from the few times I've been in there. My children are young, so they aren't in sports yet, but yes, I think the HS gym needs some enhancements. As for a health and wellness center... I'd like to know that Oakwood is upgrading the classrooms and technology before building a new health and wellness center. Education first. :)

**Jill - JAN 29 2018 7:01 PM**

We recently enhanced our athletic facilities--the Pit floor was replaced and we built a whole new facility at Old River. Oakwood is (and should strive to be) an intellectual powerhouse; our limited financial resources should not be used primarily for athletic endeavors.

**Sarah - JAN 29 2018 1:39 PM**

No thank you. This is not education related. If we can keep Oakwood a walking community, it would give many exercise at no additional cost!

**Jen Messaros - JAN 26 2018 10:46 AM**

We have the OCC. Kettering Fairmont has athletic facilities open to the public, which Oakwood people can use for a nominal fee. I don't see the need. The idea of a health and wellness center in the city schools confuses me. Also, didn't we just open a new athletic facility last year?

**Justin Shineman - JAN 25 2018 9:21 AM**

I would support enhancements to our athletic facilities. The disparity between Harman and Smith gyms is striking. The lack of gym space for the HS and JHS is pathetic. Mack Hummon is in a terrible state of disrepair; it's embarrassing when we host other schools. The softball and baseball teams can't host home games simultaneously based on their layout and space. Irving Field (OJHS field hockey and lacrosse) is unusable when it rains due to poor drainage, has limited parking and no restrooms for spectators.

I do not, however, agree with incorporating a community health and wellness center with school facilities. That should be done separately with the OCC.

**Nadja - JAN 24 2018 12:00 AM**

I think updating the schools to be 21st century learning environments should be the focus/priority of any capital improvements funded by the taxpayers. Having said that, there are interesting possible synergies should the OCC building or its central location be repurposed (for PreK and/or SC for example), and a community wellness center be integrated with the HS weight room and athletic facilities at the HS, like Kettering's Fitness and Wellness Center at Fairmont. I think our facilities can/should be multipurpose in how they serve the entire community, providing for adult and senior health, sports and fitness as well as children. There's no need for our communities facilities to be separate and single purpose.

**Kirsten Halling - JAN 20 2018 5:51 PM**

I would support updates to the community pool and the OCC.

**brad - JAN 20 2018 2:40 PM**

No to a "new" health and wellness center but if enhancements are needed, it seems they should be the responsibility of the city and not the school. Regarding other enhancements to the schools' athletic facilities, some improvements seem to be needed but people don't choose Oakwood Schools because of the quality of the athletic facilities. My children are both athletes. If I wanted them to have state-of-the-art athletic facilities I would have bought a house in Centerville.

**Lynn Behnke - JAN 18 2018 10:11 PM**

Would support improvements being made to Mack Hammond bathrooms. Would possible support improvements made to the OCC pool area. This is not where our tax dollars should be spent. School infrastructure should be the priority. The community should decide what needs should be meet next followed by a few community favored want items.

**Amy Askins - JAN 18 2018 10:07 PM**

No to a health and wellness center. Regarding athletic facilities, the Harman gym and outdoor recess area is seriously lacking. I would like to see the green space at Harman opened up to students during recess. Unfortunately the school is land-locked and I do not know where a larger gym could be built without starting the building from scratch. I think the athletic facilities at Smith are good and at the HS are adequate. I would support the permanent closure of Schantz between OHS and Mack Hammond field to utilize the space for an addition, new structure or outdoor courtyard. I do not believe HS athletes need state of the art facilities. Rather, ADs at OHS and OJHS should make every effort to select caring, knowledgeable coaches who are committed to "doing what's best for students" in terms of being good role models, treating all athletes with respect regardless of whether they are starters, and teaching strong character in addition to valuing athletic achievement.

**Deanna - JAN 17 2018 1:45 PM**

I would support the development of a health & wellness center. Our athletic facilities are very limited in my opinion. The gym space is lacking especially when we have to share it with the OCC basketball program. The Harman gym is not a gym nor is it handicap accessible and if you could

finagle a wheelchair down the so called ramp, then you surely wouldn't have any where to be without being in the way. It's simply awful and unacceptable in my opinion.

We would benefit greatly from added gym space. Now, how do we do this and how much will this cost? I'm not sure but I'm open minded and think Oakwood schools need some major updates/additions.

**Alex Gusev - JAN 17 2018 11:25 AM**

PLEASE think about not what we WANT, but what we can AFFORD at this time. Please think and ask the City's officials (every time during this Facility Plan discussions) by how much our tax payment will be increased for every \$10 million capital spending amount (than calculate based on 30-50-75 million proposed). Please think if we, the residents, will be able to re-sell our approx \$300-350K on average houses with a potential \$10-12K property tax bill per year attached to it in the next 5-10 years (excl. County's increases every 3 years on top). Please think if it is better to move elsewhere and send kids to Miami Valley School in lieu of paying so much in taxes in Oakwood (the City's tax bill is steadily pushing some in this direction). Please think that with every tax increase we, the residents, will be investing less in the upkeep and remodel of our old aging houses (think about re-sale values, deterioration, maintenance neglect, etc. in light of re-sale values). Please think that this is about the buildings only, not about the quality of teaching and education, teachers' ability (know-how, creativity, knowledge) to teach, or overall quality of the materials. Please think about the City's capital investments pipeline (what kind of projects are coming next, how many, the reasons, such as rejected "Library Project" last year) and ask the City for the list with the capex costs. Again, PLEASE think what we can AFFORD and not what we WANT to do at this time in order to preserve the values of our houses assuming increased tax burden for years to come. This is not only about the EDUCATION here, but the survival of the CITY itself, community, house values, tax burdens, among other things. Thank you, Alex Gusev at alex.gusev@ipaper.com

**Brent Mackintosh - JAN 17 2018 10:37 AM**

We don't need a new health and wellness center, but I would support through tax dollars the maintenance and updates the current facilities (fields, etc) would need for their continued use.

**Cara Kite - JAN 17 2018 9:45 AM**

No! We've been down this road before with the City - and it was rejected. Please review this data from about 10 years ago. There is no money for this. It would be great, but EDUCATION should be our first focus. I personally belong to the Kettering Rec. It is close to home and affordable. This is a great option for Oakwood families, and shows why we do not need a new health & wellness center at the expense of our taxpayers. Keep the focus on EDUCATION.

**DS - JAN 16 2018 7:55 PM**

I don't feel we need any more enhancements at this time. Our children are well-served by our current facilities (although I would agree that the Harman gym seems a bit inadequate). I am not clear on what a H&W ctr would include or who it would serve. I feel that the OCC is sufficient for most needs. I don't think the kids need anything outside of what is currently offered at school, recess, PE, organized sports, playgrounds, green space, etc. Anyone who needs more than what they offer may be better suited going outside of the city, instead of creating a monster H&W ctr (it would become a monster if it included everything that people would want in a new center).

**Kent Miller - JAN 16 2018 5:05 PM**

This could be good as long as it does not take funds away from the arts and the academics for which our excellent school system is known and recognized.

**Alex Gusev - JAN 16 2018 1:35 PM**

Yes, if it will be within the City's boundaries and walkable distance.

**Kristopher Andrew Miller - JAN 16 2018 10:46 AM**

Athletics are a waste of taxpayer money that could be better spent on academics.

**jessica - JAN 12 2018 11:20 AM**

No. Already ridiculous that the district spent tax money on the new "privately-funded" stadium. While important for some, extracurricular athletics and related facilities should be funded outside of our education budget. Plus - kids are already enrolled in so many after school sports/activities. We don't need (and wouldn't use) a new health & wellness center.

**Ralf Kircher - JAN 11 2018 9:29 PM**

Enhancements to athletic facilities is one thing, the development of a health & wellness center is another. To the former, sure; to the latter, the OCC seems the logical location to consider such an idea.

**amy - JAN 5 2018 11:58 PM**

I feel that a new health and wellness center is a bit excessive. Keeping kids active doesn't require much, it's been happening for years with less than we currently have. Growing up, we had free weights, a lumpy ball field and corn fields (true story). We all thrived and learned how to live, eat well and make healthy choices. I am pretty sure money could be placed elsewhere.

**Maura - JAN 5 2018 4:22 PM**

Some enhancements could be done at Harman and the High School within their existing structures. However, at this time I don't believe it to be a priority.

**Shelly D - JAN 5 2018 9:32 AM**

Physical Education serves the students well with what is available presently. I would place this in the category of dream additions for the future. The OCC could do with several upgrades/additions but let's keep focus on educational needs first and foremost.

**Jack A. - DEC 18 2017 11:32 PM**

There are enough "need to have" items identified on the building assessments, that we have to be careful with the "nice to have".

Phys Ed is an important part of a balanced education. I support adequate facilities for year-round age-appropriate Phys Ed at each building. Some minor tweaks at the HS and an upgrade at Harman seem appropriate.

Lack of facilities are not keeping our student athletes from competing successfully.

**Robyn Angel - DEC 14 2017 1:34 PM**

I do not. While I understand the athletics are an important part of a well rounded student's life, I do not feel there is currently a lack of facilities to encourage student participation. Kids have

been able to get in shape and stay in shape forever with less than Oakwood currently offers. While there have been advances in training over the last hundred years, sports have virtually stood still in comparison to the advances in other areas of education. Money should go into providing facilities to equip our kids for the 21st century.

**Melanie - DEC 14 2017 9:43 AM**

No to a health center. Upadating current facilities or enclosing occ pool to allow for indoor or outdoor use and increasing the water temperature would be a good addition.

**Lisa - DEC 13 2017 12:07 PM**

Wow...a new health center is a lovely idea but very costly!!! All of our gyms need upgrades for sure but a new health center in a time when frugality is important seems extravagant.

**JP - DEC 13 2017 8:46 AM**

I support enhancements but not a new health center.

**evelyn - DEC 11 2017 6:44 PM**

Both Smith and Lange gyms need sound dampening improvements. The noise level tends to be at or above the level that damages hearing. I do support improvements, if they involve added noise dampening system.

**evelyn - DEC 11 2017 6:42 PM**

I support the OCC getting a year round pool. I do not support the school getting a new health center.

**Kelly - DEC 10 2017 5:05 PM**

A wellness facility should be VERY low on the list of spending priorities. Many families have students in athletic activities, such as ballet or dance, and pay for wellness and physical therapy out of our own pockets. PLEASE make academics the highest priority when it comes to new initiatives.

**Daniel - DEC 9 2017 9:55 PM**

I think our athletic facilities are fine. We don't need a health and wellness center. Focus on educating the children.

**Tracy - DEC 8 2017 4:05 PM**

No to athletic facilities.I would be interested in the options of the city and schools working together on health and wellness facilities.

**Susanne - DEC 5 2017 9:38 AM**

Families move here because children can walk to parks that are all over the city, and because of Oakwood school's academic excellence. I would definitely not support a new health center. Why not remodel stadium bathrooms and do whatever else is needed to improve current facilities instead?

**Ellen Ireland - DEC 4 2017 9:39 PM**

Only if there is a compelling case for the need. Most individuals have easy access to sufficient health and wellness opportunities.

**Sam Dorf - DEC 4 2017 9:13 AM**

We have enough sports and athletic facilities!

**Seth - DEC 4 2017 8:45 AM**

The Oakwood Schools are renowned for Academic Excellence and as wonderful place for children to develop into young adults in a walkable, safe, beautiful environment. Our budget priorities ought to remember this. A health & wellness center does not sound like something a school district should be in the business of building and maintaining.

**Don O'Connor - DEC 3 2017 12:22 PM**

I would support enhancements to performing arts and athletic facilities if they make sense financially and for use by a district of our size. I would like to see a detailed list of our current shortcomings and some ideas for improvements. But because of space and cost constraints I doubt I would support large, new facilities.

**E F Mende - DEC 2 2017 5:01 PM**

Two different questions. Enhancement ala Texas multimillion type is out of the question and you could mean a new stadium. Definitely no support for undefined enhancements. How does a new wellness for the community intertwine with the school system ? If not for the community, why include it with the school planning ? If for the community, how/when will be available to the public and still meet school security ? If only for the school, why ? Again, definitely no support for ill-defined requirements.

**Jennifer - NOV 29 2017 9:15 PM**

Yes - fitness will always be a need and to ensure we have sufficiently updated and flexible space available for all ages would be awesome for the district. Possibly include an indoor soft room for littles to get movement when weather is bad. Maybe an indoor pool too!

**Pam Stephens - NOV 29 2017 3:34 PM**

Why? I would certainly need to have more information but it seems to be duplicating the city and school current facilities.

**Judy Payne - NOV 24 2017 3:21 PM**

I would need to have more details as to what is wanted before I could give approval. If a fitness and wellness center that is available to the Oakwood public as well as the students is planned, I would be more likely to support it (there is already a training center in the school for the athletes). If you were going to add classrooms to the Junior High for 6th graders, then upgrading "The Pit" at that time would make sense. I think our playing fields are in good shape at the moment (except, as someone pointed out, the stadium restrooms).

**Judy Payne - NOV 24 2017 3:21 PM**

I would need to have more details as to what is wanted before I could give approval. If a fitness and wellness center that is available to the Oakwood public as well as the students is planned, I would be more likely to support it (there is already a training center in the school for the

athletes). If you were going to add classrooms to the Junior High for 6th graders, then upgrading "The Pit" at that time would make sense. I think our playing fields are in good shape at the moment (except, as someone pointed out, the stadium restrooms).

**Steve Walters - NOV 24 2017 3:02 PM**

The school system has everything it needs from an athletic facility standpoint. It is not the purpose of school system to provide expanded facilities for the community at large. If there is a problem with the OCC, go talk to the city. The primary focus of Oakwood Schools should be on excellent ACADEMICS and on sports only to the extent that it supplements a good education (which it does.)

**Eric - NOV 24 2017 8:00 AM**

Do families move to Oakwood for athletic prowess and first class athletic facilities, or do they come because of the community and good academics. If people would like additional services that are not offered at the OCC, then I might suggest finding one of the numerous facilities that are located within a few miles of the city.

