

STRATEGIC RIGHTSIZING:

A Guide for Large Urban School Systems

OCTOBER 2026

1956 70 2026 YEARS

Council of the Great City Schools

CONTENTS

Introduction 4

Guiding Principle 1: Student Opportunity First 7

Guiding Principle 2: Leadership Alignment 9

Guiding Principle 3: Community Engagement 12

Guiding Principle 4: Data-Driven Planning 16

Guiding Principle 5: Support for Transition & Repurposing 19

Resources 22


EXIT

The Case for Rightsizing and the Unique Challenges and Opportunities Faced by Large Urban Districts

Urban school systems across the country are at an inflection point. Declining enrollment, shifting population patterns, aging facilities, and mounting fiscal pressure are forcing district leaders to confront a difficult but unavoidable reality: many school systems are no longer optimized to meet the needs of the students they serve. These districts are operating far more buildings than current enrollment can support, a mismatch that produces inequitable access to high-quality programs, staffing constraints, underutilized and aging facilities, and strained budgets. Bringing them back into alignment isn't optional, it's what is necessary to give every student access to strong learning environments and enrichment opportunities. In this context, rightsizing—the thoughtful consolidation and optimization of schools, staff, and resources—has emerged as a necessary yet complex strategy for improving student outcomes.

Schools are not simply buildings; they are anchors of community identity and history, and decisions about consolidation can surface fear, frustration, and resistance from families, educators, and community members alike. District leaders need to anticipate that response and plan for it from the outset, approaching the process with transparency, consistency, and an unwavering commitment to student-centered outcomes.

For members of the Council of the Great City Schools, these decisions carry additional weight. CGCS districts serve high concentrations of students experiencing poverty, educate diverse populations with complex needs, and often operate aging infrastructure shaped by decades of funding and resource inequity. They must navigate overlapping governance structures, heightened political visibility, and, in many cases, a history of school closures that has disproportionately affected communities of color. These realities demand an approach to rightsizing that is analytically rigorous and, just as importantly, deeply attentive to equity, community trust, and long-term impact.

At the same time, rightsizing presents district leaders with real opportunities. By consolidating facilities and aligning staffing and resources more effectively, districts can reinvest in stronger academic programs, improve facility conditions, expand student supports, and build more coherent, sustainable systems, moving from a model of scarcity and fragmentation to one of abundance and quality, where fewer, better-resourced schools deliver on the promise of a high-quality education for every student.



This guide is designed to support CGCS districts in navigating that work. It offers a practical, student-outcome-centered framework for planning and executing rightsizing grounded in the real experience of large urban systems. During the winter and spring of 2026, the Council conducted interviews with current and former superintendents and school board members, along with leaders and staff in the areas of academics, operations, facilities, transportation, public relations, and communications, and analyzed them to identify common themes and lessons learned.

There is no single path forward. But the lessons and strategies in this guide are meant to help school boards and district leaders approach consolidation with clarity, purpose, and a shared commitment to delivering stronger outcomes for the students and communities they serve.

Structure of this Guide

The sections that follow are organized around five guiding principles, drawn from patterns that surfaced again and again across interviews with district leaders: Student Opportunity First, Leadership Alignment, Community Engagement, Data-Driven Planning, and Support for Transition & Repurposing. Together, they cover the full arc of the work, from keeping students at the center of every decision, to aligning leadership before a vote is taken, to earning community trust, grounding the plan in transparent data, and following through once the decision is made. At the center of all five is Communication. It is not a sixth principle standing apart from the others, but the thread that runs through each one.



Each section defines the principle, and provides concrete examples from districts around the country of what these principles look like in practice (see *Principle to Practice* sections). At the end of each section there are *Key Considerations* that provide advice and strategic reflections from district staff. A sample of district resources is included at the end of the document and housed centrally here: https://tinyurl.com/cgcs-rightsizing.

"Don't talk about money. Focus on kids and the quality of their experience."

— **SUPERINTENDENT,** LARGE URBAN DISTRICT

Every decision made in the process of reorganization and rightsizing should be driven, first and foremost, by considerations of how the process will improve instructional quality and access for students. This needs to be the focus of a district's planning as well as its community outreach: the district must highlight how rightsizing will make the system stronger, not weaker, and ultimately better serve students, families, and communities.

