

Q12 Please explain why you favor the slow, moderate, or fast/full implementation transition approach.

Answered: 233 Skipped: 0

Answers for SLOW Implementation

| # | Responses | Date |
|----|---|--------------------|
| 1 | The logistics of moving a lot of people at once is difficult. I can only hope personnel can deal with these changes if it comes slowly. | 2/21/2017 6:31 AM |
| 2 | I want to limit the amount of school moving for students as I feel this could be extremely disruptive to their education | 2/20/2017 10:34 PM |
| 3 | Given that children, especially YOUNG children, are most effected by changes to routine and environment, I see that anything but the SLOW Roll-Out being incredibly detrimental to the overall health, well-being and education of the already impacted students at Sharpstein. There are at least two grade levels who are experiencing great gains in regards to children's time-on-task and ability to self-regulate their behaviors. This is obvious to any parent who's spent time coming and going over the last year. At times, the school had so many children running around, yelling, and doing unusual things, that it was... a bit unnerving. This year, while the previous year's scene is still sometimes visible, it is a stark contrast to what it's been. Like Blue Ridge, I think that kids who have had a tough go of things, and their peers, are reaping rewards that are likely to be upset if their respective classes undergo a major upheaval, like being sent to a different school, with teachers they do not know, staff they do not know, surrounding that they do not know, and Intervention Specialists that they do not know. Anything but a slow roll out, in my opinion, seems adult centered and not child centered. The dual language program did not start in a day, it started slowly, and it let the children grow and progress up and out of Sharpstein slowly. Kids should be given a chance to maintain current programming and teachers, as well as their peer groups. | 2/20/2017 9:00 PM |
| 4 | One simple reason for my choice: kids do not like change. They like stability. I want to support the least disruptive process. | 2/20/2017 8:50 PM |
| 5 | Other approaches seem higher likelihood of not being able to attend my neighborhood school. | 2/20/2017 8:49 PM |
| 6 | Kids already in the program don't need to be shook before the middle school transition.... | 2/20/2017 8:06 PM |
| 7 | I think that the majority of students are comfortable in their dual program schools with teachers, building and fellow classmates in their grade and should be allowed to finish their education at that school. I also think that issues will come up in the transition and this will give more time to address those. | 2/20/2017 7:30 PM |
| 8 | I think it's unfair to move children around in the middle of their elementary years. | 2/20/2017 7:22 PM |
| 9 | this will allow for more adjusting to the roll out plan as we see what worked and didn't work from the first round. it also potentially affects less families. | 2/20/2017 6:42 PM |
| 10 | The slow transition is the only model that allows all the students to remain in the program. I see no other viable option. The commitment made by the families to dual-language should be acknowledged and allowed to continue. It is also the least disruptive option. | 2/20/2017 6:05 PM |
| 11 | N/a | 2/20/2017 5:52 PM |
| 12 | I think the change would be more readily accepted by the public if there is a show roll out. Plus, my kids currently enrolled in dual would be allowed to finish their elementary years. | 2/20/2017 5:37 PM |
| 13 | It is the least disruptive. We fear that too much disruption may cause unintended community backlash. | 2/20/2017 5:24 PM |
| 14 | Gives the school district office more time to communicate with students, parents, community and plan transition as well as develop a "realistic" budget to do so. | 2/20/2017 3:55 PM |
| 15 | [REDACTED] | 2/20/2017 3:45 PM |
| 16 | I see benefits to doing this with minimal disruption for kids | 2/20/2017 3:07 PM |
| 17 | As a parent, I would NOT want my child moved from their home school to a different elementary school NO MATTER WHAT. Many people select their homes based on proximity to elementary schools and to have their child forcibly relocated to a school farther away would be a huge inconvenience and irritation. | 2/20/2017 2:44 PM |
| 18 | Seems to offer the least disruption. | 2/20/2017 1:24 PM |
| 19 | Less disruptive to current students | 2/20/2017 1:03 PM |

