

# **Elementary World Language Task Force 2016-17**

**Recommendations to the  
Superintendent**

**April 4th, 2017**



**Task force members:**

The Lake Oswego School District would like to thank the following members of the task force for their work in producing the following recommendations:

Maria Belcik, Parent

Kirsten Carnese, Parent

Julie Dausman, Parent

Brett Dodson, Parent

Dr. Dan Draper, River Grove Principal

Melissa Griffiths, Director of Community School

Maria Krekorian, River Grove Teacher

Leanne Mann, River Grove Teacher

Angie Markman, River Grove Teacher

Dr. Joe Morelock, Assistant Superintendent

Dr. Mike Musick, Executive Director of School Management

Lilian Sarlos, Oak Creek Principal

Darcy Steele, River Grove Teacher

Eric Taussig, Parent

## **Introduction**

During the summer School Board retreat of 2016, the Board requested the Superintendent study the possibilities of expanding the world language learning options for elementary students in the district. The Superintendent directed her staff to convene a task force to study the world language options currently available, the possible expansion of existing programs, and a plan for the future to provide further opportunities for language learning for elementary students in the Lake Oswego School District.

The task force was comprised of fourteen members, including elementary teachers and principals, Central Office staff, and parents of both current immersion students and those interested in world language opportunities for their children. The group met five times over three months in order to consider options for, and to recommend solutions to, the following:

- Whether or not to expand the Spanish immersion program currently housed at River Grove Elementary;
- and, determine the value and feasibility of other opportunities for world language learning for more of the district's elementary students.

During the course of their meetings, the task force reviewed information provided by the district, which included current demand for world language opportunities (including immersion, after school programs, and summer programs), costs associated with several of their preferred options, updated demographic study information, and articles of research and interest into world language programs in other districts around the country. The task force was able to explore more deeply several options and present their considered approaches in the pages that follow in this report.

## **Process**

This group engaged in a multi-step process to come to some agreements and recommendations. First, task force members created a short brainstorm list related to their personal values, beliefs, and biases related to world language opportunities for elementary students. These included:

- Expands global awareness / worldviews
- Helps with neuroplasticity (sponge brains)
- Bilingualism is a specialized skill that opens doors
- Incorporates art and culture
- Increases self esteem and confidence
- Confidence to explore the world
- Enriches learning experience
- Better to learn at an earlier age
- Broader lens for life
- A gift that we can give our students
- Teach about the global community and give our children advantages

After the discussion of the values, beliefs, and biases members brought to the task force work, the next job was to read and discuss a set of articles about different kinds of elementary programs to glean any further insights that could inform the task force's previously-stated values. After reading the articles and research, the task force developed a list of insights:

- Younger ages are the best place to start-- before 10 years of age
- Students in a FLES program (Foreign Language in Elementary School) outperform non-FLES students on standardized assessments
- The success and value of the program depends upon what your goals are for the students. What outcome do you want?
- There is an advantage to even minimal exposure to language at the elementary level
- Gives students more exposure to cultures and world views. Gave parents a broader world view as well.
- Surprise that there was no information on impact on community, such as home values increasing, etc.
- All students are able to access the benefits from elementary language programs
- Some of the programs seemed like too much time and effort to give just exposure to a language
- Does not have to be either/or (immersion or nothing).

After combining the group's beliefs and values with the insights from the articles and the research, the task force engaged in a brainstorming activity to develop options for further discussion by the group. The initial ideas proposed for further study and/or recommendation generated a large list of options and values:

- Make the best world language programs in the country
- More choice within district-supply meets demand
- After school opportunities in multiple locations
- Incentives offered to teachers/EAs when hiring to get and retain the best
- District wide coordination for immersion (TOSA)
- Additional languages beyond current offerings
  - 90/10 Chinese immersion program, or
  - 50/50 - make more Spanish strands available
- Advanced placement opportunities at all ages/grades within immersion
- Cultural celebrations
- Exposure 2-4 hrs/wk
- Planned and rolled out slowly to build a strong and sustainable program
- Standardized curriculum for cultural competency K-12
- Rosetta Stone (technology-based) as a FLES strategy
- Language offered to all elementary students (FLES during the school day)
- 2nd strand of immersion on north side of the district
- Additional languages and strand(s) as part of a magnet school
- Add a 2nd strand of immersion at River Grove
- Be proactive to get qualified candidates
- After school enrichment for non-Spanish
- Additional stipend for language teachers (for hiring and retention)