The most effective rightsizing efforts sought to address longstanding disparities in student learning environments and experiences from school to school. This meant expanding access to academic opportunities and resources such as libraries, science labs, and extracurriculars that small, underenrolled schools cannot sustain. At the outset of one district's rightsizing effort, only three quarters of students systemwide had access to college-credit coursework, only half of high schools offered career pathways, and only a third of elementary schools offered enrichment beyond art, music, and physical education. Facing a budget gap, the district closed around 30 schools, its largest consolidation ever. This effort not only resulted in around $50 million in savings, it also yielded clear, concrete benefits for students: 100% of students in closing schools moved to academically stronger, better-rated, newer buildings, with full college and career access districtwide.

These gains for students need to be the focus of district messaging around rightsizing.

PRINCIPLE TO PRACTICE

- Several districts made the case for consolidation concrete by putting two school profiles side by side: a small campus without a full-time nurse, social worker, or arts teacher, next to a larger or merged campus able to sustain instructional coaches, counselors, expanded bilingual education offerings, and a broader elective schedule.
- Leaders in another district argued that campuses operating at 40 to 60 percent capacity struggled to sustain strong course offerings and staffing, while concentrating students in fewer, fuller buildings would strengthen both programming and facilities.
- One district focused on the benefits of staff consolidation at newly-merged schools, showing how absorbing staff from closed schools let schools finally offer world languages, technology, and expanded arts courses that a rigid schedule at half-empty buildings had made impossible.

- Another district recorded videos of students, staff, and families describing their experience in new schools, capturing, for example, a special education teacher who went from being the only specialist at her campus to being part of a full department, and students describing new access to a library and a full-service cafeteria.
- One district removed cost savings from its messaging altogether, choosing instead to talk about the inequity of small schools that could not offer robust programming—a reframing that proved far more persuasive to the community than a financial argument alone.

Across the board, districts cited the importance of framing the case for rightsizing through the lens of improved opportunities for students—stories about what a student's (or teacher's) day could look like were more relatable and compelling than building utilization statistics. Naming the initiative itself something aspirational, rather than a clinical label like "consolidation," further reinforced the message that the goal was building something better, not simply closing buildings.

> *"You are not just taking something away—you are creating new spaces and opportunities. That's what the conversation has to be about.*
>
> **CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER,**
> LARGE URBAN DISTRICT

KEY CONSIDERATIONS

- **Use rightsizing as an opportunity to improve student experience and outcomes.** The purpose of consolidation should not be to reduce buildings, but to ensure all students have access to strong academic programming and resources.
- **Focus on what students will gain.** Highlight concrete data and examples of how students—and teachers—will benefit from larger, better-resourced campuses.
- **Use real stories, not just statistics.** Testimonials from students, staff, and families can communicate the case for change more persuasively than data alone.
- **Brand the initiative.** Name the initiative something aspirational ("Building Brighter Futures" or "Rebuilding Stronger") to shift the narrative and reinforce the focus on students.

"The support of the school board cannot be vague. And it cannot be only behind the scenes. The board needs to be up front and out front."

— **SUPERINTENDENT,** LARGE URBAN DISTRICT

A shared organizational vision and a strong working relationship between a superintendent and the local school board is critical to planning and implementing a successful rightsizing initiative. The process is likely to be difficult and controversial, but unity of purpose gives the community more confidence that the plan will yield higher achievement and efficiency. Board members and superintendents alike noted that while boards may not be involved in the daily administration of a plan, they have a crucial, public-facing role to play in providing oversight and championing the initiative. One board chair noted that the board must show immense empathy during public meetings and that their role is to listen to each community member. Another board chair noted that their role was to be transparent, keep parents and community groups informed, and acknowledge the experiences shared.

This need for "unwavering alignment" between the board and superintendent was often the biggest lesson school leaders learned over the course of rightsizing initiatives. When a board does not openly support the district's plan and strategic direction, the process is more likely to stall or fail under public pressure. Reflecting on one such experience, a superintendent interviewed by the Council team recommended pausing and regrouping, rather than pushing forward once a board begins publicly questioning a district leader or the particulars of a district's plan to close schools.

Gaining the full backing of the board started with communication, and leaders often cited the need for boards to be fully briefed at every step along the way, and present at community meetings, rather than learning of decisions and developments alongside the public. School board leadership also plays a critical role in helping to keep school board members aligned and focused on student outcomes. One school board chair noted that board members in the past would keep small schools open to appease local elected officials, but student academic experiences suffered in schools with an enrollment of fewer than 200 students. The board chair noted that school board members, as community leaders, must be willing to step up and make difficult decisions that are in the best interest of children.