Bilingual Committee Seeks Input on Proposed Changes

SurveyMonkey

| | | |
|----|---|--------------------|
| 20 | Seems fairest to the children. | 2/20/2017 1:01 PM |
| 21 | What is the rush really?? | 2/20/2017 12:55 PM |
| 22 | Continuity for students and time for families to make choices and accommodations for things like travel | 2/20/2017 9:22 AM |
| 23 | It would be unacceptable for children who have already begun dual programming to be removed. The slow approach minimizes disruptions for ALL children, as well as staff. | 2/20/2017 8:24 AM |
| 24 | Minimizes separating kids in the same families | 2/20/2017 8:18 AM |
| 25 | Less upheaval for the greatest number of kids. | 2/20/2017 8:16 AM |
| 26 | Because nobody likes changes and moving children around can be stressful for them. They would have to make new friends, plus they have to adapt to a different school, teachers and etc. | 2/20/2017 12:03 AM |
| 27 | Duh. Again, this is an opportunity for my kids to get a leg up -- of course I want to see them get as full a grasp of Spanish as possible. | 2/19/2017 11:20 PM |
| 28 | Doesn't negatively affect so many kids | 2/19/2017 10:33 PM |
| 29 | The slow approach is clearly the least disruptive option for the students currently enrolled in the program and for school communities (teachers and staff). Providing continuity for a child should be of the highest priority. For students with anxiety, ACES, and learning difficulties, disrupting their school environment is detrimental to their educational success, their sense of security, and their well being. Additionally, the slow transition provides time for the district to see how the program is working, make adjustments over time, and study the trends rather than throwing everything into chaos at once. Although this option less immediately address some concerns (ie problems in English only threads), minimizing disruptions to the majority of students MUST be the priority. Urgent problems that are not addressed by a slow implementation can be addressed in other ways. | 2/19/2017 9:59 PM |
| 30 | The slow approach is clearly the least disruptive option. It also provides the best to opportunity to monitor and respond to the effects of curricular changes. This method less immediately addresses some concerns (e.g. problems in English-only threads), but minimizing a disruption to the majority of students should be prioritized. Urgent issues left unresolved because of a slow rollout can likely be addressed in other ways. | 2/19/2017 9:58 PM |
| 31 | This model is the most feasible logistically, and it provides the least amount of disruption for the children. | 2/19/2017 9:28 PM |
| 32 | Why are you wanting details about transition when the final decision to do it has not been made? It sounds like we don't have a choice and you have already made the decisions--by getting this survey out right before the deadline. Any changes are best slow and give time for everyone to adjust in order to lessen the disruption to the children's education. Also you have not talked about the cost of such an extensive changing of schools for everyone in the district. Money that could better be spent on equal access to education for the children. Why was the cost of such a disruption not even mentioned in your proposal? Was the outreach to the community only done for the white population?? How did you outreach to the minority population?? | 2/19/2017 9:15 PM |
| 33 | A slow roll out will give more time to trouble shoot unintended consequences. | 2/19/2017 8:44 PM |
| 34 | Some of these children are attending the only grade school they've ever known. Why disrupt their education? | 2/19/2017 8:07 PM |
| 35 | Slow because children should finish their elementary education where they started it. | 2/19/2017 7:51 PM |
| 36 | Slow would be the best approach. The school district should allow children that already know one school to finish out their elementary education at THAT school. | 2/19/2017 7:38 PM |
| 37 | The slow transition effects less staff, students and families all at once. It gives more time to plan and implement the program with fidelity. | 2/19/2017 7:16 PM |
| 38 | Since I'm not Hispanic I am not exactly believing in dual language in the first place!! | 2/19/2017 6:36 PM |
| 39 | Change should not be rushed. | 2/19/2017 5:25 PM |
| 40 | This is a very complicated proposal which will be very disruptive to the educational process and the community, especially the Latino community. It should be implemented slowly to mitigate the ensuring chaos. Logistically, it needs to be done slowly. | 2/19/2017 4:28 PM |
| 41 | least disruptive | 2/19/2017 3:50 PM |
| 42 | I think for students and staff, as well-implemented programming, slow is almost always better. Learn from mistakes is much easier this way. | 2/19/2017 3:08 PM |
| 43 | It seems like the least disruptive for the students. | 2/19/2017 2:57 PM |
| 44 | Easier transition for both students and staff. | 2/19/2017 1:58 PM |
| 45 | Simplicity | 2/19/2017 1:45 PM |

Bilingual Committee Seeks Input on Proposed Changes

SurveyMonkey

| | | |
|----|---|--------------------|
| 46 | Less disruption to current students and it will give you a chance to test the financial and logistical impacts of this move on a smaller student population before having to roll it out on a grand scale; however, a fast approach would make the most sense for families with multiple children in the dual-language program since then half of the families wouldn't have to send their kids to separate schools. I assume more families have all their children enrolled in one program or another than have multiple children enrolled in both programs, but maybe you could check those statistics before deciding. | 2/19/2017 1:21 PM |
| 47 | Kids shouldn't be uprooted after they've started school somewhere and made connections with staff and other students. | 2/19/2017 1:00 PM |
| 48 | Na | 2/19/2017 11:58 AM |
| 49 | Wherever the program is established, I would strongly argue in favor of a SLOW roll out so that there is time to work out challenges in program changes. I believe that moving more quickly would lead to chaos and additional problems. Perhaps additional supports to English-only classes could be provided in the meantime to help supplement during the transition. | 2/19/2017 10:31 AM |
| 50 | adjust program one move at a time | 2/19/2017 9:56 AM |
| 51 | I am appalled that children in non-dual, traditional classrooms at Blue Ridge would be moved to other schools where needed support services would not be available. These are families that lack resources taken for granted elsewhere. Busing children will effectively eliminate after-school programming for many. Levels of parental involvement will fall. Children that depend on Blue Ridge health services will not find the same assistance in other schools. | 2/19/2017 9:27 AM |
| 52 | I think that this approach would have the smallest impact on everyone involved - parents, students, & staff. I think that it would also expose any further issues that might arise as the transition happens making those things easier to evaluate & fix whereas a drastic change could cause huge issues all at once. | 2/19/2017 9:07 AM |
| 53 | it lets the children already in school stay where they have been and are comfortable | 2/19/2017 8:55 AM |
| 54 | While some children would be more adaptive to these changes, there are many children who will not take these changes well and will be negatively affected by them. While it might be easier for the district to do this all at once, the ones who will be affected the most, and could have negative implications for years in the future would benefit from the slow approach. | 2/19/2017 8:51 AM |
| 55 | [REDACTED] | 2/19/2017 7:50 AM |
| 56 | Seems best for the students and families. | 2/19/2017 7:31 AM |
| 57 | You haven't realized the impact | 2/19/2017 12:35 AM |
| 58 | The slow implementation will ensure that students will maintain their peer groups, specialist teachers, support staff, anticipated teachers, and the learning environment that they have become accustomed to. Children tend to function best in a predictable and structured environment. Changes to these things increases their stress and makes them less able to learn and behave productively. If we want children to learn and have a better chance at success, we will implement changes slowly. The dual program, at least at Sharpstein was implemented slowly at its inception. It worked well. The slow implementation will put administrators in a better position to make staff placements that will maximize the learning opportunities for students. If teachers are shuffled around hastily, as well as students shuffled around hastily, there WILL BE MISTAKES. The negative outcomes will be felt for years to come. [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] | 2/18/2017 10:34 PM |
| 59 | When adding the dual language program into Sharpstein, the slow roll out approach was used and it was very successful for both student and staff transition. The slow approach would allow time to carefully consider program, staffing and student transitions. This is essentially when bringing about such a change to programming, facilities, and staffing. A fast implementation would bring on a degree of stress that is hard to predicted the impact on students, parents, staff, and the community. | 2/18/2017 10:10 PM |
| 60 | Logistics relative to facility and curriculum transition of this size Hoping to avoid scenario in which my 3 elementary children, and other families children are split between different locations if they don't all get in to The dual program | 2/18/2017 10:07 PM |
| 61 | Seems less disruptive. | 2/18/2017 9:26 PM |
| 62 | This with give the staff, parents and students more time to adjust to the changes. | 2/18/2017 6:54 PM |
| 63 | I think this will be easier for both families struggling with the switch and for the district as transportation needs change. Having said that, I hope the district has a plan in place to address how thin the English-only teachers are spread in the meantime. | 2/18/2017 5:43 PM |
| 64 | I believe my answers speak to my opinion on this matter. | 2/18/2017 2:43 PM |