After collecting the list of ideas, the task force used a process that allows groups to pare long lists of ideas and make decisions about which of the ideas have the most value to study more deeply. The group landed upon five primary options of the myriad proposed during the brainstorming session that warranted deeper discussion. The options selected to go through the next phase of conversation by the group were:

- World language as a "cultural competency curriculum"
- Adding a 2nd immersion strand-- not at River Grove
- Adding a 2nd immersion strand at River Grove

- Options for “inside school” world language (i.e. during the school day; FLES, Rosetta Stone, other)
- Options for “outside school” world language (i.e. before or after school; summer school)

Then, in small groups, members employed a SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats) analysis of each of the five options, spanning across two meetings. SWOT analyses are broken down into: **Strengths**, the ways in which the option/recommendation is strong and brings benefits to the district and its patrons; **Weaknesses**, the parts of the option that present challenges which need to be addressed by the district; **Opportunities**, facets that allow for the district’s future growth and opportunities; and **Threats**, which are sides of the recommendation which may cause the most concern for both patrons and the district alike.

An additional option to open a magnet school at one of the facility sites not currently being used as a school was put on the table by the task force after the initial SWOT analyses on the items listed above were completed. Ultimately, members of the task force wrestled with projected costs and the feasibility of each of their options from those which had been discussed, and settled on four key areas for the district to focus its efforts in terms of short-term options and long-term strategies for further study:

- Launch an additional Spanish immersion strand at River Grove.
- Create a FLES program, using either teachers who rotate or using computer technology, or both.
- Install an additional immersion strand at a different school than River Grove.
- Reopen a currently shuttered elementary school, creating a language immersion magnet school.

In the pages that follow in this report, each of the bullets from the previous paragraph will be parsed by the task force’s analysis of each. Three of the four options require changes to policy or procedure that will require both further study and more time-- meaning that they cannot be implemented immediately and be in place for the 2017-18 school year. The first option, to add another strand of Spanish Immersion at River Grove, can be put into place for the coming school year and may bring some relief to the current high demand for the program, but has its

own set of challenges in terms of long term school capacity numbers. The fourth option, while the most expensive, also works as a possible solution to elementary school capacity issues, without the need for a boundary adjustment. Although the group understands there are significant cost implications for most of the options provided, they felt it important to include all of their best thinking for the district to consider for the children it serves. Further, the task force recommendations will be a combination of certain options, as those options are not necessarily mutually exclusive from each other, and may make more sense as a “package proposal” in their combined state.

## **Options**

Three of the options which follow will be broken into three main parts: short explanation of the options; SWOT analysis done by the task force; and, overall committee viewpoints about the option. A SWOT analysis was used to determine the viability of each for district operations and goals by breaking it down into *Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats*. The fourth option, reopen a currently shuttered elementary school and creating a language immersion magnet school, did not go through a SWOT analysis, but will be discussed on its merits and how it may fit into the larger district picture for the future.

### **Option A: Launch an additional Spanish immersion strand at River Grove**

Demand for the Spanish Immersion program at River Grove, which currently hosts one strand of students from Kindergarten through 5th grade, has been higher than the available capacity for the last three years. The program continues into the middle school at Lakeridge Junior High School, with 6th grade in its first year there in the 2016-17 school year. Demand for the program far outstrips the available 28 slots in Kindergarten. Waitlists for 2015-16 had 43 students (including 25 River Grove students), the 2016-17 school year set the number at 62

(with 54 River Grove resident students), and for 2017-18, there are 33 on the waiting list (including 14 River Grove residents).

As for the SWOT analysis of adding another strand to River Grove, the task force found:

- **Strengths:**
  - Collaboration amongst teachers in the immersion program
  - Shorter wait lists for families to get into the program- supply meets more of the current and future demand
- **Weaknesses:**
  - Space and/or capacity concerns- where to put them?
  - Transportation costs and additions for more students coming from across the district to RG
  - Shortage of qualified staff to teach immersion - will need more hard-to-find teachers
  - May need more EA support for early literacy
  - North side not represented as well, as school is not as conveniently located
  - Attrition through the grade levels may not hold classes at high-enough numbers over the 6 years of the elementary program
- **Opportunities:**
  - Students and classes can be mixed up
  - Based on academics or behaviors
  - Richer language experience for more students
  - More district students served, smaller waitlists for entry
- **Threats:**
  - Might have to move non-immersion teachers out of River Grove as the program grows and less space is available
  - Disgruntled teachers for having to move schools
  - Disgruntled parents of students who are moving schools, if not enough capacity for all River Grove resident students as more non-RG students enter the program