Another step district leaders took to ensure leadership alignment and shared ownership—particularly when facing inevitable public pushback—was to make board support official.

PRINCIPLE TO PRACTICE

- In one district, the board unanimously passed a resolution directing the superintendent to present a rightsizing plan.
- After an initial attempt failed to secure board votes in another district, the superintendent re-launched the work by first having the board pass a policy directing the pursuit of school closures. This policy explicitly prohibited school closings from increasing segregation across the district, a mandate that pushed the effort into affluent neighborhoods as well as under-resourced ones.
- In a third district, the superintendent secured a board agreement around a target level of building utilization—or classroom seats—rather than a fixed number of schools, which let the technical work proceed without inviting premature debate over individual buildings.

In many districts, superintendents and board members advocated for a single up-or-down vote on the full plan, modeled on the military's base realignment process: an independent, criteria-driven list, then one binding vote. A package vote depoliticizes individual schools and individual board members. It also makes it unlikely that any single school can derail the process.



It is equally important to ensure that district staff and department leaders understand their role and are aligned in support of the district's strategic goals. District leaders cited the critical contributions of a number of departmental leaders and staff, beginning with academic leaders who helped ensure that rightsizing efforts served to address disparities and expand access to academic opportunities and resources throughout the district. District leaders also frequently mentioned relying on the input and insight of Chief Operating Officers, Chief Innovation Officers, Chief Finance Officers, and Chief Communications Officers, among others. To ensure effective communication and coordination of the work of each of these departments, superintendents described establishing a regular structure of weekly or biweekly meetings and check-ins to track progress, refine strategies, and address issues in real-time. One superintendent advised naming a project lead to coordinate this work, so the superintendent is not left to manage dozens of separate relationships.



> *"School boards need to ask questions, talk to the data experts, and understand why rightsizing is necessary before we are asked to vote on it.*
>
> **SCHOOL BOARD MEMBER,**
> LARGE URBAN DISTRICT

KEY CONSIDERATIONS

- **Come together.** Board support for a district's rightsizing initiative is a precondition for success. If board members are not prepared to support the plan in public, pause and regroup before moving forward.
- **Make it official.** Secure a board resolution or policy directing the superintendent to pursue rightsizing, rather than relying on informal or verbal support that can erode under pressure.
- **Build internal coordination.** Establish regular, structured meetings to ensure communication and collaboration across district departments and staff involved in the work.
- **Delegate.** Name a project lead to coordinate the effort and communicate progress across departments, rather than leaving the superintendent to manage every relationship alone.

"Communication is as much about listening as it is about talking. The community wants to know that they have a voice in policies that are impacting them."

— **CHIEF COMMUNICATIONS OFFICER,** LARGE URBAN DISTRICT

Any rightsizing initiative must reflect the educational vision and values of the community it serves—the hopes families hold for their children and their expectations for the kinds of instructional environments that will enable academic success. District leaders also need to understand the history of their cities—a history that, in urban centers, likely involves structural resource inequities and local policies that have disproportionately impacted poor and minority communities, leaving a legacy of mistrust and resentment.

District leaders should therefore approach community outreach and engagement not as a step along the way, but as an important starting point. The process of gathering input and building a deep understanding of the perspectives and priorities of stakeholders should be undertaken before launching any rightsizing effort. There is no clearer way to demonstrate that a plan was developed with student, parent, and community needs in mind. Of course, community engagement does not end there. Across the board, communications leaders shared that clear, consistent messaging and being transparent about the data driving the work were powerful strategies for building trust as the district moved forward with its plan.



Districts that were most effective in their outreach cast a wide net. In one district, leaders held more than 60 community meetings alongside individual meetings with politicians, city council members, and media; in another, leaders held more than 100. Both districts also engaged labor union leadership, county commissioners, city council, the mayor's office, state representatives, business leaders, and neighborhood associations, not just parents and staff. Several leaders stressed that the superintendent needs to be in the room, since it is the superintendent who is ultimately delivering the message, and communities expect to speak directly to the person accountable for the decision. One district sustained momentum between large meetings with a weekly video update from district leadership—a small, consistent touchpoint that kept the process visible even without major news to report.



Storytelling also reinforced the district's message.