Bilingual Committee Seeks Input on Proposed Changes

SurveyMonkey

| | | |
|----|--|--------------------|
| 65 | I think that there are going to be a number of kinks that need to be worked out in the new program and it is best to slowly implement the program and figure things out as you go. There is also the situation where parents selected the schools that their children currently attend (even the parents that aren't happy with the current programming who could open enroll elsewhere) and I think that child should be allowed to finish their education at that school. Also kids don't necessarily do well with change and in many instances they already have friends in their classes and a comfort level with everyone in their grade. The fast model seems ridiculous to me. Too many changes in too short of a time. | 2/18/2017 1:42 PM |
| 66 | I chose slow because it will allow the students to remain at their current location | 2/18/2017 1:07 PM |
| 67 | Prefer the stability of this approach | 2/18/2017 11:53 AM |
| 68 | Fast is too confusing | 2/18/2017 3:47 AM |
| 69 | Children need consistency and stability in their educational environment. Allowing them to continue their elementary education in a familiar setting is ideal. | 2/18/2017 1:50 AM |
| 70 | Because students should finish their current school year in the schools they have been attending all year long | 2/17/2017 9:29 PM |
| 71 | It gives students time to adjust to the transition | 2/17/2017 9:14 PM |
| 72 | I do not want to move my daughter to a new school due to her 504 plan and all the support she is currently receiving. | 2/17/2017 8:43 PM |
| 73 | This is going to be a very difficult transition for families and staff. The slow approach will give adequate time for a more well-planned transition. This transition, while desperately needed, is going to hurt a lot of families, so if we can do it more slowly it will give people more time to adjust. | 2/17/2017 8:41 PM |
| 74 | The children who are currently attending their respective schools deserve to stay at the schools they are already at. Taking any faster route would not only be confusing and stressful for the children but it would also mess up the teachers as well, as some may need to relocate or find new jobs. It is very unfair to have children moving around for no reason, when this is a very important time in their lives to learn consistency and structure. | 2/17/2017 8:28 PM |
| 75 | Think of the kids | 2/17/2017 7:53 PM |
| 76 | It gives the staff and families more time to adjust to changes. | 2/17/2017 7:26 PM |
| 77 | Least negative impact on students currently enrolled at schools involved | 2/17/2017 6:24 PM |
| 78 | In my opinion, the slow roll out is the only responsible approach, in order for the district to be able to address the inevitable unanticipated problems that will arise in a thoughtful and deliberate manner, rather than in what may turn out to be haste and chaos if the changes are made all at once. It is simply unfair to throw up all the pieces into the air at once and see where they land, so to speak, when the experiment is on the education/lives of children. The moderate and fast approaches both have the potential to drastically affect children's (and their families') trust in, feelings about, and commitment to school. | 2/17/2017 5:09 PM |
| 79 | We've heard time and again that kids do better when they get to go to one school the whole way through. A slow rollout achieves that. Also, families — like mine — who specifically bought a house in the neighborhood so their child could go to the school in that neighborhood — should be respected. Pulling the rug out in a fast rollout might be good for staff, but not kids and parents. | 2/17/2017 4:41 PM |
| 80 | Children are delicate they need to stay comfortable | 2/17/2017 4:31 PM |
| 81 | It is completely unfair and unreasonable to move only some kids out of their neighborhood schools, students at only the poorest schools in town. Neither of the two richer schools are affected. Moving kids is detrimental to their stability and transportation needs are a valid concern. Neighborhood schools are also crucial to this community and one of the things that makes small town living appealing. I can see my neighborhood school from my house, can hear the kids playing at recess. I intentionally bought a house in this neighborhood, taking on the risk of a higher mortgage, specifically to be here and be able to have my child walk to school. That we would be forced to relocate at the very neighborhood we moved from makes me extremely worried. We were not within walking distance before, and that was a major reason to move. I decided to move so my child could walk to school. To have my child be bussed or be driven twice a day instead of walk to school is not a healthy outcome. I am also worried about the psychological impact of not being allowed to go to the school she has been attending, that she sees from her front yard. If the roll out allows for children staying and finishing out at their present school, I am supportive of this plan as it seems to be making a dual only school one of the only ways to avoid the problems associated with single strands. Honestly, if you had asked me, would you rather keep your child in the single strand situation -or- bus/drive her to a different school, I would say - I would already have open enrolled her elsewhere if I thought the single strand thing was that big of a problem. It isn't "that" big of a problem. So, roll it out slowly, so children are not uprooted. | 2/17/2017 4:17 PM |
| 82 | so not as many kids are negatively affected | 2/17/2017 4:10 PM |
| 83 | least impact on all kids | 2/17/2017 4:00 PM |