**Eric - NOV 23 2017 7:36 AM**

Where will the money come from for such a facility? Do people move to Oakwood because of the athletic prowess, or because it offers our children a good academic opportunity.

**Colleen - NOV 21 2017 9:29 AM**

To a degree. Athletics can easily overshadow academic spending. I prefer money is spent on education needs. Sharing as someone who attended Centerville HS and saw the lopsided priorities.

**Peter - NOV 21 2017 8:36 AM**

I echo Harrison's comments. Well stated.

**Denice Moberg - NOV 20 2017 6:33 PM**

I see other priorities for spending money at this point.

**Becky Weaver - NOV 20 2017 12:28 PM**

No. Academic facilities should be the priority right now.

**Kate - NOV 19 2017 10:42 PM**

Yes, the Pit is embarrassingly inadequate.

**Harrison - NOV 19 2017 9:54 PM**

I find this question difficult to answer. I agree with many of the other comments, some of our facilities are embarrassing like our Mack Hummon bathrooms. And while other facilities like The Pit are not state-of-the-art their uniqueness are loved and important to our identity. Our community and our students deserve updated athletic facilities and a health and wellness center for student athletes and community access. But now we are talking about city/school collaborations. There has been talk over the years about updating and changing the Oakwood Community Center. I often support these ideas. So, I am very willing to see ideas that might help

to improve the athletics/health/and wellness services to our city. Oakwood will continue to be a desirable city because our people care and our schools and city services are strong.

**Leigh Ann Fulford - NOV 19 2017 3:41 PM**

I wish the City and Schools could work together more to share spaces in regards to recreation and athletic facilities. It would be great to have intramural sports for ALL ages (K-12), but we don't have the space to accommodate all of this. It would also be great to have a centrally located rec center (similar to Trent) that could house indoor sports with a walking track and possibly an indoor pool that could serve students and residents. HOWEVER, these expenses (maintenance and construction) should not be supported by the school district alone. Our community center is very small and cramped and does not have the space for indoor track, pool, etc. Perhaps redesigning the OCC and Shafor Park should be discussed (or moving the OCC near Lane where there is ample parking?), but I don't see the cost-effectiveness of our schools adding to or enhancing what we have. AND, moving anything down near Lane goes against the "walkability" factor, and we moved here and are staying here in our empty nest because we LOVE Oakwood's walking community.

**Cindy - NOV 18 2017 10:46 AM**

Perhaps some improvements are needed at the stadium if supported by the boosters. Nancy's idea of destroying Shafor Park is a nonstarter. The children at the north side of town need convenient access to a park.

**Christopher Morris - NOV 17 2017 6:49 PM**

Lane Stadium has been a significant upgrade for soccer, field hockey, lacrosse, and track. I recommend evaluating the cost of adding a health & wellness center (similar to Kettering Rec, although not on such a grand scale) to the Lane Complex. OCC is too limited. I am concerned about the total cost to taxpayers to build, maintain, and operate a new facility, so we'd have to be prudent.

**Dave - NOV 17 2017 10:07 AM**

No, our current facilities are perfectly fine.

**Wendy - NOV 16 2017 10:28 PM**

I would not support any funding for sports facility enhancements with tax dollars. If alumni and community members think it's important, they'll donate. The only enhancements I'd support with partial tax payer funding is OCC pool upgrades like a bubble so the swim team doesn't have to practice at ridiculous hours at UD. If people want a top of the line health and wellness center, they need to look at the OCC, not schools. Or pick any number of the fantastic gyms within 15 minutes or less of here. And they need to pay for the enhancements they want.

**Wendy - NOV 16 2017 10:28 PM**

I would not support any funding for sports facility enhancements with tax dollars. If alumni and community members think it's important, they'll donate. The only enhancements I'd support with partial tax payer funding is OCC pool upgrades like a bubble so the swim team doesn't have to practice at ridiculous hours at UD. If people want a top of the line health and wellness center, they need to look at the OCC, not schools. Or pick any number of the fantastic gyms within 15 minutes or less of here. And they need to pay for the enhancements they want.

**nancy - NOV 16 2017 9:57 AM**

Yes, we have suggested many times to completely destruct the OCC/Shafor Park and start fresh. A field house is greatly needed. It would enhance the physical fitness of all Oakwood community members as well as student athletes. We are way behind the times in this area.

**David Laatz - NOV 16 2017 9:11 AM**

Yes, enhancements and upgrades are needed for public facilities, restrooms, concessions, ADA compliance etc.....but new development of a Health & Wellness center is not necessary.

**Sarah Q - NOV 16 2017 7:56 AM**

No, I would not support any enhancements.

**Steven - NOV 15 2017 9:00 PM**

We already have Lane stadium, it is new and modern, we should make full use of it.

**Dante Connell - NOV 14 2017 6:28 PM**

I am not sure we need a new health and wellness center. I would support enhancements to our athletic facilities with private funding, not tax-payer money. There are plenty of fitness centers in the area, that are reasonably priced. I am not sure Oakwood could recoup the investment made on building something new, while also maintaining reasonable membership fees and program/activity fees.

**Stephanie - NOV 14 2017 12:01 AM**

I would support some updating but again I think we should look at private donors.

**Meredith - NOV 12 2017 2:20 PM**

Yes, we would consider doing so.

**Colleen Smith - NOV 10 2017 5:14 PM**

A health and wellness center upgrade at the OCC should only be considered if membership fees can cover the cost. I don't agree that taxes should be increased to support more facilities.

**Barbara Erbe - NOV 9 2017 7:25 AM**

The Oakwood Community is lacking gym space and an acceptable health & wellness center. I would rate this need as one of the highest needs of the community. However, this is more of a community issue verses a school issue. Our school teams have facilities that could use some improvement but they are adequate. The Pit is not a state-of-the art facility but in my opinion, it is the best gym around to watch a game. We are unique – I am willing to accept the limitations (and encourage improvements) but I am not willing to tear down all our character filled “old” schools to get a cookie-cutter new top-of-the line athletic facilities.

**Matt - NOV 6 2017 3:14 PM**

Yes. The district does not have enough basketball court space - at a minimum, West Gym needs to be updated and expanded. Updating the OCC fitness center would make the most economical sense. Bathrooms at Mack Hummon need updating.

**Kristin - NOV 4 2017 9:58 AM**

Yes

**Sharon Kelly - NOV 3 2017 12:48 PM**

I would support upgrades to Mack Hummon. Bathrooms and concessions are pitiful. Handicap access is nonexistent on the "home" side of the field. Not sure if we need a health and wellness center---unless it is a building similar to what is at Lane for the Athletic Trainers, locker rooms, etc. Fortunate that we have Lane!

## **Question 7: Would you support relocation of athletic fields and Mack Hummon stadium in order to address site constraint issues?**

**Steve - FEB 14 2018 9:59 PM**

Absolutely. I enjoy attending football games and I love the central location of Mack Hummon field, but we have a new state-of-the-art field that could be utilized for football (I think the only remaining sport at Mack Hummon). We should utilize the Old River complex and Lane Field, and utilize the large area across from OJH for temporary schooling (during renovations) or permanent expansion of OHS & OJH. In addition, the city recently purchased a tennis club, this again asks the question about the efficiency and needs being met by the OCC (which has several tennis courts). Is there a possibility of relocating excessive tennis and obsolete football facilities/activities to better meet community and educational needs?

**Alex Gusev - FEB 9 2018 10:12 AM**

This is an alternative voice to this official web cite. Please check the materials, opinions, and data on the same topics, and think for yourself: <http://oakwoodvoice.com>

**Rose - FEB 6 2018 10:05 PM**

I suppose. My children are in elementary school so I don't know much about this. I would need to understand more about the site constraint issues and the plan for relocation to fully support it.

**Jill - JAN 29 2018 6:48 PM**

No. The central location of Mack Hummon encourages the community to be part of the high school athletic program.

**Ellen - JAN 29 2018 3:15 PM**

Never! Oakwood is all about tradition. Mack Hummon field is tradition! Would you tear down Fenway Park? Never! Leave the west facing facade/press box/restrooms. You could add a new facade with new restrooms/locker rooms, on the east side of the existing Visitor side of the stadium. You could move baseball/softball to Lane Stadium. But do NOT move the beautiful Mack Hummon Stadium. Football deserves to remain there.

**Justin Shineman - JAN 25 2018 9:36 AM**

Yes. The focus should be on optimizing the learning space of the school. Having a centrally located school that students attend 180 or so days a year is more important than having a centrally located football stadium for six Fridays in the fall.

However, I would not support incorporating football at Lane Stadium. Adding a 4th fall sport to Lane would create myriad scheduling issues that were a primary reason we moved all non-football, field sports out of Mack Hummon. It would also require new turf to incorporate football boundaries and lines - way too expensive until it's time to replace the turf.

I do believe that the school's property between Far Hills and Shafor could be better utilized if Schantz were closed between Spirea and Dellwood, Mack Hummon were relocated (closer to Shafor or another location) and the baseball/softball fields were moved (possibly to Old River). For those who don't want to do anything with Mack Hummon, just wait 10 years and there won't be much of a stadium left to demolish. By the way, the grounds-keeper's "office" is an

unheated/unairconditioned space under the stadium. We should really ask him about the condition of Mack Hummon.

**Nadja - JAN 24 2018 12:11 AM**

I think the stadium and athletic field are an ideal, centrally located place to build temporary building(s) as swing space should the community undertake major renovations to its school buildings. The stadium/athletic functions are far easier to relocate temporarily outside the heart of the community than any other school function and swing space will be needed for any construction program. I am also not opposed to permanent relocation of athletic fields if its deemed necessary to 1) modernize and bring up the schools up to standard as 21st century learning environments 2) maintain Oakwood as a walking district by reusing their prime location.

**Laura Lee John - JAN 20 2018 5:44 PM**

I believe it would make more sense to keep Mack Hummon where it is and build the new High School where the baseball diamonds are currently. This would elevate some of the traffic issues by having Shafor be the main drop off for the new high school and Schantz would be the main drop off for the junior high. Also, there would not be the cost involved of demolition of the current football stadium and rebuild.

**Kirsten Halling - JAN 20 2018 5:37 PM**

No. The centrally located stadium helps keep the community connected. Moving the stadium to Old River would isolate high school events from the community, thus taking away from the charm and cohesiveness of Oakwood.

**brad - JAN 20 2018 1:15 PM**

I would not dismantle the football stadium and agree with the others here who have emphasized the importance of this space to the community and to our students. There is nothing wrong with the stadium and the walkability for all students and parents is paramount.

**Jennifer - JAN 18 2018 11:10 PM**

Yes. We have a space issue. I favor progress over charm. From what I can tell, there is little that can be done to preserve Mack Hummon. It seems to be crumbling. Let's spend money wisely.

**Amy Askins - JAN 18 2018 10:17 PM**

I would prefer to see Schantz permanently closed and space around OHS more fully utilized. Further relocation of athletic facilities makes walking difficult and would detract from the community, neighborhood feel of Oakwood.

**Lynn Behnke - JAN 18 2018 9:40 PM**

No! There is nothing like walking to a sporting event at Mack Hummon on a fall evening. Such a great community treasure. Not to mention it's rich history.

**Alex Gusev - JAN 17 2018 3:41 PM**

PLEASE think about not what we WANT, but what we can AFFORD at this time. Please think and ask the City's officials (every time during this Facility Plan discussions) by how much our tax payment will be increased for every \$10 million capital spending amount (than calculate based

on 30-50-75 million proposed). Please think if we, the residents, will be able to re-sell our approx \$300-350K on average houses with a potential \$10-12K property tax bill per year attached to it in the next 5-10 years (excl. County's increases every 3 years on top). Please think if it is better to move elsewhere and send kids to Miami Valley School in lieu of paying so much in taxes in Oakwood (the City's tax bill is steadily pushing some in this direction). Please think that with every tax increase we, the residents, will be investing less in the upkeep and remodel of our old aging houses (think about re-sale values, deterioration, maintenance neglect, etc. in light of re-sale values). Please think that this is about the buildings only, not about the quality of teaching and education, teachers' ability (know-how, creativity, knowledge) to teach, or overall quality of the materials. Please think about the City's capital investments pipeline (what kind of projects are coming next, how many, the reasons, such as rejected "Library Project" last year) and ask the City for the list with the capex costs. Again, PLEASE think what we can AFFORD and not what we WANT to do at this time in order to preserve the values of our houses assuming increased tax burden for years to come. This is not only about the EDUCATION here, but the survival of the CITY itself, community, house values, tax burdens, among other things. Thank you, Alex Gusev at alex.gusev@ipaper.com

**Brent Mackintosh - JAN 17 2018 10:41 AM**

I do not support moving a beautiful, ideal stadium like Mack Hummon. It is centrally located, has a great history and is a source of town pride. It should be painstakingly maintained and treasured.

**Cara Kite - JAN 17 2018 9:59 AM**

If it doesn't impact my tax bill, then I don't mind if you relocate Mack Hummon closer to Lane Stadium. However, this was examined several years ago and it was decided that Mack Hummon needs to stay in the "heart of Oakwood" at the current location.

Why do we keep revisiting the same topics over and over again? (Same question for the health & wellness site.) Do you want a different answer?

**Sarena Kelley - JAN 17 2018 7:30 AM**

This is a difficult question as we know we need more room in town, but I believe that relocating the athletic fields, especially to the north end of town would take away from the charm of Oakwood. I fell in love with this community when I attended my first homecoming parade leading to the OHS.

**DS - JAN 16 2018 7:21 PM**

No!!! For so many reasons. Just a few: 1) Oakwood is a small, walking community and having football, baseball and softball in the heart of the city is great for a sense of community. I have no kids on any of those teams, but I enjoy walking over to catch the games. 2) The stadium and fields are used heavily by PE classes (as well as conditioning for some of our athletes), as well as runners/walkers in the community. 3) The fields are a great green space in the center of town. 4) If the stadium and/or fields were to be razed and replaced by a k-12 campus, parking/traffic would be horrendous! 5) We were "promised" when Lane Stadium was presented to the residents that football would not leave Mack Hummon. 6) Moving football/baseball/softball to Lane would bring back the scheduling issues Lane was supposed to solve.