PRINCIPLE TO PRACTICE

- One district's communications team invited a reporter to embed at a closing middle school for half a year, producing coverage that reached a far wider audience than the district could reach on its own.
- Another district arranged visits to two peer urban districts—taking board members, labor leaders, and parents from large and small schools. One of the parents went on to be a rightsizing ambassador at community meetings.
- One communications officer recounted how the district established a Student Advisory Council that proved especially powerful. Once students understood the plan, they asked to join the community meetings themselves, and when they spoke at board meetings, the room went quiet and people stopped to listen. The students were able to make a clear case for what they wanted and valued, which included enhanced course offerings, extracurricular activities, and newer facilities—all possible only after a rightsizing initiative.



Communications leaders were quick to point out that effective communication is not solely about sharing information, but about listening and being willing to make changes: communities need to feel they have a voice in the process. In one district, a draft framework was released, adjusted in response to community feedback, and reposted so the public could see exactly what changed. When a labor leader raised concerns that closures would disproportionately affect low-income students, another district commissioned an independent equity study through an outside researcher and shared the findings publicly.

Even with heavy investment in outreach, leaders across districts said this is the area they most wished they had done more of, sooner. Community meetings still surfaced misinformation and misconceptions despite district efforts to provide transparent data, and several district and board leaders regretted not focusing more on neighborhood needs and concerns. Leaders also cautioned against avoiding hard conversations with the community on controversial issues, such as the repurposing of school buildings. The district will not be able to address every concern or issue raised, but transparency and engagement is critical so community members never feel blindsided by the decisions that are made.

In addition, several leaders talked about the emotional impact of the work on central office staff, especially the executive team, who were often on the receiving end of angry parents and community members. In fact, this was a lesson that many leaders wanted to pass along to other districts undertaking this work: that the process will be trying and can take a mental toll, but that leaders can't waver from doing what is right by students. As the public face of such controversial and emotionally fraught work, superintendents have lost their jobs in the past in the wake of rightsizing campaigns, and this is a risk any leader should be prepared for.

KEY CONSIDERATIONS

- **First things first.** District leaders should understand the history, priorities, and perspective of their community and work to ensure that any rightsizing plan reflects this understanding.
- **Expect community pushback.** Resistance to change is natural—particularly from parents and community members in schools identified for closure.
- **Over-communicate.** Share information clearly and consistently throughout the process.
- **Cast a wide net.** Ensure that district information and messaging reach a diverse set of stakeholders.
- **Bring the data to life.** Storytelling and testimonies from students, teachers, and parents will resonate more than statistics alone.
- **Listen and learn.** Be willing to make reasonable changes based on community feedback so people feel genuinely heard. Institute a formal "you said, we did" process to show how public input influenced the work.

GUIDING PRINCIPLE 4: Data-Driven Planning

"As a leader you need to know your data inside and out. Only a strong data case can cut through the noise and make the need for change undeniable."

— **SUPERINTENDENT,** LARGE URBAN DISTRICT

Effective rightsizing requires a clear picture of the whole school system: enrollment trends, academic programming and needs, extracurricular offerings, the condition of facilities, transportation patterns, and staffing. Many districts found that identifying and gathering this data was an important first step in designing a rightsizing plan and communicating with stakeholders and policymakers.

PRINCIPLE TO PRACTICE

- A number of districts studied student enrollment trends at specific school sites and across the district—some even bringing in demographers to conduct local trend analyses rather than relying on national projections.
- Districts under mayoral control could pull directly from city planning and labor department data to ground enrollment and workforce projections in the same figures other city agencies were already using, which strengthened the credibility of the district's plan with the elected officials reviewing it.
- Districts also conducted thorough needs assessments of the gaps in resources and academic programming, as well as the maintenance needs of aging buildings, to build their case that school consolidation would lead to improved student outcomes.

It is no surprise, then, that a major theme across interviews was that consistent, transparent data on the state of schools and classrooms across the district made the case for change "undeniable," even when the process remained emotional. The use of data was particularly important when identifying which schools would be closed or consolidated. The criteria and rationale used to make these calls had to be robust enough to withstand public scrutiny, allowing the community to trace decisions back to a defined set of criteria rather than a closed-door judgment call.