Bilingual Committee Seeks Input on Proposed Changes

SurveyMonkey

| | | |
|-----|--|-------------------|
| 84 | I already have a grandchild that is upset about having to move when the transition time has not yet been confirmed. Pulling kids out of their school is very stressful for them. While I understand the Districts reasoning for change, let's not cause any more anxiety than necessary. | 2/17/2017 3:51 PM |
| 85 | Since I believe the whole idea of converting a school to only dual language is ridiculous, the longer it takes to implement the system, the better. My kids would much rather stay at Sharpstein than move to Edison. And they have made friends with students in both the dual program and traditional program and it would be nice if they could all stay in the same building. | 2/17/2017 3:47 PM |
| 86 | it will not affect as many kids | 2/17/2017 3:40 PM |
| 87 | To give people time to adjust to the change | 2/17/2017 3:39 PM |
| 88 | it will negatively affect the least amount of students | 2/17/2017 3:34 PM |
| 89 | So my child can stay at Green Park | 2/17/2017 3:25 PM |
| 90 | I believe the slow approach would least negatively affect the children currently in the schools involved. My daughter has anxiety and I know this has already affected her because she has been told that her friends in the dual classes would be going to a different school. she looks forward to the time she gets to spend with the dual kids at lunch, recess, p.e., music, and library. I am sure there are MANY other students that it would negatively affect them because they have already made close friendships by 2nd or 3rd grade. | 2/17/2017 3:25 PM |
| 91 | The moderate transition breaks families up. For instance, regardless of the model, if the transition is moderate, my current second grader and kindergartner would be in different schools next year, depending on the choice between Edison and Sharpstein, if the transition is moderate. And if you were to go with Model one, then I would also be opposed to the fast transition because students already in the program are going to be removed. At none of the information meetings that I attended was the question of how students would be removed from the program satisfactorily answered. Surely it must be more than just testing--if there are other factors on the table for getting into the program--such as siblings etc.,--these must also be taken into account, no? I understand that a slow transition means that students already in single traditional tracks at Edison and Sharpstein, are stuck. But I'm opposed to kids being summarily dismissed from the dual program and to families being split apart. On that basis, a slow transition to model 2 is the only option that makes sense to me. | 2/17/2017 3:23 PM |
| 92 | So my son can finish at Green Park | 2/17/2017 3:21 PM |
| 93 | I don't agree with these approaches, they should stay as they are. | 2/17/2017 3:11 PM |
| 94 | Less effect on kids already started at a school. | 2/17/2017 2:37 PM |
| 95 | students need time to adjust to new enviromental.. | 2/17/2017 2:37 PM |
| 96 | I am on the fence on this. For my comfort a slow move seems easier but if the English strand classrooms are doing poorly/ overcrowded than we need to make the change sooner than later. | 2/17/2017 2:29 PM |
| 97 | The slow approach is necessary to measure the impact of this change over time and make adjustments as needed. The potential ramifications of this change, especially if fast, may not be realized for years down the road. Let's move wisely (slowly, based on experience) to mitigate those potential pratfalls. | 2/17/2017 2:28 PM |
| 98 | Staff and transportation need time to prepare. It will not be a drastic change for the children. | 2/17/2017 2:25 PM |
| 99 | I think its to fast to make changes. As time wise. | 2/17/2017 2:20 PM |
| 100 | I like the grandfathering in Option 1. | 2/17/2017 2:14 PM |
| 101 | I do not think the fast implementation would be a good choice, given the potential transportation implications/costs. I also think it is clear there is a lot of trepidation on the part of our local community to move that quickly with this change. I prefer the slow model because otherwise it is likely I will have kids at more than one location. A slow model provides more time for people to become comfortable with the change. To be sure, if we go with the slow model, we still need to address the issues plaguing the single-strand English classrooms. That needs to be _the_ priority for the school system. If we do move to the moderate approach, I would like to see a real emphasis placed on not splitting up families. My family only has one car and it would be difficult to have to travel to Blue Ridge and Edison/Sharpstein after I get off work to pick them up, to say nothing of the fact that my kids wouldn't be in after-school care together. I know this is a difficult process with no easy answers. I am grateful for all of the multiple opportunities to provide feedback. Thank you for all of the time and energy you have invested in helping us create educational opportunities so that all students can succeed. | 2/17/2017 2:00 PM |
| 102 | This model sounds ideal because it would not require children already enrolled in elementary school to move to a different school, which could be disruptive for the student and the family. Although I oppose the 1-school plan, I would especially favor this model under the 1-school plan, as it would be a tragedy if students currently in dual immersion were pushed out because of the reduction in seats. | 2/17/2017 1:46 PM |