**Kent Miller - JAN 16 2018 5:14 PM**

Possibly. Save and reuse parts of the stadium; an example would be how Miami University handled the replacement of its stadium.

**Kent Miller - JAN 16 2018 5:12 PM**

Possibly. Save and reuse parts of the stadium.

**Alex Gusev - JAN 16 2018 1:33 PM**

No.

**Kristopher Andrew Miller - JAN 16 2018 10:45 AM**

If anything has to be demolished to make way for new construction, I'd prefer it be the stadium. It's a nice stadium, but there's not much room to grow in a land locked town like Oakwood.

**Jessica - JAN 12 2018 11:21 AM**

I don't feel strongly about this either way.

**Ralf Kircher - JAN 11 2018 9:25 PM**

No.

**Kimberly - JAN 8 2018 11:28 AM**

Yes

**Amy - JAN 6 2018 12:10 AM**

Absolutely not. Mack Hummon Stadium is a valuable part of our community and our Lumberjack tradition. It is within walking distance for most of our neighbors. Sporting events at our stadium are a unique social experience. Several of our children have graduated and moved on and we have several still in elementary, yet we still buy season tickets for sporting events and look forward to games every year. Walking to the stadium is a part of what makes our lives good here in Oakwood. Mack Hummon is a large part of the fabric that is Lumberjack Country. And while the new stadium is, well..."new", it is lacking in the emotion and ambience that gives us all "the feels" when we walk through the gates (after parking our car, because for most folks in Oakwood it is not a convenient or reasonable walking distance).

**Shelly - JAN 4 2018 11:15 AM**

Mack Hummon serves as outdoor dining for OJH/OHS in nice weather, is within walking/biking distance for most residents and allows teenagers independence to attend football games, walk over to OCC for dances after games and essential to the charm and social interaction of all residents.

**Shelly - JAN 4 2018 11:15 AM**

Mack Hummon serves as outdoor dining for OJH/OHS in nice weather, is within walking/biking distance for most residents and allows teenagers independence to attend football games, walk over to OCC for dances after games and essential to the charm and social interaction of all residents.

**Jack A. - DEC 19 2017 12:09 AM**

Mack Hummon is an important part of the community identity. If new buildings are needed as a result of this planning process, the ball fields are in play, but it would be desirable to design around the historic football field, preserving it as a PhysEd facility and a community gathering point.

**Emily - DEC 15 2017 10:47 PM**

Keeping the fields near the schools helps get students there who might be only slightly interested in going, and those events build camaraderie during a developmental time where it is imperative for people to feel that they are a part of something. I didn't think I had any special attachment to Mack Hummon, but I don't think Lane gives the same opportunities for open space to the heart of the community.

**Robyn Angel - DEC 14 2017 6:25 AM**

I don't have deep roots in this community so I have no sense of the tradition that is attached to Mack Hummon by so many. I do have an appreciation for the truly unique charm of most of town being able to walk to sporting and other community events. It makes our city a neighborhood.

**Lisa - DEC 13 2017 12:11 PM**

Mack Hummon is part of our tradition, our charm. We needed Lane Stadium badly but it has changed some of the ease of attending events. Certainly improvements could be made but moving it altogether is not favorable.

**JP - DEC 13 2017 8:38 AM**

No, don't support it. If you need to build something new, put it where the baseball fields are and move those.

**Molly - DEC 11 2017 9:26 PM**

No! Keep it next to the school, maintain its historical character. Colleges and universities are able to preserve historical structures. I don't support tearing this down. Protect the history and character of Oakwood and its charm. Its central location is appealing and encourages community participation and attendance at various events held at the stadium. The seating at Lane Stadium is set too far back from the field, and makes the spectator experience less than desirable as compared to spectating at Mack Hummon.

**Evelyn - DEC 11 2017 6:41 PM**

No

**Kelly - DEC 10 2017 5:01 PM**

Bad idea. The history of Mack Stadium is important to our community. The sports events bring the community together. There is nothing better than seeing students and parent all walking and gathering at the stadium for football games in the fall. Such great memories. It wouldn't be the same feel with a stadium on the outskirts of town.

**Daniel - DEC 9 2017 10:00 PM**

No way. Terrible idea. Mack Hummon is a great gathering place within walking distance. An off-site location would be terrible.

**Daniel - DEC 9 2017 9:59 PM**

Absolutely not. Mack Hummon stadium is beautiful and has a lot of personality and history. People are able to walk to it and many can hear the activities from there homes. Part of what makes our community unique.

**Tracy - DEC 8 2017 4:08 PM**

I do not know enough about the need to say.

**Susanne - DEC 5 2017 9:43 AM**

Absolutely not. The open space gives OJH and HS students much needed space to decompress between classes. Green spaces in the middle of a city improve the quality of life for everyone. The only place to "relocate" Mack Hummon stadium would presumably be somewhere that is not in walking distance of most residents. That would be a big loss and a big mistake. Currently, students attend games, then walk to the OCC for a dance, then walk home or to friends' houses. If we only had Lane stadium, back are the [Centerville] days where parents have to drop off and pick up for every activity. We moved to Oakwood precisely to avoid that and give our children a sense of independence.

**Ellen - DEC 4 2017 9:47 PM**

Probably not. It's hard for me to imagine that we need to relocate fields because we are unable to find solutions to our site constraints. There are so many great options for learning - we need to be more creative.

**Sam Dorf - DEC 4 2017 9:14 AM**

absolutely!

**Seth - DEC 4 2017 8:40 AM**

No. The central location is perfect for our community.

**Don O'Connor - DEC 3 2017 1:51 PM**

We love the activity and events right in the heart of the neighborhood. We already miss the sports and liveliness that have left. The football, baseball, and softball fields are the biggest public green space besides Lane which is inconvenient on the edge of town. Losing this green space and activity in the heart of the city would be a great loss. However, I see the need for upgrades to the fields and schools. Maybe consider closing Schantz to vehicle traffic between the schools and Mack Hummon. Additional seating could be added on the west side of the field. The visitor bleachers could be removed allowing more room for baseball and softball. Closing Schantz (but leaving pedestrian and bike access through) would allow more room for new school facilities (locker rooms, restrooms, weight room, additional basketball seating, etc), and create a vehicle-free plaza between the school and stadium. Let's get creative and save our open spaces.

**E F Mende - DEC 2 2017 5:23 PM**

My interpretation is that the stadium is to be relocated for the desired "Campus". Then NO! If not, what other reason to relocate the stadium ? Relocating the stadium is not going to improve the learning ability of the students and will be less convenient and accessible for the sports attendance.

**Jennifer - NOV 29 2017 9:18 PM**

This is a tough one. One of the reasons I intentionally chose Oakwood was how embedded the community is with everything going on - it's not like the burbs where you have to drive to everything. I like the idea of walking to games etc. But - I also see the need for classroom improvements. If relocating the athletic facilities is the only way to do that then I would prioritize academic space and quality over athletic field nearness. But to there posters comments - I'd be concerned with the total lack of PE space near the school.

**Pam Stephens - NOV 29 2017 3:37 PM**

Absolutely not! Lane Stadium is certainly an asset to the schools and the athletic programs, but it is too bad that it needed to be built away from the schools and the students who use it.

**Judy Payne - NOV 24 2017 3:49 PM**

Probably not. The fields are needed for physical education classes and the band during school days. Also, it is a nice open space, that is centrally located, which is available to the community for a variety of activities. The track is well used by the citizens. Having football games elsewhere would cause transportation needs for the team and the band which would be cumbersome. Right now having two stadiums is resolving space constraints. If you move all sports to the new field, we would back to not having enough room for everything.

**Steve Walters - NOV 24 2017 3:26 PM**

No! Mack Hummon stadium is a classic and important element of our schools and community. It's right in the middle of the city which makes it easy for everyone to walk to Friday night football games. Just talk sometime to parents from other schools who come here for athletic events at our stadium. They can't believe how lucky we are to have a beautiful classic stadium that is perfectly, architecturally matched to the school and is so close to the school. There is also no justification for the cost of moving the stadium.

**Eric - NOV 23 2017 7:42 AM**

I am against this option! The idea that students and families have the ability to walk to the stadium for events is part of the charm that this community offers. It is what makes Oakwood different!

**william - NOV 23 2017 7:03 AM**

Personally I have already felt a loss with the move of soccer and other sports away from the center of the community. I wish too that all events could be carried on at Mac Hummon.....new traditions are fine for those who WANT new traditions.....but communities are what they are for some very subtle and often intangible reasons.....places have a 'feel' to them.....I sadly believe that has already begun to change with the partial move to Lang.....to continue the makes 'logical sense', but as others have said there are plenty of communities that offer that.....I would like to see football remain in it's current location and would also like to see the occasional rivalry or big other game RETURN to Mac Hummon.....I would support renovation (it's needed) but keep the heart where it is.....it's there for a reason.

**Amanda Price - NOV 22 2017 9:42 AM**

Absolutely not. Mac Hummon is a wonderful part of Oakwood tradition and carries some of my fondest memories as a student at Oakwood. It was great in junior high to walk from the football

games to the community center dances and I know it made parents feel at ease because it was just a few blocks. Many kids walk and bike to events at Mac Hummon. This makes it accessible for children whose parents cannot drive them everywhere. It is also relatively safe because of the quiet side streets surrounding Mac Hummon. However if the stadium was destroyed in favor of Lane, kids could no longer walk to the OCC for the junior high dances and many parents would no longer feel comfortable letting their children walk or bike to the stadium, as Far Hills is very busy near Lane. In high school being in the student section, in such a beautiful historic stadium, was so special to me. To demolish Mac Hummon would be taking away a piece of our community that so many people hold dear in their hearts.

**Debbie M Price - NOV 22 2017 8:50 AM**

I agree with all of those in opposition. I totally oppose relocating the stadium.

**Peter - NOV 21 2017 8:41 AM**

I would oppose a relocation. Those who have already commented have made all the key points.

**Amanda - NOV 20 2017 12:51 PM**

Absolutely not. Walking to football games and sports practices is one the things that I used to "sell" my family on the idea of moving back to Oakwood. All of these questions are making us second-guess our decision to move back and raise our children there. We could move to Springboro or Bellbrook, but we chose Oakwood charm and tradition. If you destroy what makes Oakwood unique, there is no reason for people to move there. Great educations are available elsewhere, but the spirit and community feeling created by having Mack Hummon part of the walkable Oakwood community is not.

**Becky Weaver - NOV 20 2017 12:31 PM**

Yes. All sports in one location. Keep the academic campus in the heart of Oakwood.

**Carole Judge - NOV 19 2017 11:21 PM**

The stadium is the heart of the district and adds to the charm of a town where people have gathered for events (from funerals to fundraisers to games). The facade is historic, yet the stairs and seating could use a renovation. It could be enlarged to accommodate all who want to attend games, especially homecoming, but I'd hope they'd keep the brick front -- and keep it in the center of our walking community so people can walk to it!

**Kate - NOV 19 2017 10:46 PM**

There's no doubt walking to football games right in the heart of the neighborhood is a charming tradition unique to our community. That said, if it is in our students' best interest to create new traditions, I'm open to that.

**Harrison - NOV 19 2017 10:07 PM**

Yes. Ideally it would be great to keep Mack Hummon but I think the option needs to be kept on the table.

**Leigh Ann Fulford - NOV 19 2017 2:53 PM**

Logically, it makes no sense that Oakwood has two athletic fields. The expense of maintaining two facilities is a luxury that we probably can't sustain given the costs involved. Logically, if we

had to choose between Lane and Mack Hummon, Lane would be the winner because it has the capacity to host all games (soccer, field hockey, lacrosse, track, football) and has plenty of parking. HOWEVER, Lane lacks everything that is the spirit of Oakwood. Mack Hummon is in the heart of Oakwood. People walk to the games. It is a beautiful "old feel" stadium much like Wrigley Field. It is a big part of Oakwood tradition. Losing Mack Hummon would be an amputation that would disfigure what many of us have become used to and love. Yes, Oakwood could adapt to a new tradition of Friday night lights at Lane, but it will take a long time for many to adjust. This change would be VERY controversial. Even though we were told that Lane would not take away from Mack Hummon, I think most residents knew a change would probably happen. Personally, I wish we could host all games at Mack Hummon where residents and students can walk to all games and meet neighbors. Many stop to watch soccer, lacrosse, and track when on neighborhood walks. To me, the expense (both financial and health) of artificial turf doesn't justify its use in high schools. I would rather we concentrate on our academic excellence and the teachers, buildings, and technology that support our students. It's unrealistic to have the best of everything in our highly taxed (and almost maxed-out tax-wise) community.

**Cindy - NOV 18 2017 10:50 AM**

No. This stadium is a central part of Oakwood life. In the evenings you can see families and groups of teenagers walking to games. There is no need to demolish this structure.

**christopher morris - NOV 17 2017 6:57 PM**

I would strongly oppose relocation of the football stadium and the baseball/softball fields. The central location of Mack Hummon Stadium and Chuck Ely Field are an attractive, somewhat unique element of oakwood. While the parking is a bit of a hassle for visiting football teams, it is a good reason to move the fields. Much of the community supports the friday night football games and can walk to the games.

**Kathy - NOV 17 2017 6:30 PM**

No the field should stay! One of the special aspects of this community- update the restrooms!

**Dave - NOV 17 2017 10:03 AM**

No, and let's also not forget, how are you going to get all this money. Taxes are already sky high!

**Wendy - NOV 16 2017 10:38 PM**

I think it's a great idea! Move all sports to a single location so they can share concessions, locker rooms, etc. Lane Stadium can accommodate better parking for spectators and better accommodate the visiting teams, and it's still plenty close enough for a majority of the community to walk.

**David Laatz - NOV 16 2017 9:18 AM**

Absolutely not! Mack Hummon stadium is the glue of this community. Just stop and think about it. I really can't believe this question is being asked!

**Sarah Q - NOV 16 2017 7:58 AM**

I would not support relocation of the stadium. We love walking up to the stadium when it is not in use by the athletic teams.