Although adding a strand at River Grove is an option that immediately reduces the number of students on the waitlist for entry into the immersion program, it does come with its own set of challenges. In the appendix, Section Model Chart 1 shows the growth of the program over time, and the eventual displacement of resident River Grove students who are not in the Spanish Immersion program in all of Kindergarten and all of 1st grade by the 2022-23 school year. There are some assumptions for the chart and they include:



- The additional track of Spanish Immersion follows similar rules as current track (i.e. lottery, half from North side schools, half from South side schools) but that at least 14 students are from River Grove;
- Section count remains at a maximum of 22 classrooms for River Grove, which is the current number of available;
- No boundary adjustments are included in the calculations;
- No additional growth is accounted for in the above numbers, which includes the growth predicted in the Davis Demographics report from Jan 2017;
- 1st grade would be the next grade level to be overflow after all Kinders (including Spanish Immersion Kinder) are sent to overflow schools;
- River Grove enrollment stays under the 550 cap for 2018-19 even with additional section of Spanish Immersion;
- If enrollment count continues to follow current rollup and/or demographic report, then the next group to begin overflow would be Spanish Immersion Kindergarten students and would begin in 2018-19.

As seen in the chart, while the number of sections at River Grove remains relatively constant, the space that allows for resident River Grove students in the early grades diminishes rapidly over 6 years. Further, this model does not account for growth per the Davis Demographic report of January 2017, so the sections that go into overflow scenarios may well accelerate past the chart's assumptions. The chart is meant as an illustration and is based upon the best numbers we currently have; however, the numbers of students are fluid, and will continue fluctuating.

The instructional delivery model in this option could be a 50%-50% model, with students having two teachers, one who teaches in English full time, and one who teaches in Spanish full time. This method allows less disruption to the overall teaching staffing at River Grove, but changes the Spanish Immersion model that has been under development this current school year.

The immersion model could also focus more on the target language in the early grades (i.e. 80%-20%, 70%-30%, etc.), which would require hiring a new Spanish-speaking Kindergarten teacher in the first year and additional bilingual teachers in the years that follow in order to grow the program-- this model is more disruptive to the overall staff at River Grove, as

non-Spanish Immersion teachers will need to be relocated in order to make space in the teaching sections. This would, however, continue on the model the Spanish Immersion staff have been working on throughout this year after the adoption of their Spanish literacy curriculum.

In section A.1 of the Options Cost Chart located in the appendix of this report, the additional cost factors for adding a strand at River Grove are approximated, which include adding an Educational Assistant, curriculum requirements, and additional planning time set aside for Spanish Immersion teachers. For the first year, approximately \$111,000 will be necessary to purchase additional materials and planning time and to fund the additional EA, afterwards increasing each year for the planning time (but reducing the curriculum purchase needs) to about \$61,000 annual dollars for maintaining the program with the additional strand.

***Option B: Create a FLES program, using teachers who rotate or by using computer technology, or both.***

In some school districts around the country, FLES programs (Foreign Language in the Elementary School) have taken hold by either a roving teacher (or set of teachers) or using digital technology tutor, or a combination of both.

- Strengths:
  - All students have an opportunity
  - Supports existing programs
  - Gives cultural exposure to wider range of students
  - Creates a common experience for all elementary students
  - Any language exposure is better than none
  - More access to languages
  - Thankful for the opportunity
- Weaknesses:
  - How much will they actually learn of the language?
  - Time limitations for teaching FLES
  - What subjects do we replace or reduce to make time for FLES
    - Can each school make a different choice?
  - Hard to get more than just exposure
- Opportunities:

- Rosetta stone (technology-supported language learning) could be used as a support or to expand the program
- How deeply do our students understand the cultures of other?
- Run as a multiple option program with different languages taught throughout the FLES program
- Creates a common experience for all elementary students
- If more people have exposure, you may gain more support for immersion programs, magnet schools, etc
- Threats:
  - Getting a qualified teacher - specials teachers
  - What comes out of instructional day
  - Can we support vertical articulation - will the numbers of students who take world languages throughout their schooling overwhelm the system of world language classes we currently offer?
  - Can we “impose” FLES at all schools?