Bilingual Committee Seeks Input on Proposed Changes

SurveyMonkey

| | | |
|-----|--|--------------------|
| 103 | I would vote for the least cost to the school district. I would then vote for the least hassle for the parents and children already involved. | 2/17/2017 1:17 PM |
| 104 | There is no reason to take the students already enrolled in non dual at their respective schools and cause stress and confusion by moving them to a different school. Elementary school is an important time for children to learn structure and it's hard for that to happen if you're making them move schools. | 2/17/2017 11:10 AM |
| 105 | The children already enrolled in the non-dual program deserve to stay at the school they are currently enrolled in. It would cause too much distress and unnecessary confusion between schools to move them to a new one so quickly. | 2/17/2017 11:04 AM |
| 106 | I believe that parents with children entering kindergarten will be the most open-minded as to whether their children go to Blue Ridge or Sharpstein. Also, start fresh; don't bring a lot of resentment into the program. | 2/17/2017 10:48 AM |
| 107 | The slow implementation would give everyone involved time to adapt and process. | 2/17/2017 10:14 AM |
| 108 | It has the least disruption for students. | 2/17/2017 9:43 AM |
| 109 | These children are learning and making relationships with teachers and students that could last for years to come unless we step in and tear them apart. The future students wouldn't know anything else and mentally wouldn't take a toll on them like it would the current student body. | 2/17/2017 9:29 AM |
| 110 | Students should have the option to stay at their current school and finish their elementary years with their current peers/teachers. | 2/17/2017 9:08 AM |
| 111 | I believe that my child (who is in a traditional classroom) should be allowed to continue his education at the school we are zoned for. Disrupting his education just for the sake of dual classes is unnecessary in my opinion and does nothing but punish children who are not in the dual program. | 2/17/2017 9:04 AM |
| 112 | I think this would be the easiest for staff and families to stomach. Sweeping changes would have a larger negative impact. It will also give families time to have their children already enrolled in bilingual programming see it through to the end, which was what they thought would happen when opted to have their children in this program. It will also give the district time to make more informed decisions on transportation, staffing, and programming. | 2/17/2017 8:59 AM |
| 113 | None of the above I do not agree with children being forced to move | 2/17/2017 8:41 AM |
| 114 | I want my child to remain in their current location and allowed to finish grade school without this ridiculous hassle! | 2/17/2017 8:35 AM |
| 115 | I like Blue Ridge and would like for my daughter to stay in this school, I would just like for the Spanish part to be a part of her learning. | 2/17/2017 8:13 AM |
| 116 | Least amount of confusion involved | 2/17/2017 7:48 AM |
| 117 | This is unfortunate. This program can only benefit the district and its students and families, but the immediate full implementation would require moving students and that is just stupid. If, of course, every school did this it wouldn't be an issue. | 2/17/2017 7:15 AM |
| 118 | zxcz | 2/17/2017 7:14 AM |
| 119 | Actually I am not really in favour of any of these options but this is the choice you gave me. You should not move kids out of their schools based on your agenda to push dual on us. | 2/17/2017 6:46 AM |
| 120 | Makes the most sense. Why screw up a child's routine. | 2/17/2017 12:16 AM |
| 121 | Changes are difficult. I feel both models are horrible. | 2/16/2017 11:26 PM |
| 122 | Change the rules for new kindergartners. Leave kids in the school they already in. Give options for parents if they want to move their kids to a different school and leave transportation the same as now. No transportation for students who opened enrolled. | 2/16/2017 9:49 PM |
| 123 | I have kids at both ends of the grade spectrum. I can't stand the thought of my kids not going to the same school. How would I pick them both up? How do they get to their after school babysitter when I'm at work? I support the change but doing this at anything besides the slow approach will negatively affect too many people. The Slow approach also gives the parents of those new Kindergartners options to make the best informed decision that works for their situation. I don't like the idea of any children being forced to move away from a school they already attend. This will also give the school district the opportunity to modify and grow with the change as unforeseen challenges occur. | 2/16/2017 9:21 PM |
| 124 | Less anxiety for the children. | 2/16/2017 9:06 PM |
| 125 | It took me a long time (for whatever reason on the schools part) to get my children into the dual programs, don't punish us that truly want and appreciate this program by scattering us throughout town! Leave our kids where they are already familiar with teachers and other students and start implementing with the kindergarten class. | 2/16/2017 9:05 PM |
| 126 | I don't choose slow, I choose leave the children and schools alone. All kids learn different and making this change will affect all families in many different ways. | 2/16/2017 8:43 PM |

Bilingual Committee Seeks Input on Proposed Changes

SurveyMonkey

| | | |
|-----|--|--------------------|
| 127 | The transition time will allow for staff to adjust whatever needed to make the program succeed over time. | 2/16/2017 8:33 PM |
| 128 | Slow approach to transition children appropriately. | 2/16/2017 8:25 PM |
| 129 | It seems the "do the least harm" approach. | 2/16/2017 7:46 PM |
| 130 | Less disruptive and gives more time to evaluate the process. | 2/16/2017 6:19 PM |
| 131 | The transitioning is going to be challenging for kids that have to move. Letting those who are in finish out where they are at is preferable. This still will cause problems for people with kids already started that may end up with kids at different schools though. | 2/16/2017 6:10 PM |
| 132 | Gives families and staff and district more time to plan. Students can finish at their current school. | 2/16/2017 4:16 PM |
| 133 | I think the most successful approach for the students is to let them complete their primary education at the school where they started in the neighborhood in which they live. | 2/16/2017 3:16 PM |
| 134 | It makes more sense in every way. Current students have a chance to finish in/at the home school the have built as rapport with. Current staff won't be ripped out of their building, creating a Mass Exodus. Custodial staff summer deep cleaning will not be as impacted, with moving teachers and their classrooms in and out. | 2/16/2017 2:35 PM |
| 135 | I believe the district should provide the least disruptive transition model possible. What seems like a small change from our point of view can have drastic consequences in the life of our students and families. | 2/16/2017 2:32 PM |
| 136 | I have a 4th grader currently I don't want her to have to switch to a new for her final year of elementary school. Same goes for my 1st grader I would not want her to have to switch schools midway through her elementary education. | 2/16/2017 2:30 PM |
| 137 | N | 2/16/2017 2:24 PM |
| 138 | To fast and it will upset to many parents. | 2/16/2017 1:58 PM |
| 139 | This transition is already a huge shake-up, which I believe will create bigger problems than the ones it seeks to solve. Also, this transition is too hasty (you plan to implement in 6 months, and you don't even know what you are going to do yet. Therefore, the slowest version of transition would be the best of the options presented above. | 2/16/2017 1:47 PM |
| 140 | I want my kid to stay at Sharpstein until he's done. Moving once was already hard enough. | 2/16/2017 1:46 PM |
| 141 | If Sharpstein is not picked as a school under any approach I want a slow transition so my kids who are currently enrolled there don't have to go to a different school. I have one soon to be kindergartner and I want all my kids to stay at the same school. If Sharpstein is picked under either approach I would be OK with Moderate or Fast/Full implementation because it would not impact my family. I do not want my kids going to different elementary school and [REDACTED] | 2/16/2017 1:39 PM |
| 142 | I think that a slow approach would less likely traumatize the children and parents that are currently enrolled at the schools that would be affected. | 2/16/2017 1:08 PM |
| 143 | Slow, my son started kindergarten this year. Sharpstein is within walking distance, he wants to finish his elementary career where he started. | 2/16/2017 12:49 PM |
| 144 | I prefer both the slow and the fast implementation. Slow would allow for more time to process and for students currently in program to not have to uproot and change schools. However, there are changes that just need to happen sooner rather than later. | 2/16/2017 12:48 PM |
| 145 | I don't want my kid to be forced to move schools half way through elementary just because someone doesn't want dual where he is now. I'm also sad because my younger son will be starting soon and now he may not be with his brother. That's more driving around for me and they were/are looking forward to being together. | 2/16/2017 12:39 PM |
| 146 | Children shouldn't be forced out of their school | 2/16/2017 12:27 PM |
| 147 | Changing schools is stressful for students and parents. To force them to do so is disrespectful of choices that brought them there. | 2/16/2017 12:04 PM |
| 148 | If not carefully implemented, many students are going to be shifted to another school. | 2/16/2017 12:01 PM |
| 149 | / | 2/16/2017 11:36 AM |
| 150 | The timeline is too short for the fast approach. I could be talked into moderate, but the slow approach lets everyone know exactly what will be happening. The moderate pan is a bit of a bait and switch to move the K-1 people now. | 2/16/2017 11:23 AM |
| 151 | If this plan must go forward, give yourselves time to search and traverse to find out how it will work best. | 2/16/2017 11:19 AM |
| 152 | When a new music program is created in a school, this is usually the model it follows. You start with your first incoming class and teach them as beginners so you're not teaching seniors in high school beginning instrumental music. I think it will be easier on kids, parents, teachers, and administration to follow this pattern. | 2/16/2017 11:15 AM |