**Lynn Hartman - NOV 15 2017 8:48 PM**

Mack Hummon Stadium is the heart of our neighborhood/schools. Our children can walk with their friends to the football games and most of us can hear excitement in the stands from our homes. I would not support relocation of the stadium.

**Dante Connell - NOV 14 2017 6:30 PM**

No. We love the central location of Mack Hummon. It is nice to have a football field in a residential neighborhood that families can walk to. The green space and fields are nice for community members and families when not in use by Oakwood athletic teams.

**Lucy - NOV 14 2017 11:32 AM**

DEFINITELY NOT!!!!!! I think this is a terrible idea. This is such a wonderful community tradition. It is wonderful to have the stadium in and amongst the community. I am opposed to the relocation of this stadium and its fields.

**Stephanie - NOV 14 2017 12:16 AM**

Absolutely NOT!! Mack Hummon was a sports legend in the Dayton area. He played professional football for the Dayton Triangles in addition to playing pro basketball and pro baseball in Dayton. The NFL BEGAN with a game between the Dayton Triangles and Columbus Panhandles. Mack Hummon was an Oakwood High School administrator and coach from 1925 to 1965 while coaching football, basketball and tennis. His helmet and jersey are in the Pro Football Hall of Fame in Canton, and the Oakwood High School stadium has been named "Mack Hummon Stadium" in his honor. We should not relocate Mack Hummon stadium.

**Meredith - NOV 12 2017 2:32 PM**

The central location of Mack Hummon certainly is a benefit and unique to this community. However lots of other sports are now played at Lane Stadium. The surprise tax money used for Lane, should not have happened. If the BOE wants our support they must be transparent and stick to their agreements.

**Laura Lee John - NOV 10 2017 9:40 PM**

No, I would not support the relocation of Mack Hummon stadium although it is in need of some updates and a turf field would be nice!

**Colleen Smith - NOV 10 2017 5:23 PM**

NO, the community is what it is because of its size. We moved here to be part of a community and we all pay dearly in taxes for this benefit. Moving the stadium eliminates the spirit of football games and community events. Not only would you destroy the charm of this community but people couldn't afford to live here due to the ever increasing taxes! Stop looking for ways to spend more money and raise taxes.

**Barbara Eerbe - NOV 9 2017 7:27 AM**

Absolutely not. I find this question infuriating. Less than two years ago the current school administration made two promises while Lane Stadium was being considered. 1. No tax dollars would be used to build Lane Stadium 2. Mack Hummon stadium/football would not move to the new location. I did not approve of the construction of Lane Stadium but didn't speak up due to these two key promises. This first promise was broken in 2016 when the administration

recommended and the Bard approved, at the last minute, \$350,000 of tax dollars for the stadium construction. Now, the administration is considering breaking their second promise. Moving the football games to Lane Stadium would completely change the environment; it would be an event attended by students and those who have a child participating in football/band/cheer. Friday night football is special as it brings the community together. It is one of many things that makes this community unique. I also believe that having baseball games in the Ely field, in the heart of the town, is ideal. As a parent of a baseball player, I see how many walkers, with no connection to the team, stop by and watch a few innings. Current parents and students, community members whose children are grown, recent alums, five year-olds who dream of playing on the team one day - all together cheer on the Jacks. Oakwood might not have state-of-the-art athletic facilities but they are one of a kind and they create a sense of community like no other town around!

**Tami - NOV 6 2017 3:18 PM**

I'm going to repeat myself. Please keep the things that make this community so special in the forefront. Walking to and from our homes to watch football at the stadium is an important ritual in this town. We meet and greet friends and neighbors and our kids walk with their buddies. The community comes alive on football nights. Again, never lose sight of how important it is that our kids can walk safely to just about anywhere. Because of that, our kids have the opportunity to be very independent at a very early age.

**Matt - NOV 6 2017 3:17 PM**

No.

**Kristin - NOV 4 2017 8:20 AM**

No. Having Lane Stadium in the heart of our community fosters the community itself for a host of reasons, including by enabling face to face interactions among community members as we walk to events vs all being in cars.

**Sharon Kelly - NOV 3 2017 12:51 PM**

No. When Lane Stadium was built the community made it quite clear that the community did not want football moved down to Old River. Community members (as well as students) use the stadium for walking and PE classes.

**John Hadley - NOV 3 2017 10:28 AM**

No. It would not serve the purposes of unity of the community that is Oakwood beyond the schools. The stadium is a part of city of Oakwood not just the school.

**Question 2: Would you support separate primary and intermediate school buildings?**

**Marti S - FEB 12 2018 5:13 PM**

I agree with most that keeping Oakwood a 'walkable school district' is important and what makes our town unique and desirable. Every effort should be made to keep it that way and it should be a last resort to change Oakwood to a 'school bus district'.

**Alex Gusev - FEB 9 2018 10:12 AM**

This is an alternative voice to this official web cite. Please check the materials, opinions, and data on the same topics, and think for yourself: <http://oakwoodvoice.com>

**Rose - FEB 6 2018 10:14 PM**

Yes. I think primary and intermediate grades benefit from being with teachers who can focus on their specific needs and from being with students at their developmental level. For example, the school libraries could curate better collections. Currently the libraries have many books that are inappropriate for about half the kids in the school, either because the books are too mature or too young. Teachers could more easily plan special events, such as speakers, that would appeal to the age group. I can only imagine that it is currently very hard to bring in speakers/events that appeal to grades 1-6. I also think it would help erode the "Harman kid" "Smith kid" division that I see in Oakwood, even with my kids only being in 2nd grade. I am not from this community originally, so I see no reason to continue separate schools as a "tradition" when this "tradition" seems to create a divide. In regards to walkability, kids would still be able to walk easily during half of their elementary years or they could just walk/bike a bit further for half of the years. A mile or two is still walkable, if you're bent on doing that. So yes, I support the separate of primary and intermediate grades for educational and social reasons.

**ellen - JAN 29 2018 3:26 PM**

NO! Please leave the 2 primary schools and the 1 junior high. This is a walking community. Don not make kids on Corona walk to Harman and vice versa! This is ludicrous. Please leave the campuses as they are. Work within the existing footprint. We are not growing in population or enrollment!! You know this!

**Sarah - JAN 29 2018 1:32 PM**

Being a walking to school community is one of the big reasons we moved to Oakwood. Having primary and intermediate schools separate would impact that dramatically. Also, as kids get older it is good to have a new "group" of kids to meet. Although, many of the kids from both schools already know each other through sports, DI, etc. - it is still good for them to have some new faces and friend potential when then start in the teen years.

**Jen Messaros - JAN 26 2018 10:53 AM**

No. Many people have brought up transportation as an issue, and I agree with them. Keeping all the first graders in one building isn't a priority for me. Continuity is, though. I have a child who has dealt poorly with transitions. Going from elementary school to junior high was difficult. Having children transition again and again is an unnecessary stress.

**Justin Shineman - JAN 25 2018 8:11 AM**

Yes, I would support this concept, primarily because it would give the district the opportunity to tailor the facilities to the different learning modalities for those age groups. Transportation becomes the bigger issue, depending on where the schools are located. Having K-5, and even 6-8 to a certain extent, centrally located in Oakwood facilitates 'walkers'. More HS students drive, and can reasonably be expected to walk farther to school than the elementary students, so physical location is less of an issue.

**Nadja - JAN 23 2018 11:07 PM**

Yes, I would as long as kids K-5 can continue to walk to school. If that can be achieved, I would have no problem having separate primary and intermediate schools. I think its important to the quality of life in Oakwood to maintain "neighborhood" schools and not have parents/buses driving kids across the city.

**Kirsten Halling - JAN 20 2018 5:32 PM**

Separate schools for 1-3 and 4-6 is a very interesting idea. It would provide for a more specialized educational environment. However, I agree with other comments about transportation. Oakwood should remain a walking district.

**Lynn Behnke - JAN 18 2018 9:47 PM**

No. Although the idea is interesting, I feel that the negatives far outweigh the benefits. Many families strategically try to purchase their home near a specific school as we are a walking district. It just does not seem logical to change to a primary/intermediate school profile. I think the traffic alone would be a logistical nightmare.

**Amy Askins - JAN 18 2018 9:09 PM**

No, because it would make walking to school much less of a viable option for many. One of my favorite aspects of Oakwood living is that our kids can get themselves to and from so many activities. It teaches them responsibility and independence, is good exercise, and makes our busy lives much easier. I would hate to see a large increase in idling cars along our beautiful city streets every day at dismissal because of increased distances from school and older and younger siblings spread out to various locations. Generally speaking I believe Oakwood students are well prepared for college not because of their physical surroundings but because of the high value the community places on education. We must be fiscally responsible regarding our aging school buildings while not losing focus on what factors most significantly affect our children's education and development.

**Alex Gusev - JAN 17 2018 11:24 AM**

PLEASE think about not what we WANT, but what we can AFFORD at this time. Please think and ask the City's officials (every time during this Facility Plan discussions) by how much our tax payment will be increased for every \$10 million capital spending amount (than calculate based on 30-50-75 million proposed). Please think if we, the residents, will be able to re-sell our approx \$300-350K on average houses with a potential \$10-12K property tax bill per year attached to it in the next 5-10 years (excl. County's increases every 3 years on top). Please think if it is better to move elsewhere and send kids to Miami Valley School in lieu of paying so much in taxes in Oakwood (the City's tax bill is steadily pushing some in this direction). Please think that with every tax increase we, the residents, will be investing less in the upkeep and remodel of our old aging houses (think about re-sale values, deterioration, maintenance neglect, etc. in

light of re-sale values). Please think that this is about the buildings only, not about the quality of teaching and education, teachers' ability (know-how, creativity, knowledge) to teach, or overall quality of the materials. Please think about the City's capital investments pipeline (what kind of projects are coming next, how many, the reasons, such as rejected "Library Project" last year) and ask the City for the list with the capex costs. Again, PLEASE think what we can AFFORD and not what we WANT to do at this time in order to preserve the values of our houses assuming increased tax burden for years to come. This is not only about the EDUCATION here, but the survival of the CITY itself, community, house values, tax burdens, among other things. Thank you, Alex Gusev at alex.gusev@ipaper.com

**Alex Gusev - JAN 17 2018 10:41 AM**

NO, I do not support this idea.

**Brent Mackintosh - JAN 17 2018 10:20 AM**

No, I believe the current set up is quite suitable. K-6 or 1-6 has served well over the years.

**Cara Kite - JAN 17 2018 9:51 AM**

Yes, I would support separate primary and intermediate school buildings IF transportation was resolved. For example, a kid on Volusia can't be expected to walk to Smith and a kid on East shouldn't be walking to Harman.

I think there would be a benefit to having all first graders in one building, and all fifth graders in one building. I always wonder how much difference there is between Smith and Harman and the synergies that could be gained by being in one location.

Anyways, I support it either way IF transportation is resolved.

**Sarena Kelley - JAN 17 2018 7:34 AM**

With the increasing numbers of students, I believe it would be beneficial to split up age groups especially at the middle school level. This would open up room at both Harman and Smith. I believe the biggest issue is not Harman and Smith however when looking at the master plan, but the Oakwood JH and HS. This building needs extensive preservation and interior renovations. It may be worth considering building a new HS at a different location, (if only we had buildable land next door that wasn't the stadium), and then turn the newly renovated HS/JHS into a collective 5-12 building, or 6-12.

**DS - JAN 16 2018 7:42 PM**

No! I like the current setup. Assuming this refers to having Smith be 1-3 and Harman 4-6, or vice versa... Splitting primary and intermediate would mess with the walkability of our community. I love that, over 15 years so far, I have never driven my kids to school. We have always walked or biked. I don't know if that would have been possible had I needed to get young kids to 2 separate buildings. We even have kindergarten transportation from the "homeschools" that supports children/families walking to school. Traffic around the buildings would worsen as driving kids to school may become a necessity for families that can currently walk to a single building. I know a number of "intermediate" grade students that walk their younger siblings/neighbors to/from school. Our family also loves the open lunch concept. Surely, that

would also be difficult to maintain if the elementary age students of a family are attending different buildings.

**Kent Miller - JAN 16 2018 5:22 PM**

Yes, using the current buildings as a basis for this change with an additional facility if needed.

**Kristopher Andrew Miller - JAN 16 2018 10:39 AM**

I would support the existence of a separate middle School. As someone who went to Oakwood schools from k-12, I can say from experience that I don't care for the 1-6 elementary, 7-12 Jr/Sr High model. As 5th and 6th graders, we were regularly collectively scolded for intimidating the younger children. As a 7th and 8th grader, sharing a building with the highschool was like being a minnow in a shark tank. As a high school student, sharing the building with the junior high wasn't much fun either; having to share space with immature children at their most obnoxious age. Being stuck in the same building for such a long time also made the whole educational experience seem futile, like you never advanced.

**Jessica - JAN 12 2018 11:12 AM**

Yes. Seems weird that 7th graders mix with seniors, and nobody has room to eat lunch.

**Ralf Kircher - JAN 11 2018 9:06 PM**

No. While it's not ideal for 7th and 8th graders to be mixed with older kids, there are some benefits that come from it as well. Speaking from experience, you wind up growing up a lot that 7th -grade year, and a lot of that comes from being immersed with older kids, most of whom are surprisingly good role models for the younger kids.

**Kimberly - JAN 8 2018 11:12 AM**

Yes...I love this idea.

**Amy Korab - JAN 5 2018 10:35 AM**

I LOVE our current set up. The ONLY reason we live in Oakwood is for the schools. I love the TEACHERS, the ARCHITECTURE of each building, the walkability of the schools. That being said, while I like the convenience of two elementary schools, 1-6, I sometimes feel that it would make better sense to make one of the elementary schools 1-4 and the other one 5-8 or some similar configuration rather than splitting the kids after kindergarten and rejoining them in 7th grade. Removing grades 7-8 from the high school also frees up space to modify/spread out/reappoint classrooms and facilities to better serve the students without demolishing the beautiful and unique buildings we currently have.