PRINCIPLE TO PRACTICE

- In one district, leaders created an initial list of 70 schools based on five years of regional enrollment data, then narrowed this list further based on building-utilization rates below 65 percent, clustered by elementary and secondary subregions.
- In another district, leaders built a "quality seats" score from 21 distinct data points, and before finalizing these scores they asked parents across every feeder pattern to rank which measures mattered most. Every elementary and PreK-8 school then received a score out of 100, which was reviewed along with measures of school capacity, the use of facilities, the transfer-out rate, and the availability of a viable receiving campus within two miles when making school closure decisions.
- The leadership team in a third district built a rubric for rating the conditions of facilities, the effective use of resources, academic performance, teacher turnover, and school culture and climate, and organized schools into three broad categories for the purpose of closure considerations.
- One district's model made equity an explicit variable in the scoring, splitting scores across three weighted categories: roughly half on equity measures like proximity, program access, and historical academic outcomes; a portion on school culture and academic performance; and a deliberately smaller share on operational efficiency, since weighting cost and utilization too heavily tended to concentrate closures in the same lower-income neighborhoods every time.

Another theme was the importance of not only collecting the data and using it to drive decisions, but of making the data clear and accessible for the public. For many districts, online data dashboards that made information easy to access and understand helped build a shared, credible starting point for conversations with the community. One district published its full methodology on a public dashboard so residents could compare any given campus against the criteria directly. In another district, online maps showing school-sizes throughout the city revealed clear patterns, with schools below the average range clustered in the same neighborhoods. Sharing the data in such ways helped turn a spreadsheet into a story leaders could share.



KEY CONSIDERATIONS

- **Let the data do the talking.** Study a diverse set of data and use it to develop a plan that will best address the needs and realities of your district.
- **Avoid a purely financial lens.** Pair capacity and cost data with academic and student-experience measures so the conversation is anchored around serving students, not just efficiency.
- **Pay attention to who benefits.** Study the data to ensure that consolidation will improve—not impede—educational opportunities for the students and communities that need it most.
- **Build trust through transparency.** Publish a wide array of data, including the criteria and methodology used to consolidate and close schools, so the public understands the case for change.
- **Make the data accessible.** Deploy user-friendly formats such as online data dashboards so people can see how the numbers work, not just the result.

"In some cases, the schools we are closing have been in our cities for over a hundred years. What are we going to do to honor the legacy and the history of closed schools?"

— **SCHOOL BOARD MEMBER,** LARGE URBAN DISTRICT

A board vote is not the finish line; it is the start of a longer process in which staffing, logistics, culture, and student wellbeing all have to be expertly and thoughtfully managed. For districts that navigated this period of change most effectively, implementation was approached as a critical part of the planning process, rather than an afterthought once the rightsizing repurposing was underway. These districts identified potential issues and chokepoints well in advance and had a plan in place for addressing them.

In particular, closing a building that has anchored a neighborhood for decades is a loss, and districts that planned for that loss explicitly fared better than those that treated it as a purely logistical challenge.

PRINCIPLE TO PRACTICE

- One district funded a yearlong mural project at a closing school, then physically divided the finished piece among the three receiving campuses so students carried a piece of their old school with them.
- Another district appointed transition ambassadors, one for staff and one for families, at every closing and receiving school. These ambassadors were onsite at the schools the morning after the Board vote, and the Superintendent had a recorded message that was played at all impacted schools that morning as well.
- Several districts built joint events, shared field days, and staff meet-and-greets before the first day of school so students and educators were not meeting each other for the first time on move-in day.
- Mental health support for both students and staff across many districts was arranged in advance of official closure announcements, so resources were ready the moment they were needed.

The trust of students, staff, parents, and communities was won or lost in physical details on the first day of school. Leaders repeatedly emphasized making sure receiving schools were visibly better before students arrived: desks, books, and materials in place, academic programming and staffing already upgraded, so families could see the promised gains rather than take them on faith.



One district reported aligning its capital improvement plan to the rightsizing initiative directly, moving previously scheduled renovations at receiving schools earlier in the timeline and redirecting savings from buildings no longer being maintained.

Focusing on the needs of families and offering flexibility, where possible, was also cited as an effective tool for supporting impacted families. One district used a fixed distance threshold beyond which a new bus route was added automatically, so families were not left to negotiate transportation case by case. Another created enrollment zones guaranteeing displaced students a transportation option to the school of their choice within the zone, even beyond standard distance limits, giving affected families real agency rather than a single assigned outcome. Districts partnering with local university or independent researchers to track academic outcomes after the transition, and sharing them with community members, were better positioned to adjust supports and show their commitment to students and families over the long term.

Staffing was cited as a particularly sensitive and crucial part of implementation. In one district, principals for newly merged schools were named within weeks of the vote so schools were not left leaderless during the most uncertain stretch of the transition. Teachers were placed with an explicit goal of blending familiar faces from both the closing and receiving schools so no student arrived at a campus with an entirely unfamiliar staff, followed by classified staff such as food service and custodial teams. Leaders stressed the importance of providing clear information about timelines and other pertinent details as far in advance as possible, including any staff layoffs or hiring freezes, since uncertainty about jobs disrupts everything else in a transition.