Bilingual Committee Seeks Input on Proposed Changes

SurveyMonkey

| | | |
|-----|---|--------------------|
| 153 | Staff needs to be prepared through PD and movement. Families need to prepare. Fast roll out would cause major displacement right away! | 2/16/2017 10:46 AM |
| 154 | It's all about smooth transitions and trying to get it right the first time. If the change is done in a moderate or fast/full transition there really isn't an easy fix for student that are already accustomed to the routines set prior to the change. This way the Kinder grade will model the new routine for the grades to come. | 2/16/2017 10:12 AM |
| 155 | The transition to any of these approached should be slow. It should start with one school (Edison), and the transition should be slow, thoughtful for parents/staff/students implications, and progressively evolve. | 2/16/2017 9:58 AM |
| 156 | Start from K for school year 2017-2018 then move on to moderate the following school year. | 2/16/2017 9:57 AM |
| 157 | I feel that the slow approach would be the least disruptive for the students who currently attend those schools. For so many of our students, the strong emotional/personal daily connection that they have with the adults at their schools is the ONE constant they have in their lives. To suddenly take that away would be unsettling and possibly cause the students to backslide academically and emotionally. So many of our students have ACES and it is important to provide them with the most stable and predictable environment as possible. | 2/16/2017 9:57 AM |
| 158 | Not all grades are currently in a dual program. | 2/16/2017 9:25 AM |
| 159 | I favor Slow because then my children would be allowed to remain in dual language at Green Park. | 2/16/2017 9:24 AM |
| 160 | It would be a hardship to parents to parents to force their kids to be attending two different grade schools if one is in the dual program that gets moved to another school. Plus it would be a shock and frightening to younger students to "know" they are going to one school, then get bumped to another school. Some kids may chose to back out of the program just to keep in the same school their siblings are/have attended. | 2/16/2017 9:04 AM |
| 161 | there will be transportation issues for parents and it is better that they know when enrolling the kids, also the kids usually like to stay with their friends | 2/16/2017 8:59 AM |
| 162 | I really can't answer which way is more effective. | 2/16/2017 8:58 AM |
| 163 | I bought my home in a school district that I was told my child would go to school in. If I wanted my child to be bused to another school I would have bought my home in that district. I for one think this is a very stupid idea for you to force my child to be bused somewhere else for school when my option was the ONE I CHOOSE. Just how do you think you are going to be paying for the teachers, the busses and anything else that you have to have with this mess. I for one will not be voting for more taxes to supplement this program. LEAVE THE SCHOOLS THE WAY THEY ARE AND GET BACK TO BASIC TEACHING THE KIDS. | 2/16/2017 8:41 AM |
| 164 | You are basically inducing reverse segregation. Putting all the native Spanish speakers or kids that prefer to learn Spanish in one or two locations and you will inadvertently house all the non-Spanish in the other schools. SO WRONG! Why on earth can't EACH school offer dual language in a couple classrooms. By segregating them to one or two schools you will be removing the diversity from the other schools. | 2/16/2017 8:39 AM |
| 165 | I think that the other two approaches, moderate or fast/full would be very hard on the students currently in the programs and could lead to challenges with the programs success as well since the transition would happen too quickly both for the students and staff and might not lend enough time for preparation and setup. | 2/16/2017 8:34 AM |
| 166 | easiest transition for parents and students | 2/16/2017 8:33 AM |
| 167 | When we changed all the boundary lines a few years ago it was hard for families to adjust. I think we learned that the community accepts our changes easier when it is done slowly. | 2/16/2017 8:33 AM |
| 168 | incase sharpstein gets selected I don't want my son to have to change schools | 2/16/2017 8:23 AM |
| 169 | Honestly, I think parents of current students should be the group to vote and make this decision—not the rest of us. I answered as if my child was still at Edison. | 2/16/2017 8:19 AM |
| 170 | Optional language is fine, but making this a big deal is getting ridiculous | 2/16/2017 8:12 AM |
| 171 | So this is a dilemma because I believe we need to do something for the children that the dual program is not working for. For my child who has mild anxiety and is in the 3rd grade I would prefer he not have to move or change. But the non-parent in me would vote for moderate change as long as there is room for all the children currently in the program. | 2/16/2017 7:58 AM |
| 172 | A rapid transition like this is going to be so disruptive to so many students. Also, there are many families who have intentionally purchased homes in a specific district to qualify to have their kids attend at a specific school. A gradual model gives kids the chance to adjust to it and is least disruptive. Even talking about the possibility of a school change in our household has resulted in many tears being shed...it's just too abrupt. Families would need to rapidly adjust their schedules and lives for different school start/end times and different transportation options and those families who have intentionally purchased or rented homes in a specific district need the time to either adjust to the changes or choose to move to a different district. | 2/16/2017 7:58 AM |