**Shelly D - JAN 4 2018 10:58 AM**

I support the current setup with 6th graders being at the elementary school. There is a marked difference in maturity between 6th and 7th grade. Part of Oakwood's charm is a child's ability to get to school by their own steam. Our 6th grader became confident this year to walk by herself to Smith (1/2 mile) but would not be confident enough to ride to Jr. High building at this age. Older kids are intimidating, by no fault of their own.

**Shelly D - JAN 4 2018 10:58 AM**

I support the current setup with 6th graders being at the elementary school. There is a marked difference in maturity between 6th and 7th grade. Part of Oakwood's charm is a child's ability to get to school by their own steam. Our 6th grader became confident this year to walk by herself to Smith (1/2 mile) but would not be confident enough to ride to Jr. High building at this age. Older kids are intimidating, by no fault of their own.

**Elizabeth - DEC 30 2017 11:45 PM**

Yes. Kids at these ages don't need to be integrated with older kids.

**Kathryn - DEC 19 2017 9:18 AM**

Not really. It all comes down to walkability. Walking from 1-3 is good, but if that goes away in 4-6, what good does that do? Lunches will have to be completely re imagined because the only way the cafeterias work now is because of open lunch. My child will not have time to go home to eat if they have to get to the other side of the city for school. Or this adds even more traffic to the roads by the schools at lunch, which is also not great.

**Jack A. - DEC 18 2017 10:42 PM**

I definitely support and emphasize the walking to school concept. It was a strong selling point for my family in moving to Oakwood. Fifth and sixth graders should be able to handle a slightly longer way to school by using a bicycle, gradually increasing their independence. It is allowed beginning at third grade now.

If room needs to be created at the elementary schools and such room is not available at the current site, a central intermediate School is a valid option. I would NOT support designating one of the current Elementary Schools an Intermediate School and only having one Elementary School for the entire District.

**Robyn - DEC 14 2017 2:03 PM**

I would support this if it would take some space pressure off of the elementary schools. But remaining a walking district is paramount to building independence and autonomy in our young citizens.

**Lisa - DEC 13 2017 3:47 PM**

I think we should maintain the two elementaries and keep grades 7 and 8 as they are now. There is a big change in mindset and maturity with jr. high children and I think our 6th graders do well as leaders of our elementary schools. Let's keep them age appropriate as long as we can.

**Lisa - DEC 13 2017 12:01 PM**

I love our current setup. I love the multi-ages in the elementaries for programs like GRIT/HARMANIZE, and class buddies. I like the feel of the neighborhood schools and the ability for students to walk. Oakwood Schools are unique in many ways and the neighborhood elementaries are a special feature of this unique place.

**JP - DEC 13 2017 8:40 AM**

No

**Megan Gilbert - DEC 12 2017 2:07 PM**

No, the current arrangement allows for most students to walk, which is great for health and building communities, not to mention better for the environment!

**Mychaelyn - DEC 12 2017 9:28 AM**

There is so much emphasis and pride in Oakwood of being a walking community. It is important to me that my children be able to walk to school every morning. Walking to school is a time for reflection, a time to clear your head and prepare your mind and body for the activities of the day. I do not wish to participate in a hurry to rush to catch a bus or drive to a school jockeying for position in a drop off-line. If you separate the primary and intermediate schools how would it be possible for Oakwood students to still be able to walk to their neighborhood school?

**Molly - DEC 11 2017 9:44 PM**

I do not support a separate primary and intermediate school if that means only 1 primary and 1 intermediate school building for the district. I can't imagine where the primary school would be set up to provide walking distance to all students.

**evelyn - DEC 11 2017 6:49 PM**

yes

**Kelly - DEC 10 2017 5:26 PM**

I question the need for this. Will any increased efficiencies be offset by the cost of providing transportation? Parents would have to drive back and forth OR the school district would have to provide transportation. Very costly. I like the idea of having two elementary schools so children have a small grade size and can walk home at lunchtime.

**Daniel - DEC 9 2017 9:53 PM**

No, leave the schools as they are.

**Seth - DEC 4 2017 8:46 AM**

In the absence of compelling evidence to change the status quo, I support the current and historic arrangement of two separate elementary schools and one combined OJHS and OHS building.

**Don O'Connor - DEC 3 2017 11:25 AM**

Not if this meant one district-wide primary school and one district-wide intermediate school. I think keeping separate neighborhood schools for the younger kids is important. And this would hurt the walkability of our community, which is one of Oakwood's most important assets. No other community in the Dayton region comes close to the walkability of Oakwood. That is one of the main reasons we are in Oakwood and not a newer suburb. We want our kids to walk to school with their friends, not get dropped off at a school "factory" on the outskirts of town.

**E F Mende - DEC 2 2017 6:04 PM**

How does this question differ from 6-7 Intermediate School and 7-8 Junior High ? If different. what is the rationale ? Without a compelling explanation the answer is No. Same arguments apply: Lack of land/space, why tear down existing buildings and replace with less desirable architectural design, how does this improve student learning, etc.

Jennifer - NOV 29 2017 9:19 PM

Possibly. If you could get preschool and kindergarten included and then they move to a new school for intermediate grades that might be less disruptive.

Pam Stephens - NOV 29 2017 3:39 PM

No! What we have now seems to be working well, and continues to preserve not only traditions but excellence in learning.

Judy Payne - NOV 24 2017 3:24 PM

Probably not. I assume you would use our current buildings, and this would require busing which is expensive and cumbersome. I think a major advantage of our Oakwood schools is that no busing is required because of easy access to the schools.

Steve Walters - NOV 24 2017 3:06 PM

NO. We have the kind of arrangement of primary and secondary schools and community involvement that other cities would kill for. There is no reason to change or even consider changing. The people asking these questions don't appear to understand the Oakwood community.

Bill Sherk - NOV 24 2017 12:01 PM

Absolutely not. First, we will hear that it makes some economic sense to build new versus repair. Yes there are subsidies on the construction of new facilities versus renovations but the analysis will not be an apple to apples comparison on structural components that presently reflect the beauty and charm of the present facilities. The charm of a new facility will be minimal. Most of the new buildings funded by the government look like psuedo prisons (Lebanon, Brookville, Eaton as examples). It is correct that one cannot build new Tudor buildings. Yes the HVAC system needs repair but previously there was no a/c in classrooms and we survived.

Second, you will hear that this will help student scores and achievement. This may be the biggest fallacy of the argument. If you look at the top schools in Ohio and compare their facilities to say, Stebbin's beautiful new school/prison, you will note that there is no empirical evidence that newer schools improve test scores.

Third, this is a walking community and it may be unfair to families that are on the edges of the community. Has anyone considered the potential real estate value reduction to homes on the periphery boundaries.

Fourth, my brothers and sister "endured" the social hardship of going to Smith versus Harman. So did our sons. The social impact is noting less than a ruse.

Finally, we donated to the funding of the new stadium. It was based on the commitment that Mack Hummon Stadium would remain....just putting this on the record.

Eric - NOV 23 2017 7:19 AM

Why push change for the sake of change. The charm of Oakwood and the draw for many families with younger children is the walkability, community feel that the current set-up allows.

william - NOV 23 2017 6:43 AM

no, would not support

**Debbie M Price - NOV 22 2017 8:53 AM**

Our daughter attended Harman. We walked every day. I love that school and the community within and around it. It's also a marvelous building full of wonderful teachers and staff. I know the parents of Smith feel the same. Having neighborhood elementaries is extremely important -- and if you move, teardown, consolidate these schools, you destroy what is best about Oakwood.

**Colleen - NOV 21 2017 9:23 AM**

Agree with other comments, we like walking to school and the history of Smith and Harman.

**Peter - NOV 21 2017 8:20 AM**

I prefer the current set up.

**Amanda - NOV 21 2017 8:06 AM**

Mike Ruetschle, what about walkability? Many of the proposals I've seen in these questions eliminates some of the things that make Oakwood special, like the ability to walk to school as a family, a child being able to come home for lunch, or children going to practices at MacHummon instead of having their parents drive them to Lane. We were moving back for these things. As I mentioned in one of my other comments... we can get an excellent education elsewhere, in a community with lower property taxes, and we would be living in a newer, larger home with less maintenance. We are moving back to Oakwood in January for the unique experience Oakwood provides. We were coming to look at homes next week, and we have a specific home that we were planning to make an offer on, but we've changed our minds now. Because of what I see here we will probably rent and see how this all plays out... we will not invest in Oakwood during the period of instability and unfortunate change in direction I see indicated by your questions.

**Leigh Ann Fulford - NOV 20 2017 7:16 PM**

Yes I support this idea for the reasons I gave in other responses to questions.

**Denice Moberg - NOV 20 2017 6:19 PM**

Absolutely! I have long believed that this is the way to provide the best services for our children.

**Becky Weaver - NOV 20 2017 12:45 PM**

No. I support two neighborhood K-5 elementary schools.

**Amanda - NOV 20 2017 12:37 PM**

No. Combining Smith and Harman eliminates walkability for a significant number of elementary students. Walkability is one of the charms of the Oakwood experience. Also, the school we are moving from is a giant elementary school with 8 classes, and we feel it is harder to maintain and build young friendships when there are 6-8 classes for each grade level. Chances are less that your child's friends will be in their class each year, and because the grade levels are so large they cannot even be on the playground for recess at the same time. Bigger is not better.

**Tricia - NOV 20 2017 12:27 PM**

No. I like having 2 elementary schools with a separate Junior High. Walking to school is a great asset.

**Becky Weaver - NOV 20 2017 12:23 PM**

No. I would support keeping two K-5 neighborhood schools.

**Kate - NOV 19 2017 10:31 PM**

Yes, open to this idea if there is a compelling reason for it.

**Harrison - NOV 19 2017 9:21 PM**

Yes

**Cindy - NOV 18 2017 10:26 AM**

No.

**Christopher Morris - NOV 17 2017 6:32 PM**

No, I do not support separate primary and intermediate school buildings. I strongly prefer keeping two elementary schools and the junior high separate. Oakwood grade schools are wonderful - especially the ability to walk to school for 80%-90% of the kids.

**Dave - NOV 17 2017 10:05 AM**

No.

**Wendy - NOV 16 2017 10:45 PM**

I think this is an interesting idea! If love to get more details before I could decide for sure, but as long as we used existing buildings, I'm open to this change.

**Linda - NOV 16 2017 6:07 PM**

No, I will not support this. We have had wonderful success with our education system in Oakwood.

**Sarah Q - NOV 16 2017 7:51 AM**

I would not support this. I like that my child is in preschool and smith and has a "buddy" which is an older kid that comes into the class to help. They have mentors and are able to look up to the big kids. When you have multiple kids this would be challenging for the parent to get your children to school and not allow the students to walk together as a family.

**Mike Ruetschle - NOV 15 2017 10:30 PM**

Some other points to consider, hopefully adding more context to the conversation and prompting additional dialogue. Lets say there are 3 sections of 5th grade at Harman, and 4 sections of 5th grade at Smith. In a PK-2, and 3-5 building, all 7 sections of 5th graders would be in one building. This would facilitate greater teacher collaboration across each grade level. Fluctuation in grade sizes, and the disruption this places on teachers having to often change what grade they teach each year, would be lessened by being able to distribute the student numbers more evenly across more sections in the same building. Sometimes our District only needs 1/2 a teacher to accommodate an influx of unexpected new students, but is forced to hire an additional full time teacher to cover these enrollment swings. Having a greater pool of 5th grade students across the learning spectrum in one school (more top level kids, more average kids, and more special needs) would allow greater focus of resources towards all students. Socially, the "Harman" and "Smith" kids feel a very real distinction that lasts through 12th grade,

and actually their whole life. Is this a good thing socially? Is this artificial? Or conversely, in a PK-2 and 3-5 all students would go to Harman and Smith. A larger student pool would also provide greater diversity and more likelihood that each student would find there place among a larger group of friends to choose from. Special Ed could also be at both buildings instead of only at Smith.

**Dante Connell - NOV 14 2017 6:15 PM**

No. I think there is a benefit for students in the upper elementary school grades to mentor the younger students in the building. The younger students look up to the older students and look forward to special programs and traditions that are grade-based. One of our children served a math tutor last year and it was very positive experience. The Harmanize program provides a diverse group of students with all grades represented.

**Lucy - NOV 14 2017 11:28 AM**

I do not support separate buildings. I love there being a mix of ages at the elementary level. I also think it allows students and teachers to collaborate together across grade levels. I think it makes it difficult for parents to have their children at different buildings and possible farther away than there neighborhood schools.

**Stephanie - NOV 13 2017 11:51 PM**

I do not support separate buildings. We moved back here because we loved the group dynamics of the schools. The grade configurations work great!! No reason to change it!

**Meredith - NOV 12 2017 1:59 PM**

If it keeps the grade levels together throughout their entire school career, then we would consider supporting the idea.

**Laura Lee John - NOV 10 2017 9:23 PM**

Yes, I believe it would be best to have 1st - 5th in one building/ 6th-8th in a second building/ 9th-12th in a third building

**Colleen Smith - NOV 10 2017 5:48 PM**

I don't support separate buildings. To do this would be a major project to build new schools and move athletic fields. Keep Oakwood schools the way they are!

**Barbara Erbe - NOV 9 2017 7:21 AM**

No. I strongly believe that elementary grades should be located close to home to encourage a walking environment. I also think that there are benefits of having siblings in the same school building (benefits for them and their parents).

**Tami - NOV 6 2017 3:00 PM**

No, our neighborhood schools are a big reason why Oakwood is such a desirable place to live and raise a family. Kids being able to walk or ride their bikes to and from school and come home for lunch is one reason that makes Oakwood so special,

**Kristin - NOV 4 2017 9:57 AM**

Yes

**Sharon Kelly - NOV 3 2017 1:00 PM**

No, I do not support separate primary and intermediate buildings. From a parent perspective, it would be difficult to potentially have children at multiple buildings (more so than now). I am not sure what the district would gain by separating out the students.