In section B.1 of the Options Cost Chart in the appendix are the costs associated with bringing FLES programs to each school using a teacher-centered model. As the requirements of the program increase (e.g. the amount of teachers needed for the amount of time in FLES desired), so does the number of qualified staff that must be hired. The task force believed that the 3-teacher option would be the best approach, giving every student approximately 30 minutes per week of FLES instruction. This time would come from within the instructional day, and it would be up to the school to decide what other subjects would be reduced in order to make room for FLES. Also, schools would need to schedule with each other, as three teachers would be shared across six buildings. The approximate cost, not including curriculum costs for this type of model would be about \$300,000.

The option of using a technology product was also raised. That cost is listed in section B.2 of the Cost Options Chart. Instead of hiring three teachers, there could be a combination of teacher time and technology time for students to engage in FLES during the school day. The cost to license something of that nature is approximately \$100,000, not including the upgrade costs of the necessary technology tools and infrastructure. The only way to make FLES a less

expensive option is to combine the two options, with a teacher and software to get down to the approximate \$200,000 annual threshold.

**Option C: Install an additional immersion strand at a different school than River Grove**

Another option the task force considered was to open an additional strand of world language immersion at a different elementary school than River Grove. The idea was to balance the North and South side enrollments in the program and provide more ease of transportation for students and parents.

- Strengths:
  - More students to supply the program (North vs South)
  - More exposure to immersion programs for different school communities
- Weaknesses:
  - Division of resources (staff, curriculum, etc) and possibly a duplication of resources would be necessary
  - Continuity of staff- turnover in immersion has been relatively high
  - Division of staff- would we move some to start the new program, or start completely fresh with newly hired staff?
  - Not accommodating all students who are on the waiting lists
- Opportunities:
  - More students involved in the immersion program;
  - Reopen a building and create a magnet school for immersion
- Threats:
  - Space concerns- we are already really tight for available classrooms
  - Staffing changes, either hiring new or dividing those we already have
  - Resources could be costly (curriculum, teachers, transportation)
  - Equity/equality- Would they be similar programs or the same or totally different?

As can be seen in section C.1 in the Cost Options chart, this option has several cost implications, including the need for additional space to be placed at Lake Grove, the only school with a practical location to place modular classrooms. Further, this model makes a second program that replicates the costs associated with the current program, making it possibly more cost prohibitive. However, since it would be at a different school, the opportunity exists to start a

program with a new language (e.g. Chinese or Japanese) and would allow that school to include that in its school identity. Figuring out the staffing costs is challenging, as students would most likely come from around the district, but until the program has time to grow, there will most likely be additional staffing necessary for the first few years.

***Option D: Reopen an elementary school and create an Immersion Magnet Program***

Demand for the Spanish Immersion program at River Grove, which currently hosts one strand of students from Kindergarten to 5th grade, has been higher than the available capacity for the last three years. The task force felt that immersion was a program that attracts families to Lake Oswego, and that its present location puts constraints on growing the program beyond the current configuration. This option has two parts: move immersion to a reopened elementary school and expand it with additional tracks (and possibly another language as well) in order to keep up with demand for the program. Using 3 as the number of Kindergarten programs to start with, the school could grow to nearly the current size of other elementary schools, with 18 sections (3 tracks of Kindergarten through 5th grade) and 450-500 students.

After some consideration, the task force believed that combining the option of reopening an elementary building and expanding the immersion program would have both immediate and more long-term positive effects for students and families in Lake Oswego schools. Again, they recognized the significant ongoing financial costs to the district's general fund (some of which are listed in section D.1 of the Cost Options Chart in the appendix), but as the work progressed, the capacity issues at all buildings became prevalent and more of the task force's focus. By combining the reopening of a building, which creates classroom space capacity, and expanding the immersion program into an immersion school, which can both meet current demand and make available more immersion opportunity for students, the district can reduce capacity pressure at the other elementary schools, possibly without a boundary process being a necessity. This option, if taken, will take a little more time to create capacity at the other

elementary schools, as the program would grow into its new building over the course of approximately five to six years.

## **Recommendations**

After five meetings, the task force was able to settle on a combination of the options they had explored during their time together. They put forward two primary recommendations, fully aware that the cost implications may limit what the district may choose to study further and to implement. The task force felt it was important to put forth their best thinking and allow the district and the Board to polish them into implementable options.

### ***Recommendation 1: Add a second strand at River Grove and FLES with 3 teachers at all other elementary schools.***

The task force believes that opening a second strand at River Grove could be the first step towards creating a magnet school, and wished to combine the additional strand with Option B - incorporating a FLES program with 3 teachers that provide 30 minutes of language once a week for all elementary. This model has its challenges in terms of space and staffing, as well as from where the time will be taken to deliver FLES at the elementary schools, but this combination of options is their primary recommendation for further study and action by the district. This model allows all elementary students who are not in the current immersion program access to a world language as well as expands the current program to meet the current demand. Additionally, if this model generates even more interest in the immersion program, it could be the beginning of the conversation of opening an immersion magnet school in a currently-shuttered site in order to help with balancing enrollment at elementary schools without the need to adjust school boundaries.