Bilingual Committee Seeks Input on Proposed Changes

SurveyMonkey

| | | |
|-----|---|--------------------|
| 173 | no reason | 2/16/2017 7:57 AM |
| 174 | Poor kids, they'll wonder what's happening. | 2/16/2017 7:35 AM |
| 175 | There will inevitably be "teething problems" or kinks to get worked out as the new plan is enacted. The slow approach will allow these problems to be addressed more easily and make them less overwhelming. | 2/16/2017 7:29 AM |
| 176 | I don't see why anything needs to change. You're forgetting the adults who have spent thousands on a house to be in a specific district who will now have to scramble to get kids to and from school in a completely different area from where they live. | 2/16/2017 7:28 AM |
| 177 | I don't believe the children should be segregated | 2/16/2017 7:27 AM |
| 178 | Changing anything too quickly is too hard on children. | 2/16/2017 7:27 AM |
| 179 | Not at all,... | 2/16/2017 7:11 AM |
| 180 | Would like to see this program end. | 2/16/2017 7:05 AM |
| 181 | this will meet my families needs and my child's needs best and seems to give extra time to figure out transportation, etc. | 2/16/2017 7:01 AM |
| 182 | I do not believe any child should be forced to go to a school outside of their district they live in just because of a dual language program. | 2/16/2017 6:15 AM |
| 183 | Kindergartens need time to transition, most already developed a relationship with peers and teachers. This needs time to understand the move and why. | 2/16/2017 6:07 AM |
| 184 | Should it be done at all | 2/16/2017 6:03 AM |
| 185 | Children who are already established would benefit from the slow transition. Disrupting their known routine and course could affect their learning and hold them back if they have to start over during elementary years. | 2/16/2017 5:33 AM |
| 186 | I don't think it is a good idea to rush any of it because then you end up with older kids who are thrown out of their comfort zone all the while still learning some difficult Spanish. Just taking baby steps seems like a better option as to not disrupt those already in the program. | 2/16/2017 3:33 AM |
| 187 | I don't think it is appropriate to move the kids so quickly where they have gone to school for a couple years and are used to it and have friends. From being a person who moved from school-to-school it was very hard to make friends and be accepted! I do not wish this upon my son and do not think or believe that a fast approach is right!! | 2/16/2017 12:05 AM |
| 188 | This process gives the teachers and parents more time to plan thing accordingly. It also doesn't put the children into shock with so many changes at a single time. Also with the method, there will be more time to find more Bilingual Instructors for the various grade levels. | 2/15/2017 11:44 PM |
| 189 | This is a huge change ! | 2/15/2017 11:15 PM |
| 190 | Why are we only given the choice to change in either scenario? The committee has not adequately polled the public about this false transition. | 2/15/2017 10:54 PM |
| 191 | In the meeting, we were told that in the moderate approach, the K-1 included only incoming kinders and 2017-18 1st graders, which would indicate that current first graders are not impacted by the restructuring. However, the wording on the survey suggests that in the moderate approach, currently enrolled 1st graders would be affected in the restructuring. My son is in the 1st grade bilingual program at Sharpstein and I do not want him to be uprooted. I would rather see him miss out on the bilingual program than be uprooted to a new school across town with different friends and their families. That would have a big impact on many families. If you want to minimize impact on children and their families, a slow roll out is much more desirable. In addition, a slow roll out will allow the district to work out kinks and funding more effectively. | 2/15/2017 10:20 PM |
| 192 | This approach may elicit the same benefits over time while causing the least disruption in layout. | 2/15/2017 10:18 PM |
| 193 | If you are moving kids out of a class to another school that can disrupt friendships and cause anxiety with kids and family. Who knows - kids are resilient. Ask a psychologist please. | 2/15/2017 10:16 PM |
| 194 | There children it will take time for them to understand the difference in ABC's in Spanish and English.... As a bilingual father I was taught by my parents and they where taught by there's so having a proper education program makes thing easy for are kids to understand but not to rush them in the fact that question will be asked as I'm " why is it car red in English but in Spanish it means red car" having to explane this to a 4 or 5 year old is like having to explain to a 4 or 5 year old. Hahaha.. | 2/15/2017 10:15 PM |
| 195 | Gives district time to implement plan in an organized manner. Fewer families will be forced to choose between continuing in Dual or be split. Although I chose slow, the fast/full implementation is the option that I am fully against. | 2/15/2017 10:14 PM |