**Question 8: Would you support partial or full demolition of our existing school building(s) in order to develop new facilities that support current best practices in education?**

Kirsten Halling - JAN 20 2018 5:55 PM

I would not support demolishing our existing school buildings. Update them, get them up to code, fix the roofs, maybe even add some space, where possible - but preserve Oakwood history.

Kirsten Halling - JAN 20 2018 5:43 PM

I am against destroying these "old" buildings. I teach French and take students to buildings that are 850 years old. Relatively speaking, we have a treasure - a piece of history - in Oakwood, a treasure that can be updated - just as the French must update their patrimony. Fix the roof, change the HVAC systems, add on where you can - but find creative ways to keep Oakwood's history intact while preparing for the future needs of our students.

Brad - JAN 20 2018 1:59 PM

I do not support full demolition, and the analysis presented at the last meeting supported renovation (not new structures). I'm not as concerned with meeting what the state outlines as "recommended" size of rooms or cafeteria sizes. Our schools' quality relies on parents, teachers, and our culture and much less so on the facilities themselves. I want to hear more about what we can afford and then get about prioritizing what is truly needed vs. desired.

Jennifer - JAN 18 2018 11:03 PM

I am open to ideas. I absolutely share the concerns of the majority that the architectural beauty be preserved, but something needs to be done. I certainly do not want to keep spending our money on expensive "bandaids". It is getting too costly with little return.

Amy Askins - JAN 18 2018 10:30 PM

I am surprised by the strong reactions of so many to this idea. I appreciate the high cost of maintaining old facilities and believe that sometimes it is best to start over. I don't know if that is the case here-I get the sense that the report/analysis are meant to lead the community down the path of building new structures but I question some assumptions made and suspect bias on the part of the report creators. Further, the replacement costs noted in the report only reflect similarly sized schools (stated at Tuesday's meeting) and it certainly sounds like the Board/decision makers think larger facilities are ideal based on the analysis of classroom sizes - hence, higher than quoted replacement costs are very likely. I do believe that it is possible in theory to build new attractive buildings which would still look nice and perhaps make financial sense in the long term. I would possibly support the partial demolition if it makes financial sense. Generally speaking I believe Oakwood students are well prepared for college not because of their physical surroundings but because of the high value the community places on education. We must be fiscally responsible regarding our aging school buildings while not losing focus on what factors most significantly affect our children's education and development.

**Lynn Behnke - JAN 18 2018 10:05 PM**

Support additions only. No full demolitions or even partial demolitions of our lovely historic buildings.

**Alex Gusev - JAN 17 2018 11:23 AM**

PLEASE think about not what we WANT, but what we can AFFORD at this time. Please think and ask the City's officials (every time during this Facility Plan discussions) by how much our tax payment will be increased for every \$10 million capital spending amount (than calculate based on 30-50-75 million proposed). Please think if we, the residents, will be able to re-sell our approx \$300-350K on average houses with a potential \$10-12K property tax bill per year attached to it in the next 5-10 years (excl. County's increases every 3 years on top). Please think if it is better to move elsewhere and send kids to Miami Valley School in lieu of paying so much in taxes in Oakwood (the City's tax bill is steadily pushing some in this direction). Please think that with every tax increase we, the residents, will be investing less in the upkeep and remodel of our old aging houses (think about re-sale values, deterioration, maintenance neglect, etc. in light of re-sale values). Please think that this is about the buildings only, not about the quality of teaching and education, teachers' ability (know-how, creativity, knowledge) to teach, or overall quality of the materials. Please think about the City's capital investments pipeline (what kind of projects are coming next, how many, the reasons, such as rejected "Library Project" last year) and ask the City for the list with the capex costs. Again, PLEASE think what we can AFFORD and not what we WANT to do at this time in order to preserve the values of our houses assuming increased tax burden for years to come. This is not only about the EDUCATION here, but the survival of the CITY itself, community, house values, tax burdens, among other things. Thank you, Alex Gusev at alex.gusev@ipaper.com

**Brent Mackintosh - JAN 17 2018 11:05 AM**

I passionately support renovation, despite the tax costs. Tearing down these historic buildings for newer, modern, roomier, and even well built replacements, destroys our architectural history and heritage. I also reject the assertion that timeless, beloved buildings in some way hinder educational excellence. There are many examples of amazing educational institutions which are in much older buildings. Phillips Academy in Andover, MA is still using a building dated in 1819, Harrow School UK is still using a building built in 1615, and most of their building were built in the mid 19th century. Oxford University's oldest building is 1000 years, though most of their buildings were built during Victorian times. These institutions cherish their architectural history and still provide an excellent educational experience. Tax dollars preserving our history would be very well spent.

**Cara Kite - JAN 17 2018 10:00 AM**

I do NOT support full demolition of our existing school buildings. I MAY support partial demolition of our existing school buildings depending on the value proposition and most importantly, the cost to taxpayers.

**Sarena Kelley - JAN 17 2018 7:26 AM**

As we all understand, old buildings need a massive amount of maintenance, and our cost of maintaining the schools is relatively high. They need extensive upgrades/renovations in order to be preserved and usable for future generations. This poses the issue that more and more funds are going to bandaging the buildings instead of towards our children's education. That being

said, I believe that it is crucial that we do not demolish our old buildings and any new constructions or renovations should be within certain parameters maintaining not only the same Architectural style, but building processes to create a seamless juxtaposition of the old building and new interior. Oakwood would lose its historic charm if the buildings were to change dramatically, and I would propose increasing property taxes to fund both the preservation of the buildings and give our students a world class learning environment if funding is the issue in maintaining the buildings. This could be done with a Levy similar to with the Library. However, why the Levy failed is due to the lack of thought and design that went into the building. It did not flow with the current architecture, and needed more planning and execution on behalf of the community.

**DS - JAN 16 2018 8:18 PM**

I would not support demolition of our existing buildings. I understand that new construction estimates include an "Oakwood factor" to give new buildings old Oakwood charm. That just wouldn't compare to the old buildings! Just look at the "McMansions" that go up in new neighborhoods all over. They may try to get that old, established feel, but they never quite pull it off. And they don't usually stand the test of time. New buildings don't always mean better or less maintenance. As far as the "current best practices" go, I was unsettled by all the talk of glass-walled classrooms, modular spaces, etc. These seem like trends to me that will become outdated/unnecessary in short time. Oakwood students don't need fancy new furniture and excessive room to do what they are already doing. Kids and teachers find a way to break into groups. Yes, hallways may be used sometimes, but my kids have fond memories of small groups in the halls (and I worked as a volunteer with kids, where they did makeup work or read to me in the halls). It is what it is, and what it is works great! New buildings won't make Oakwood schools excel nationally. They already do!!

**Kent Miller - JAN 16 2018 5:09 PM**

Absolutely not! Part of the character of our community are our beautiful historic school buildings. They are part of our students' aesthetic education.

**Alex Gusev - JAN 16 2018 1:46 PM**

Absolutely NO. Who asked/created this question originally? Are we, as a City, that desperate to cut costs and exercise belt tightening already at this point in time?

**Kristopher Andrew Miller - JAN 16 2018 10:22 AM**

To even consider demolition of Oakwood's historic school buildings is beyond the pale, and seriously calls into question the fitness of the school board and the superintendent. Those buildings are the pillars of our community; strong in character and built to last. New construction just can't match the durability of the old buildings, and a new building will likely be demolished and rebuild in another 30 years. Oakwood's students are bright enough to know that a shiny new building won't give them any better of an education.

**Jim - JAN 15 2018 5:37 PM**

I support renovating only!

**Jim - JAN 15 2018 5:37 PM**

I support renovating only!

**Lauren (Kugel) Edgell - JAN 12 2018 6:33 PM**

Absolutely not!

**Lena White - JAN 12 2018 6:16 PM**

I would NOT support demolition or partial demolition of the existing buildings.

**jessica - JAN 12 2018 5:07 PM**

Absolutely not. Renovations - YES. Partial or full demolition - NO. We can achieve best practices without demolishing buildings. True - classrooms may be a few square feet smaller than "current recommendations" - but this isn't hindering learning.

**Phyllis Bergiel - JAN 11 2018 9:25 PM**

The school buildings were one of the reasons we moved to Oakwood. A community that understand the new, shiny thing is not always better. (New school design is almost always prison-like.) New schools would NOT be in keeping with Oakwood values where we are stewards of these wonderful old houses, from mansion to cottage- and library to schools. People move back to Oakwood for generations because the infrastructure is stable and memorable.

**Ralf Kircher - JAN 11 2018 9:22 PM**

No. I can't imagine anything more harmful to Oakwood as a community.

**Lesley - JAN 11 2018 9:48 AM**

No. I can't believe this is even on the table.

**Brett - JAN 11 2018 9:13 AM**

I thought this was a joke when I first heard about it. Tearing down Oakwood's historical school buildings would have a permanent devastating effect on the attractiveness of the community. People love Oakwood, and move and bring their tax dollars to Oakwood, because its beautiful, historic and unique. Destroying Oakwood's historic buildings will substantially harm its attractiveness and lead to a decline in property values. Tearing down the schools is a terrible idea, and the justification is VERY misleading. So it will take \$80M to renovate but only \$71M to build new schools? Hmmm, interesting, will the new buildings not need maintenance? How much will that cost? Anyone who has built a house or done a remodel knows that "new" doesn't mean maintenance free. In fact, sometimes its even more expensive. So the ultimate result of this plan could be the destruction of Oakwood's historical heritage, a decline in the attractiveness of the community and property values, at an overall cost which exceeds renovation. Again, I thought this was a joke and am very sad to hear this is actually being considered.

**David - JAN 8 2018 1:58 PM**

I would not support any demolition that would noticeably affect the exterior of these buildings. I have always loved the character and details of our institutional buildings, when I was in the school system here and since I returned as a tax-paying property owner. The architecture of these buildings and our housing stock makes Oakwood distinctive and attractive to new residents and businesses. I am a residential architect who knows very well that new construction can never approximate the appearance of an older building. We have to save these structures and that make our town so unique!

**Kimberly - JAN 8 2018 11:35 AM**

YES. YES. Partial demolition would allow for our facilities to match the needs of our learners. At present, and looking ahead, our buildings are far from being what we need. I understand the outside of our buildings is charming, but the functionality inside requires modifications to remain developmentally appropriate and competitive.

**Amy - JAN 6 2018 12:26 AM**

Absolutely not. We moved here 16 years ago. Our oldest was in first grade. We were waiting on the moving truck to arrive so I took a moment to walk to his new school, he was brave but really nervous about going to a new school. When we crossed the street and he could see the building from the Shafor side, his face lit up and he said "Mommy! I get to go to Hogwarts!?!?". He still has an Oakwood flag hanging in his apartment at school. Tearing down our schools would be an absolute travesty. I look at other countries, England, France, Italy, Germany; buildings survive centuries, wars, progress. There is always a way to make what you have work efficiently, effectively and be environmentally sound. It can be done. I work in construction.

Demolition/New builds are almost always the wrong answer and call back maintenance is horrific.

**Maura - JAN 5 2018 4:27 PM**

I've seen too many districts go through this change with a negative impact to the students while the construction is going on and with additional costs to maintain. Not to mention, our school grounds are more centered in our neighborhoods, which would cause a lot of stress to neighbor's. If we could focus on improving what already exists would be much better.

**Shelly D - JAN 5 2018 9:43 AM**

The Oakwood school buildings are a part of Oakwood history and charm. There is no chance to save history once it's gone. It's our responsibility for future generations to say we were here when this was optioned, we preserved our history and thus it remains. It's too important not to get this right. Surely a strategic plan can be put in place for the next decade or two to address buildings needs based on severity.

**Sharon Kelly - JAN 5 2018 8:28 AM**

Before the district starts tearing down walls (or God forbid buildings), they need to upgrade the HVAC systems and windows in all buildings. As a parent volunteer at Smith, I routinely see classrooms so cold that teachers and students are wearing their winter coats. While in classrooms on the other side of the building, windows are cracked open because the room is so hot. My own kids at OHS tell me that they carry their coat from class to class because some rooms are so cold. Late summer/fall temperatures are just as bad with the only cool air coming from noisy window A/C units. I would assume that best practices in education would include teaching and learning in a proper temperature controlled environment!

**Tyler - JAN 4 2018 4:40 PM**

I would NOT support a full demolition of the existing buildings. That would be a travesty. New buildings will come with their own set of problems and maintenance issues in time. Work with what you have and renovate / add historically-accurate additions as needed. New construction's quality pales in comparison to older craftsmanship and quality. The adage "They don't build them like they used to." would apply here.

**Elizabeth - DEC 30 2017 11:50 PM**

I would not support demolition of existing buildings. I would support historically accurate remodels and additions consistent with existing architecture

**Erica Mersfelder - DEC 28 2017 10:09 PM**

Updates and upgrades are one thing, but to demolish our buildings is to destroy history. Refurbish and upgrade, but protect our historic schools. This is part of the culture of Oakwood.

**Cheryl - DEC 20 2017 8:56 PM**

Without a needs analysis, detailing the issues and proposed remedies, the question should not be asked of the community (nor answered). Heartache lies in decisions made without the full facts! I recognize that in order for a school to maintain its position (never mind progress) it requires innovative thinking, and sometimes difficult decisions. Certainly, with local, national and global increased awareness of the need for sustainability, old buildings often need some of the most 'help', which ideally, would be done sympathetically. However, all of this can only be decided when we know the anticipated impact of doing nothing, the positives and negatives of proposed changes, and cost (and cost-effectiveness) to the taxpayers.

**Jack A. - DEC 19 2017 12:31 AM**

In addition to the facades, we should seek to maintain the character of the buildings. We have delayed maintenance in all of the buildings (behind the walls), walls need to be moved to allow for better cafeteria facilities and flexible space that can support superior education in our community throughout the 21st century. The reconfigured space needs to still feel a bit like Hogwarts and connect tomorrow's students with those who came before them. Our buildings are an important part of what makes attending Oakwood Schools special, compared to the sterile atmosphere in surrounding communities. Don't loose that just to create a huddle spot. Over the decades we have always made careful changes to improve functionality (adding a wing, controlled access etc.) and this needs to continue to make the schools fit for current and future teaching methods, but I caution not to start with a clean slate (such as just a facade). Improve, not reinvent.