Yet another “detail” that isn’t a detail at all, but a critical, legacy-defining consideration for districts managing school closures is what happens to school buildings when they are closed. Leaving this question open invites both urban blight and community mistrust. Several districts learned this the hard way: buildings left vacant without a plan were broken into within weeks, and some state and local rules require a district to show a concrete reuse plan within a set timeframe or risk losing the building to a charter or private school by default. The uses districts found for closed school buildings varied widely.

PRINCIPLE TO PRACTICE

- Some districts converted school buildings into professional development or swing-space centers to temporarily house schools undergoing renovation, while others were used for alternative programs or early childhood centers.
- Other districts leased former school sites to nonprofits at nominal fees or partnered with city or county agencies to use the sites or land for health centers, food pantries, or community spaces.
- Several districts have repurposed school sites for residential housing, including over 130 units for staff housing in one district, plans for over 675 units in another district, and affordable housing for over 2,700 residents in a third district.

A common pitfall was overestimating how easy reuse would be—one district discovered that fire-code egress requirements made multi-tenant leasing unworkable only after signing a lease, and another saw a charter school tenant fold after just three years. One best practice employed by a number of districts was to establish an expert panel or task force dedicated to the repurposing of school sites, and for this panel to share its findings or recommendations as early in the process as possible. That way the community hears the district's plan for the building—whether it is to demolish, sell, lease, or retain the site for district use—at the same time they hear about the closure itself, not months afterward.

KEY CONSIDERATIONS

- **Manage change with empathy.** Understanding that school closures take an emotional toll on communities will help district teams design comprehensive, supportive transition plans.
- **The devil is in the details.** An effective rightsizing initiative pre-emptively identifies and addresses the implementation issues—such as staffing, transportation, school climate, and mental health needs—that are likely to derail community support if approached as afterthoughts in planning.
- **Have a plan for repurposing closed schools.** It pays to be decisive and transparent with the community about the future of former school buildings.

RESOURCES

The resources below were shared in the process of conducting interviews for this guide and are accessible here: https://tinyurl.com/cgcs-rightsizing. Additional resources will be added to the folder as they are submitted.

AUSTIN

- AISD Long-Range Planning Baseline Report
- Press release of groundbreaking for school-to-housing redevelopment
- AISD website on Alternative Learning Center rebuild project
- AISD website on Repurposing Surplus Properties
- AISD website on Future Use of School Properties

CLEVELAND

- Building Brighter Futures Board Presentation
- Building Brighter Futures homepage
- Building Brighter Futures Transportation website
- Building Brighter Futures Recommendations website

DENVER

- Denver Schools Thrive Initiative homepage
- Denver Schools Thrive Students and Families memo
- Board Update – Recommendations Package
- Denver Schools Thrive Initiative Annual Report

EL PASO

- Destination District Redesign Plan
- EPISD Launches Community Meetings website

GUILFORD

- GCS Strategic School Closures

OAKLAND

- Transforming Parker School Campus

PORTLAND

- PPS Rightsizing Strategic Communication Plan
- PPS Rightsizing Strategic Communications Playbook

SAN ANTONIO

- SAISD Rightsizing homepage
- SAISD Facilities Repurposing website
- SAID Grown and Development website
- SAISD School Performance Framework
- SAISD Support Plans for Family, Staff, and Students
- SAISD 23-24 Archive websites
- Letters and Messaging used during rightsizing process

SAN FRANCISCO

- SFUSD Resource Alignment Initiative Board Presentation
- SFUSD Resource Alignment Initiative Reading Deck
- SFUSD Resource Alignment Initiative Town Hall Presentations
- SFUSD Resource Alignment Initiative Board Workshop Reading Deck
- SFUSD Resource Alignment Initiative – District Advisory Committee website
- SFUSD Resource Alignment Initiative – Principal's Invitation
- SFUSD Resource Alignment Initiative School Fact Bases
- SFUSD Resource Alignment Initiative Briefing for All Administrators
- SFUSD - Additional Sites for Educator Housing





COUNCIL OF THE GREAT CITY SCHOOLS

1331 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Suite 1100N,
Washington, D.C. 20004
(202) 393-2427 • www.cgcs.org