- *Estimated cost for Recommendation 1: \$411,000 year 1; \$361,000 ongoing additional costs*

**Recommendation 2: Add a second strand at River Grove and FLES with a combination of teachers and technology.**

This recommendation would be preferred by the task force if hiring three additional teachers is too cost-prohibitive for the district and would allow incorporating a FLES program using Rosetta Stone or a similar technology as seen in option B.2. in the Cost Options Chart in appendix, as well as a teacher or teachers to help facilitate the FLES program and to connect with students less frequently than in Recommendation 1 above. The task force prefers this recommendation only if the first recommendation is not financially or operationally feasible.

- *Estimated cost for Recommendation 2:*
  - *\$411,000 year 1; \$361,000 ongoing additional costs for 2 teachers plus a technology option (e.g. Rosetta Stone);*
  - *\$311,000 year 1; \$261,000 ongoing additional costs for 1 teacher plus a technology option (e.g. Rosetta Stone);*

**Final Thoughts**

The Elementary World Language Task Force spent five meetings together wrestling with both the aspirations and the realities of implementing further language learning opportunities for students in Lake Oswego public schools. The recommendations presented above are the product of discussions and research about best practices and the discussions of the task force's members. Although there are only two primary recommendations for further study by the district, the options which are also presented reflect many other opportunities that may be employed by the district as part of their world language strategy now and in the future. The task force recognizes the challenging work ahead for the district to implement any recommendation or

parts of any of the recommendations and options they developed, but they are hopeful that they've given the district opportunities that can be made a reality.

Finally, the district would like to recognize the significant time commitment put forth by each of the task force members in the development of these options and recommendations, and to thank each of its members for their dedication to the improvement and the future opportunities for all Lake Oswego students.



**APPENDIX**

2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23
Kinder	K-Overflow	K-Overflow	K-Overflow	K-Overflow	K-Overflow	K-Overflow
Kinder	K-Overflow	K-Overflow	K-Overflow	K-Overflow	K-Overflow	K-Overflow
Kinder	Kinder-SI	Kinder-SI	Kinder-SI-Overflow	Kinder-SI-Overflow	Kinder-SI-Overflow	Kinder-SI-Overflow
Kinder-SI	Kinder-SI	Kinder-SI	Kinder-SI-Overflow	Kinder-SI-Overflow	Kinder-SI-Overflow	Kinder-SI-Overflow
1st	1st	1st	1st	1st-Overflow	1st-Overflow	1st-Overflow
1st	1st	1st	1st	1st	1st-Overflow	1st-Overflow
1st	1st	1st-SI	1st-SI	1st-SI	1st	1st-Overflow
1st-SI	1st-SI	1st-SI	1st-SI	1st-SI	1st-SI	1st-SI
2nd	2nd	2nd	2nd	2nd	2nd	2nd
2nd	2nd	2nd	2nd	2nd	2nd	2nd
2nd	2nd	2nd	2nd-SI	2nd-SI	2nd-SI	2nd-SI
2nd-SI	2nd-SI	2nd-SI	2nd-SI	2nd-SI	2nd-SI	2nd-SI
3rd	3rd	3rd	3rd	3rd	3rd	3rd
3rd	3rd	3rd	3rd	3rd	3rd	3rd
	3rd	3rd	3rd	3rd-SI	3rd-SI	3rd-SI
3rd-SI	3rd-SI	3rd-SI	3rd-SI	3rd-SI	3rd-SI	3rd-SI
4th	4th	4th	4th	4th	4th	4th
4th	4th	4th	4th	4th	4th	4th
4th		4th	4th	4th	4th-SI	4th-SI
4th-SI	4th-SI	4th-SI	4th-SI	4th-SI	4th-SI	4th-SI
5th	5th	5th	5th	5th	5th	5th
5th	5th	5th	5th	5th	5th	5th
	5th		5th	5th	5th	5th-SI
5th-SI	5th-SI	5th-SI	5th-SI	5th-SI	5th-SI	5th-SI