**John Donnelly - DEC 18 2017 10:30 AM**

While the maintenance on the older structures is a constant requirement, the idea of tearing everything down doesn't make sense for a number of reasons. I believe the current processes of upgrading the facilities has been successful.

**Heather - DEC 18 2017 10:05 AM**

I'd support partial demo so long as it was done for safety/health/quality of services reasons. I think it's important to maintain the historical facades as well as infrastructure, but there is a definite need for upgrading and renovation. Oakwood has such a rich history and to demolish any of the schools completely would be a loss.

**Robyn - DEC 14 2017 2:00 PM**

This is a hard one. Our schools are iconic and part of this city's identity. That said, I've restored an old house and in addition to being expensive, there are areas that just cannot be updated. While I am sure the 'bones' of the school are wonderful, it's not very environmentally friendly when it comes to efficiencies. Ancient building materials need constant maintenance and that is

not particularly fiscally responsible. Oakwood needs more space for students and far better facilities for science and arts. The idea of gutting the schools and renovating would take far longer than building from scratch, and there is no guarantee the facilities would support the kind of infrastructure needed to cut maintenance costs and provide the technology needed to compete with other area schools. Plus there is the added problem of where to put the students during a lengthy renovation. For the secondary complex, if the facade (and front wing) on Far Hills could be preserved, I would support a total rebuild of the areas behind it - the gyms and Jr. High.

Ditto on Smith, if the front could be preserved, but for Harman the depth of the land would make it difficult to expand in any meaningful way if the front were preserved.

**Melanie - DEC 14 2017 9:41 AM**

No to full demolition. Updating absolutely!

**Lisa - DEC 13 2017 12:45 PM**

I support fiscal responsibility. How much higher can our taxes go? I would prefer renovations of the buildings; all of our buildings are such great structures and part of Oakwood's history. Where would we house students if they were demolished , or even renovated? We definitely need things like our heating, windows, electrical, and other infrastructure needs revamped.

**JP - DEC 13 2017 8:36 AM**

No, I would not support this at all. Renovate instead.

**Ashley O'Hara - DEC 12 2017 12:30 PM**

No, we love the buildings! I don't see a need to build new ones.

**Kyla - DEC 12 2017 11:26 AM**

Not total demolition. If there is a way to update the inside without destroying the beautiful, historic buildings then maybe. Part of Oakwoods charm is our historic schools. We moved here a couple years ago and it was one of the draws to this community. It would be a shame if the buildings were torn down.

**Mychaelyn - DEC 12 2017 9:21 AM**

In a community that values it's his stork homes and buildings, there is no way that I would support a complete demolition of its historic school buildings. It is one of the treasures of our community. However I would consider partial demolition If the addition was done in keeping with the history of the original building.

**Molly - DEC 11 2017 9:38 PM**

Absolutely no support in full demolition of our existing structures. Partial demolition for renovations or additions would be ok, especially if they are done to match the facades like was done with the last round of additions to each of the schools. Why didn't the renovations that were done most recently effective enough for the changes that are now needed?

**evelyn - DEC 11 2017 6:48 PM**

Yes I would if it would be greener: better for the environment and save money. New is not always better. Current best practices are tomorrow's backward practices. Not sure if you build to today's standards it will have lasting impact.

**Kelly - DEC 10 2017 5:12 PM**

I would support spending money to expand the existing buildings or make needed upgrades only so long as the existing architecture and character is maintained - even if it costs more.

**Kelly - DEC 10 2017 5:12 PM**

I would support spending money to expand the existing buildings or make needed upgrades only so long as the existing architecture and character is maintained - even if it costs more.

**Daniel - DEC 9 2017 10:09 PM**

I can't believe you are even asking this question. The buildings are beautiful and historical. They were one of the first things I noticed when looking at homes in Oakwood. Tearing any of them down would be an incredibly bad decision.

**Ellen - DEC 4 2017 9:49 PM**

I can't imagine how this is affordable, nor can I begin to understand how the current buildings don't support best practices in education. We all know that the most important asset in education is the classroom educator, as supported by the family and the district.

**Cait - DEC 4 2017 3:11 PM**

No, I would not support full demolition of the buildings. There is an inherent value in the buildings (historical, architectural, aesthetic) that should not be overlooked. The analysis seems to show that the cost to maintain and add value is less than the cost to build new (especially new buildings with "Oakwood character" which I would argue would be hard to re-create). Thank you for reaching out to residents for input, we sincerely hope for a sustainable (financially and environmentally) plan for the future that modifies and improves the valuable buildings we already have.

**Seth - DEC 4 2017 8:39 AM**

No. I strongly oppose demolition of our school buildings. What are the "current best practices in education" which has raised this question?

**Jennifer Speed - DEC 4 2017 7:56 AM**

First, I'd like to know how the current buildings DON'T meet current best practices in education. Second, I'd like to acknowledge that "correct best practices in education" are always changing. Demolishing buildings and building new ones is a tough sell if we are trying to keep up with changing fads.

**Masha Kisel - DEC 3 2017 9:14 PM**

I would support partial demolition with the intent to create a more energy-efficient structure and become LEED certified. Sustainability will increasingly become part of the curriculum at all levels of schooling and it will be important for us to model what we teach through experiential learning. In higher education, college campuses are increasingly including gardens, composting and energy efficiency in their infrastructural planning and remodeling, using green spaces as

learning spaces. Educational excellence in Oakwood will have to include learning about sustainable practices. Jobs in sustainable food growth, energy efficiency and green energy will be the careers of the future and minimizing our carbon footprint is the right thing for our children's future. Why not build these educational experiences and ethical practices into the very structure of our schools? Miami Valley has championed these practices on their campus and I would love to see Oakwood schools catch up.

**Jennifer Morgan - DEC 3 2017 3:46 PM**

It is important any future master facility plan for the education of our children include sustainability - as a focus of the building, its operations and as a part of the curriculum. Any new facility, remodel or addition should be built to the latest energy efficiency and green standards - these can be accomplished while still maintaining the beautiful aesthetic of our facilities. I'd also like to see a garden for students and a compost area - great for providing hyper locally produced food for the cafeterias, education and experience on nutrition and food and a mechanism to reduce our input to the waste stream. I'd also like to see green energy built into our plan - be it solar or wind generation on the premises - or something of the sort. This is important to the education of our future.

**Don O'Connor - DEC 3 2017 12:36 PM**

I don't support full demolition, but would be open to partial demolition and interior renovations as long as the historical character is maintained. I encourage going more vertical with new construction so our very limited green spaces can be left available for the community.

**E F Mende - DEC 2 2017 6:22 PM**

No. Why ? Some of these ideas appear to want to support a "Guaranteed Employment of School & Library Architects". Many communities are in a redesign phase where architects are peddling the same updating ideas at taxpayer expense. What are the "current best practices in education" that will result from these new buildings ? Brick & Mortar will not enhance learning. And where will classes be conducted during demolition & rebuilding ? I hope these questions are strictly preliminary, because the lack of details preclude accurate responses.

**Jennifer - NOV 29 2017 9:20 PM**

Possibly partial but not full demolition. The schools are beautiful and I want to maintain the beautify and history of the facilities - but I recognize the need for mechanical and infrastructure updates. And I find it concerning the lack of space for lunch. But a lesson we would do well to teach our children is to not fully demolish - to find a way to work with what you have.

**Pam Stephens - NOV 29 2017 3:38 PM**

NO!!!!!! The school building are classic, extremely well built, well-maintained, and appealing to all. They make me proud to be an alumni and as life-long resident of Oakwood.

**Judy Payne - NOV 24 2017 3:31 PM**

No. Our schools have character are attractive additions to the community. Internal changes or additions that conform to the overall character of the schools is acceptable. I think the citizen are willing to pay for the needed extra upkeep to keep our schools attractive.

**Steve Walters - NOV 24 2017 3:09 PM**

Are you nuts!!! Not only do we have the best facilities in the state of Ohio, but we just poured a ton of money into them a few years ago to make them even better. Other communities look at Oakwood with envy because of our incredible school facilities. Let's leave it that way!

**Bill Sherk - NOV 24 2017 12:07 PM**

For the idea of requiring the tear down of building for technological improvements, has anyone heard of wireless? Colleges built huge buildings to house large frame computers which you now carry in backpacks.

**Eric - NOV 23 2017 7:44 AM**

Crazy talk!!! I can't believe that this question is even being asked of the residents.

**william - NOV 23 2017 6:51 AM**

Ridiculous.

We have a beautiful community with beautiful facilities. When my daughter first told me this was even being discussed I thought it was a joke. (literally) I don't aspire to be like other, more 'modernized' communities.....that is a big part of why I live HERE. I would support remodeling, restructuring, tasteful additions.....it can be done well (and has).....please don't aspire to be what we are not!

**Amanda Price - NOV 22 2017 9:47 AM**

A million times no. Our buildings are wonderful and in great condition. I loved going to school in such beautiful buildings and it is one of the things I cherished most about my time at Oakwood. It is unnecessary to destroy what we have in favor of something new and flashy. One of Oakwoods most publazied features is our traditions. Our beautiful, historic schools are part of that tradition.

**Debbie M Price - NOV 22 2017 8:54 AM**

Absolutely not. These are beautiful buildings that contribute to the charm and character of Oakwood. They're in great condition, especially compared to other schools throughout the country, They serve our children well. Remodel, renovate as needed, but do not destroy.

**Colleen - NOV 21 2017 9:32 AM**

NO. The historic beauty and charm of the buildings add to the character of Oakwood. They should be remodeled inside so as to keep the original exterior.

**Peter - NOV 21 2017 8:45 AM**

No. The buildings can be redesigned keeping the existing exterior architecture. We are Oakwood for a reason.

**C.Shamis - NOV 20 2017 10:34 PM**

No. Demolition of the existing HS and JH will only benefit the architects. Not the students, nor our community.

**Denice Moberg - NOV 20 2017 6:28 PM**

I prefer to keep the general look of the buildings. I'm not in favor of complete tear down.

**Denice Moberg - NOV 20 2017 6:27 PM**

I prefer to see the buildings redesigned, not torn down. I love the look of all of the buildings.

**Amanda - NOV 20 2017 1:03 PM**

Never. Here in the southern school system we are fleeing (we are moving back to Oakwood in January) there is a constant demand for new, shiny school buildings. Guess what? Facilities improvements don't change outcomes. In addition, I hear graduates of the buildings that were built in the 80s and later here state that they have no attachment to the cold, sterile buildings where they went to school. As the PTA treasurer for the school my children currently attend, I can tell you that no attachment = less alumni dollars. I can't believe this question is even being asked in Oakwood. It's like you all are considering tearing out the heart of the city.

**Becky Weaver - NOV 20 2017 12:41 PM**

I support demolition of the Junior High Building and the H.S. Building for two new buildings with space configuration to meet current and future needs, including technology demands. Perhaps the H.S. Building facade could reflect the historic architectural elements we now have.

**Carole Judge - NOV 19 2017 11:12 PM**

NO, unless it's the ugly partial part between the HS and Jr. High. And it was horrible how the last renovation put in cheap vinyl flooring that looked bad from day one.

**Kate - NOV 19 2017 10:48 PM**

A common thread for me across all these questions is that we need to do what is best for the students. Obviously our buildings are lovely and historic. If we can save them, we should. But to what end, I'm not sure. If students cannot be best served in the current buildings we need to face that harsh reality and consider demolition. If they can be served within the existing structures then let's save them.

**Harrison - NOV 19 2017 10:18 PM**

I love our school buildings and feel that they are symbols of pride to our community that deserve preservation. Therefore, I would not support a plan for full demolition. However, I feel that in order to bring our schools into the 21st century we will need to look at partial demolition. In my opinion, our most important buildings are Oakwood High School, Smith School, and Harman School. I feel that each of these buildings have distinct characteristics that are worth saving much like Oakwood's Municipal Building. I am very proud of how the city preserved a portion of the original building but also added a new building that serves our citizens well.

**Leigh Ann Fulford - NOV 19 2017 4:17 PM**

I do NOT support demolition of our beautiful historic school buildings. I do support re-imagining the interior spaces and uses of the buildings and updating the infrastructure to accommodate new technology. We learned after our last major renovation around 2000, technology changes rapidly, so building a "state of the art" facility now could be obsolete in 20 years. Flash drives and smart phones did not exist when we had the "technology crisis" we addressed (with lots of mobile labs full of laptops and computer labs full of computer workstations) 20 years ago. Our older buildings need love and care AND a prepared well-thought out maintenance schedule so we can be PROactive rather than REactive when it comes to making repairs, upgrades, etc. The

quality of education comes from our teachers, staff, parents, and students. We need to be fiscally responsible to all of our residents. Looking at the changes in our neighborhood, more households have two parents who work (sometimes more than one job) and many of our neighbors are renters rather than homeowners simply because young parents cannot afford to move into Oakwood anymore. We need to be cognizant of our strongest asset: our student families.

**Markus - NOV 19 2017 1:28 PM**

This does not seem like a good idea. Agree with Dave, the buildings are less important than students, teachers than parents to the success of the students.

**Cindy - NOV 18 2017 10:17 AM**

I agree with Dave. The architects seem to think our facilities are inadequate but our schools always are given outstanding ratings.

**Christopher Morris - NOV 17 2017 7:04 PM**

The architecture of the existing buildings should be preserved. I would support renovations and additions that maintain the integrity of the existing buildings. The end result of our current education is pretty darn good...so let's not try fixing something that isn't broken. Ability to walk to school is pretty special.

**Dave - NOV 17 2017 10:02 AM**

Absolutely not, buildings don't determine the success of students, teachers, students and parents do.

**Wendy - NOV 16 2017 10:49 PM**

No. Demolition of our current buildings would be a great loss to the community. Yes, they are old. Yes, they are expensive to maintain. But nobody lives in this community because they like bright and shiny new. We value tradition and history. Remodel the insides, but keep the school buildings the same on the outside!