Bilingual Committee Seeks Input on Proposed Changes

SurveyMonkey

| | | |
|-----|---|--------------------|
| 196 | This is a major change that will require time. Parents, teachers, and administrators will all need time to adjust. The slow implementation would have the least impact on families and staff. | 2/15/2017 10:13 PM |
| 197 | Since the district is taking a data-based approach, measuring the impacts and improvements associated with any changes, the slow approach would allow for a more careful transition that might maximize the feedback loop of any lessons the data have to teach us along the pathway to transition. | 2/15/2017 10:13 PM |
| 198 | I think it is important to consider the impact it has in families and students. The slow approach would have less impact on students, and new kinders would enter school with slow approach model in place. It would also have less impact on staff members. | 2/15/2017 10:11 PM |
| 199 | Easier transition for current students | 2/15/2017 9:57 PM |
| 200 | None!!!@@@ | 2/15/2017 9:56 PM |
| 201 | So this will be done regardless... Way to ignore the voters again | 2/15/2017 9:56 PM |
| 202 | It would be better to start with a fresh batch of kids in the program rather than disrupting the routines and comfort of existing students. Students learn best when they are in predictable and familiar learning environments. | 2/15/2017 9:56 PM |
| 203 | The slow approach would result in the least disruption to students and families. | 2/15/2017 9:54 PM |
| 204 | Best for the majority | 2/15/2017 9:53 PM |
| 205 | I think this needs to be stopped. It is fine if people want to opt in to this but really. People but homes near a specific school to have their kid go to that school not to have to worry about transportation to another school because the school district is uprooting them. | 2/15/2017 9:53 PM |
| 206 | I don't think I understand whether the grade levels references in the "moderate" and "fast" implementations refer to this year or next year. At least this much is clear in the "slow" proposal, and it is hard to think about large numbers of students being forced to change schools all at once. The disadvantage, of course, is that families with older children in dual language programs at other schools may find they are split between schools. This could impact the number of families who are willing to participate initially. Also, this plan leaves unresolved, for the next 5 years, the problem of the singleton English-only sections at Sharpstein and Edison, which would continue until next year's kindergartners reach the 5th grade. On the plus side, a gradual implementation may make it possible to address unanticipated issues on a much smaller scale, or even to reverse the decision more easily, if things do not seem to be working. | 2/15/2017 9:34 PM |
| 207 | I really have no basis for the implementation chosen except it allows the children the opportunity to remain in their current school. | 2/15/2017 9:23 PM |
| 208 | It is less disruptive to current students. Also, it may allow more time to further refine these plans, which feel a little too rushed. | 2/15/2017 9:10 PM |
| 209 | Not at all is my preference - period! | 2/15/2017 8:43 PM |
| 210 | Slow... let the people in there finish in what they've started! | 2/15/2017 8:24 PM |
| 211 | Less stressful for our students and families. | 2/15/2017 8:06 PM |
| 212 | People would probably adjust better to this option because they have more options. There wouldn't be as many transportation costs. If this model doesn't work well, it seems it would be the easiest option to change to something else. | 2/15/2017 7:34 PM |
| 213 | I favor the slow implementation because this wouldn't change my sons school. It would make a difference as to where my daughter goes when she starts kindergarten, but that's years down the road. One less thing to worry about right now | 2/15/2017 7:33 PM |
| 214 | Slow, since I'm forced to choose. Because a student wouldn't have to change elementary school and more of a chance to have two or more siblings attend the same school. If not all of them are enrolled in the program. | 2/15/2017 7:33 PM |
| 215 | It's a big change and should be introduced slowly | 2/15/2017 7:11 PM |
| 216 | Don't care | 2/15/2017 7:07 PM |
| 217 | It would be easier for current students to get use to the change from the way schools have been run up to now also parents. | 2/15/2017 7:01 PM |
| 218 | This model would have the least effect on my children. | 2/15/2017 7:01 PM |
| 219 | At least my children can graduate before you implement this travesty of education. | 2/15/2017 6:59 PM |
| 220 | It is best to keep children at their schools with their friends and classmates. | 2/15/2017 6:59 PM |
| 221 | I don't support this. Hopefully a slow approach gives the necessary time to address problems and concerns as they come up. If you go thru with this a slow approach would yield the most favorable results. | 2/15/2017 6:53 PM |

Bilingual Committee Seeks Input on Proposed Changes

SurveyMonkey

| | | |
|-----|---|-------------------|
| 222 | I think the idea to segregate children is wrong and this is a horrible idea. Anyone who believes this is OK needs to look into how this will hurt the school system in Walla walla There are many families that do not feel that they should have to put their children in a bilingual classes... | 2/15/2017 6:49 PM |
| 223 | Like mentioned in previous question I think this is a big move for students. I'm undecided depending on chosen schools if my child will stay in the dual program. He is not strong in any language and struggles enough with the program to add extra changes. I understand he might not move with his current group but this might give him a chance to advanced and focus only in one language. | 2/15/2017 6:49 PM |
| 224 | I can't fathom why you would do this anyway besides a slow transition. | 2/15/2017 6:48 PM |
| 225 | None English should be taught. English will suffer. I want my children to learn English and excel in English. | 2/15/2017 6:46 PM |
| 226 | Least complicated | 2/15/2017 6:40 PM |
| 227 | I just don't want my kids be moved to a different school | 2/15/2017 6:40 PM |
| 228 | Staffing issues, easing staff and parents into changes. | 2/15/2017 6:39 PM |
| 229 | It will allow my son to continue at Sharpstien til he's done in the fifth grade. | 2/15/2017 6:35 PM |
| 230 | Slower approach would be better | 2/15/2017 6:34 PM |
| 231 | Less impact to students and staff | 2/15/2017 3:52 PM |
| 232 | I think a slow approach is best as expectations from families about where children will be going to school is a big deal and I would hate people to feel forced. It would only create problems in the future. | 2/15/2017 3:28 PM |
| 233 | It affects families with more than one child in the school. Changes at this level can be a huge adjustment let alone getting children to different schools. | 2/15/2017 2:06 PM |