Approximate Enrollment						
537	543	559	545	547	546	536

Sections Total						
22	22	22	22	22	22	22

Kinder sections overflow						
2	2	3	5	5	5	5

1st grade overflow						
0	0	0	0	1	2	3

- | Assumptions:  |
|---|
| 1. Additional track of Spanish Immersion follows similar rules as current track (i.e. lottery, half from North side schools, half from South side schools), but that at least 14 students are from River Grove. |
| 2. Section count remains at a maximum of 22 for River Grove, which is the current number of available classrooms.   |
| 3. No boundary adjustments are included in the above calculations.  |
| 4. 1st grade would be the next grade level to be overflow after all Kinders (including Spanish Immersion Kinder) are sent to overflow schools.  |
| 5. Enrollment stays under the 550 cap for 2018-19 even with additional section of Spanish Immersion.  |
| 6. If enrollment count continues to follow current rollup and/or demographic report, then Kinder-SI would begin overflow in 2018-19.  |
| 7. No additional growth is accounted for in the above numbers, which includes the growth predicted in the Davis Demographics report from Jan 2017   |

**Section Model Chart 1**

**DRAFT\*DRAFT\*DRAFT**

These are cost estimates to use for modeling purposes ONLY  
 Not all costs are included in this worksheet, and its use should be limited to discussion and planning contexts

**Options Cost Chart**

**A.1 Additional Strand at RGE Costs**

Additional staffing:	Educational Assistant (EA)	\$45,000 (annual cost)
Additional curriculum:	Kindergarten through 5th grade	\$50,000 (one-time startup cost)
Additional planning/training time:		\$16,000 (first year)
		\$111,000 First year startup cost
		\$61,000 (ongoing after 4 years) - EA plus \$16,000 additional planning time budgeted

**B.1 FLES Model Costs**

Approximately 117 classrooms in elementary  
 30 minutes per language session requires 3,510 minutes  
 Approximately 4.5 hours (270 minutes) per day of capturable time at elementary school  
 270 minutes equals 9 "sessions" per day at elementary school (similar to music and/or PE teacher daily schedule)

School	Sections	Days needed for full rotation	Required: 1 teacher, avg cost-->	30 mins per 3 week (15-day) interval	\$100,000
FHE	18	2.0			
HAL	18	2.0			
LGE	19	2.1			
OC	21	2.3			
RGE	21	2.3			
WRE	19	2.1			
Additional	1	0.1			
	Min. days req'd	13.0 days			
	Realistic target	15 days			
			Required: 2 teacher, avg cost-->	30 mins per 1.5 weeks (7.5-day) interval	\$200,000
				This equates to one (1) 30-minute lesson every three weeks per child	
			Required: 3 teacher, avg cost-->	30 mins per 1 week (5-day) interval	\$300,000
				This equates to one (1) 30-minute lesson every 1.5 weeks per child	

**B.2 FLES, using Rosetta Stone (or similar) @ each elementary school**

Annual licensing cost for all elementary schools: \$100,000 (annual cost)

**C.1 Additional strand @ other elementary school cost**

Currently, only LGE has the classroom space to bring one additional staffing, eventually needing modular classrooms to be added

Additional staffing, year 1:	Teacher	Educational Assistant (EA)	\$25,000 (first cost)
			\$100,000 (first year cost)
			\$10,000 Curriculum cost year 1
			\$135,000 First year cost, total
Staffing cost, year 2:	Teacher	Educational Assistant (EA)	\$45,000 (ongoing cost)
			\$100,000 (ongoing cost)
Additional curriculum:	Kindergarten through 5th grade		\$50,000 (one-time startup cost-estimated, Language Arts only)
	Install		\$250,000 (one-time startup cost)
Modular classrooms, per 2-classroom unit:	Annual lease		\$40,000 (ongoing cost)

**D.1 Magnet program in reopened building cost**

Annual staffing cost not counting teachers:		\$700,000 (ongoing cost)
Additional curriculum, furniture, fixtures, equipment:		\$800,000 (one-time startup cost)
Additional planning/training time:		\$60,000 (first year, 10 teachers)
		\$1,560,000 First year cost, total
		\$48,000 (2nd grade year, 12 teachers) (80 hours planning time additional)
		\$56,000 (3rd grade year, 14 teachers) (80 hours planning time additional)
		\$64,000 (4th grade year, 16 teachers) (80 hours planning time additional)
		\$72,000 (5th grade year, 18 teachers) (80 hours planning time additional)
		(\$200K furniture, \$600K curriculum & technology)
		(3 weeks planning time for new school to open and prepare)

**Options Cost Chart**