**Linda - NOV 16 2017 6:04 PM**

No. Let's maintain our present buildings and make them safe and secure. We have beautiful buildings.

**Steven - NOV 16 2017 2:46 PM**

We should continue to improving our current facilities, or some addition based on current building. As you may remember, our cost estimate for Lane stadium was not very good, it was proposed for \$2.5 Million, but finally it costs more than \$4 Million. Though it was a private funded project, our school district and city have to fund \$750,000, which indirectly relates to our taxpayers. From cost and tradition history, we have to object the project.

**nancy - NOV 16 2017 10:00 AM**

I think this is a reasonable possibility. However, I am concerned with who is deciding what the "best practices in education" are. We have seen many school environment ideas get implemented that end up costing a lot more in reconstruction due to failure.

**David Laatz - NOV 16 2017 9:52 AM**

No. Our schools and their age are what make them unique to the City of Oakwood. Our schools need to be safe (structurally), and current internally. Meaning that we need to maintain our curriculum and technology to keep up with the changes, but leave the buildings alone. Some of the best schools in the country were built circa 1600-1700.....Yale, Harvard, College of William & Mary. Our facilities are not that old, and can support current best practices in education just the way they are.

**Sarah Q - NOV 16 2017 7:54 AM**

I would not support any demolition to our schools. I feel like they are iconic to this community. Everything here is so charming and beautiful, I would hate to see any cosmetic changes to our stunning schools.

**Mike Ruetschle - NOV 15 2017 11:13 PM**

For those opposed to partial demolition, let me describe a scenario and tell me how you would feel about it. Lets say a plan option was developed that removed some grade levels from the current 7-12 JH/HS, and all the current space was not needed. How would you feel about demolishing the 2 story wing in the JH/HS that runs north/south in the middle of the school? This is the wing where the Science Hall is on the first floor and the Freshman Hall is on the second floor. This wing is not original to the High school or Junior High buildings, not in the original english tudor style (flat roof), not part of the 2003 bond issue which tax payers are still paying on, and not visible from Far Hills or Schantz?

**Mike Ruetschle - NOV 15 2017 10:51 PM**

Steven - enrollment projections have been recently completed and are on the District Master Facilities Plan page. Bottom line is that demographers are saying that Oakwood enrollment will remain stable over the next 10 years.

**Steven - NOV 15 2017 9:16 PM**

We can check very good schools around the country, they were built one hundred ago, still are used. In Oakwood, many old houses are one hundred years old, they are still charming during good maintenance. Current school buildings means good memories for many alumni, why do we want to demolish them? In Oakwood, the population is pretty stable due to our good school ranking, I am not sure how you calculate prediction enrollment, it may not be correct like poll. you can not compare 10-year maintenance cost to new building cost, it is logical mistake, the cost comparison should be 10- year maintenance cost to new building cost plus new building maintenance cost. Smart to use current funds will keep current school like new.

**Lynn Hartman - NOV 15 2017 8:26 PM**

I would not support any demolition to our beautiful schools. I could support necessary additions to existing structures.

**Dante Connell - NOV 14 2017 6:36 PM**

No full demolition. Maybe renovation and remodeling to existing school buildings to address maintenance issues, while also providing restructured learning spaces. Oakwood is recognized as a high-performing district, despite the older buildings. Instead of tearing down buildings, is it possible to work within the existing footprint? Could renovations inside the buildings provide

updated mechanicals, while also opening up the space for collaborative learning spaces? I support using our financial resources to fund educational instruction. I would support spending money on equipment and flexible furniture that would allow for innovative and collaborative instruction.

**Lucy - NOV 14 2017 11:33 AM**

I think that partial demolition may be necessary to make the changes and accommodations necessary when thinking about the future. I do, however, REALLY want the faces of the schools to remain the same (i.e. keep the facing, facade of the schools intact and gut the insides).

**Stephanie - NOV 14 2017 12:26 AM**

No, never!! Every Alumni I spoke with is furious this is even a question. The schools just need updates and our tax dollars spent wisely!

**Meredith - NOV 12 2017 2:40 PM**

We don't think there should be a need for entire building demolitions. You can maintain the historic feel and look of buildings, while making improvements to the inside for safety and best teaching practices. We make adjustments/updates to our beloved old homes and would support the same in our schools with careful cost analysis.

**Laura Lee John - NOV 10 2017 9:35 PM**

I would not support the demolition of our existing buildings. The exterior of the buildings are solid and unique - the interior can be modified as needed.

**Colleen Smith - NOV 10 2017 5:37 PM**

I can't believe you are even asking this question! It makes me sick that you would even consider tearing down our schools after all the renovation projects and tax increases we passed to support it. It still sickens me that the Terrazzo floors that lasted for decades were removed for cheap vinyl that is already peeling. Just because the State partially pays for new schools, doesn't mean we should spend the money. The quality of the buildings would not compare to what we have now. I would adamantly oppose such a project and don't agree that it is needed to support best practices in education.

**Michele morgan - NOV 9 2017 12:12 PM**

Nope. The buildings are beautiful and a part of history. I don't see the point in prison/factory architecture that most schools employ.

**Barbara Erbe - NOV 9 2017 7:19 AM**

First, I absolutely do not support the full demolition of our existing schools. Depending on the cost vs. benefits, I may support renovation of the existing buildings or a partial demolition. I would need more information to fully understand the situation. Oakwood City School is consistently rated as one of the top performing schools in Ohio. Therefore, I would need to read long-term studies showing that the "best practices in education" require a significant change to our buildings before spending millions of dollars. I would rather see additional tax dollars going to operating expenses (hiring more teachers so that class sizes can be smaller, particularly in the elementary grades) than on enlarging classroom spaces. Lastly, this is a leading question. Who wants to say that they do not support current best practices in education?

**Kristin - NOV 4 2017 8:23 AM**

No! Adding to the history, richness, and beauty of our existing schools should be a top priority, demolishing them to start over would be a massive loss of all three of those elements

**Sharon Kelly - NOV 3 2017 12:53 PM**

I would support a building addition (similar to Smith), but would vehemently oppose a full demolition of any of the existing buildings.

**Question 8a: Would you support partial demolition of our existing school buildings in order to develop new facilities that support current best practices in education?**

Steve - FEB 14 2018 9:55 PM

I find aesthetic value in the facades of OHS and Smith Elementary, both matching architectural styles of other buildings in Oakwood. Beyond that, I support the drastic demolition of extremely old facilities to update all of the schools to keep Oakwood a neighborhood of forward thinking education. The efforts of teachers and volunteers to educate our youth is wonderful, and breaking into small groups to meet specific needs is an extremely useful strategy... but is the best we have to offer sitting on the ground in the hallway? My work location is also deficient in small group meeting space, but we do not have to resort to sitting in the hallway to have a focused/private discussion.

Alex Gusev - FEB 9 2018 10:10 AM

This is an alternative voice to this official web cite. Please check the materials, opinions, and data on the same topics, and think for yourself: <http://oakwoodvoice.com>

Rose Lounsbury - FEB 6 2018 9:58 PM

Yes. I believe it is most important that our schools buildings serve the educational needs of our children. If demolition needs to happen to accomplish that, then that is the best course of action.

Jill - JAN 29 2018 6:32 PM

I do not support demolition. You talk about supporting "current best practices in education"-- Oakwood schools are consistently ranked as some of the best schools in Ohio and the nation. Clearly, our current situation is very effective.

Ellen - JAN 29 2018 12:48 PM

No demolition of the existing school buildings! Ever! If you cannot re-configure the classrooms within these buildings, then you are not trying hard enough or being creative enough, Dream Team. The "current best practices in education" might not be the Oakwood best practices in education. The current best practices were not "best" for Oakwood regarding the "Integrated Math" debacle! Destroying the buildings is not necessary to teach the children effectively.

Nadja - JAN 27 2018 5:06 PM

Absolutely. I encourage the school system and our community to embrace the many advantages of partial demolition. The greatest asset of Smith, Harman and the OHS/OJHS are their location, and rebuilding them on their sites will keep Oakwood a walking district and save taxpayer money over renovating if our aim is to truly modernize the schools for the next 100 years.

Oakwood taxpayers are rightfully concerned about the cost to recapitalize our schools. Demolition and new construction will save money over a renovation/retrofit option. When building systems are at the end of their functional life already and not designed to modern needs (security, ADA, structural, climate control, fire suppression), renovations are typically more costly. The Dayton Metro Library learned this lesson nearby recently. They kept the shell of the Kettering-Moraine branch and did a gut renovation thinking they'd save money. They

ended up exceeding the budget due to unforeseen existing conditions during the renovation. The Library learned from the experience and changed their plan from a renovation of the Wilmington-Stroop branch to a total tear-down and replacement to make sure their limited dollars were maximized for their program needs.

In addition to not saving money, renovations can limit design options as well. When designed from scratch, 21st Century schools typically fundamentally differ in shape and structure from older schools. Our schools' fundamental design pattern is a hallway with classrooms down each side (the "double loaded corridor") hailing from an era when a single teacher taught/lectured the same group of 15-25 kids. To enable team teaching; technology integration; student lead, differentiated learning; and problem-based, hands-on learning, school design today provides a variety of connected spaces and room sizes ranging from small break-out rooms to large, flexibly furnished spaces. A key structural design element for these school is a large floor plate which requires large spans from column to column. The structure of our existing schools could literally get in the way of retrofitting them to allow for such flexible floor plans, limiting what staff can do. Reusing the buildings would both limit implementation of many 21st Century design ideas AND cost us more money.

There is great community pride and attachment to our schools. Facades can be maintained while still demo'ing behind them. Building materials - porticos, brick, stone arches, tile elements, wood work, etc. - can be kept, deconstructed and/or reused in a new design. Functional portions can be kept. It is very possible to maintain the aesthetic of the existing schools while still making a cost conscious choice to demo ineffective parts of the buildings.

Oakwood has the opportunity to rebuild its schools using sustainable design principles achieving the highest practical energy and water efficiency, indoor environmental quality, thermal comfort, and environmental standards. "Net-zero" schools generate as much power through on-site renewables as they use, making their annual utility bill \$0...the epitome of both economic and environmental stewardship. Both cost savings and improved student outcomes in green schools are well documented, which is why the Ohio School Facilities Commission requires every new school built with their funds to be a certified green school.

Our existing schools are substandard in myriad ways, and I applaud the teachers and staff for the remarkable work they do despite daily work-arounds. I'd like to see updated schools for Oakwood's next generations of children, providing them sustainable, economic, flexible, and effective learning environments. To do so, I think demolition of substandard classroom wings, combined with reuse of functional portions, facades, and materials is a practical middle ground.

Eric.hutton@hotmail.com - JAN 26 2018 5:17 PM

I do not support any demolition of any of the schools in our community. If you want new schools then maybe you should consider moving to a community that offers newer schools. The charm of Oakwood is the older homes, beautiful schools that fit the community, the fact that the kids can walk to school, etc... I am not sure why newer is always better and these schools have served the community well for years and years. Classrooms do not educate children, parent and teachers do it.

Jen Messaros - JAN 26 2018 11:10 AM

I don't support demolition at all. The reason my family moved to Oakwood is we drove by the schools and looked at them. The history and beauty were what caught us.

It's true that the cafeterias are too small. Why couldn't we have two or three consecutive lunch periods? That's the way it was done at my high school. Congestion would be cut to one third. Also, students could schedule classes throughout the day and eat lunch in class. This was a great blessing to me, as sitting in the cafeteria was a torturous experience for me.

Having kids working in the hallways was mentioned in the community meeting like it was a bad thing. It seems to me that this is good use of the space. Hallways are needed, and our kids are trustworthy to complete work out there during class. The halls are a pleasant environment. All the photos shown in the informational meeting looked like hospital lobbies. They made me cringe. What is most important in education is the relationship between teachers and students. Our facilities need to be safe and well maintained. Tearing them down would be tragic.

Justin Shineman - JAN 25 2018 10:07 AM

I support partial and/or full demolition of existing Oakwood school buildings in order to develop new facilities. If the Oakwood community is serious about maintaining the academic standards of its schools, then ANY option, including full demolition of the existing schools, should be considered. Our two children will have been enrolled in eight different school systems in six states before they finish HS. Of those schools, Oakwood is not the best the school district they've seen (Fairfax County, VA and Eagan, MN were as good or better); it is by far in the worst state of disrepair we have seen, and has the most out-of-date and limited learning spaces and athletic fields. Oakwood may provide the best education in Dayton, and may rank high in the state of Ohio, but nothing is permanent. Failure to update our schools will eventually result in stagnation and ultimately decline. The decline has already happened in the facilities. It's only a matter of time before it happens in the classroom.

As facility studies have shown, Oakwood schools are grossly undersized and badly in need of major repairs. New structures would not only support best practices in education (the primary reason many Oakwood residents come/stay here), but they could also dramatically reduce future operating costs by improving energy efficiency, reducing staff, and eliminating costly maintenance issues. Just the heating and cooling systems alone are a tremendous waste of energy and money.

Moreover, the existing structures are not laid out in a thoughtful manner, but are a hodge-podge of reactive changes over time. The bathrooms alone in the HS are probably older than any in the city, are in desperate need of overhaul, and see 50-100 times the use of any bathrooms in the city.

Lunch time at the Junior/Senior HS is a nightmare. Many students have lunch time meetings for extra-curricular activities or use the time to make up quizzes, etc. and cannot leave the property for lunch. They have no suitable place to eat their lunch, and don't have time to wait in the ridiculous line to purchase food. Staggering the junior high and HS lunch times would alleviate some of the problem, but the cafeteria still isn't large enough to keep students out of the halls. We love our old buildings and homes in Oakwood - it's one of the reasons our family chose to buy a house and live here after 25 years of moves every 2-3 years. But very few of us in Oakwood have the same heating and cooling, roof, windows, kitchen, bathrooms, phone system and electrical systems that our homes were built with, or haven't renovated/updated at least once in the past 50 years. Imagine having your furnace from 50 years ago and no central air

conditioning. Imagine having the same bathroom and kitchen from 50 years ago with no modernization. They wouldn't be functional. Why should our schools be treated differently?