

Follow On Work	
24	I addressed these items in previous comments. With the "profile of a graduate" guidelines, CTE courses will be in higher demand and must be made available to students across the county which means growing those programs. APS and the County Board should be working together to maximize uses of buildings and fields. The South block should be developed to assist in delivering classes during the day (and evening in the case of ACHS) and community programs in the evenings.
25	Suggested edits to 2nd sentence in 1st paragraph in CAPS: "This may mean revisiting existing agreements with the GOALS OF ENSURING (1) CONSISTENCY ACROSS ALL SUCH AGREEMENTS, (2) MAXIMIZED FIELD USE ACROSS ALL AVAILABLE SITES/FACILITIES, especially those currently used by the three neighborhood high schools, (2) THOROUGH, CONSISTENT METHODOLOGIES FOR IMPLEMENTATION AT EACH SITE, AND (3) FAIRNESS TO ALL INVOLVED/IMPACTED PARTIES."
26	If the above study is undertaken, it must be with the understanding that any resulting recommendations be set forth as COUNTYWIDE REQUIREMENTS which are not only selectively applied to projects in the more economically disadvantaged south Arlington with the purpose of saving money for grandiose projects in the more affluent north Arlington. We must keep top-of-mind that Arlington's business and residential tax dollars are *pooled* and APS is a *public* school system - students/families with greater financial means do not deserve different/better facilities than those with fewer means. Arlington County/APS should offer equal facilities and educational opportunities to ALL of their students. I feel VERY strongly about capturing this sentiment in some way!!
27	a. "In all cases, the needs of the neighboring communities and those of the overall County must be balanced, with the needs of our growing student population given first priority."
28	Change "should" to "must" in the first paragraph.
29	Add Overall recommendations – (you'll need to edit the following):
30	The CCWG process was put into place after community concerns were raised regarding APS processes for developing new schools and programs. There was a lot of dissention in the development of the Fleet School project, which left a very strong sense of distrust. In addition, there was a belief that APS would approach the project from a school-seat only perspective without considering the needs of the Columbia Pike corridor. Neighborhood associations along the Pike joined in a letter to this effect, attached.
31	There was a delay in appointing members to the CCWG, then a delay in starting the meetings. This caused the meeting schedule to be out of sync with the CIP process. The CCWG requested information related to the CIP process and budgetary constraints, but this information was not received. The CCWG was surprised and disheartened to learn that CIP plans from APS and the School Board were recommended with no notice made to or input from the CCWG. After many members protested at School Board and county board meetings, a highly unsatisfactory plan was put forth as final and endorsed by both boards.
32	Civic engagement processes should be respected rather than dismissed as was done by the APS leadership team. The CCWG recommends that all future planning by current APS leadership be overseen by the JFAC to ensure that the leaders are not acting as if they have the authority to make all decisions on their own. The CCWG also recommends that sanctions be applied to the individuals responsible for this travesty of a process that caused intense dissatisfaction with the leadership of APS countywide.
33	a. Add "Examine school board/staff practices to ensure that decisions are made in concert with county engagement efforts such as this CCWG. This failure on the part of APS causes distrust and dissention in the community that must be avoided in the future."
34	b. Ensure that facilities built by APS are functionally and structurally sound to permit future expansion if necessary.
35	- No comment/concerns; I feel the recommended study is extremely important and should be prioritized – we need to move beyond the "schools of yesterday" and envision what APS future schools (to include revised uses/structure/student composition and attendance processes at our existing schools) might look like and operate in the envisioned new learning and educational models.
36	- DPR must be included in the give and take that needs to occur as we envision improved use models of our existing facilities for all community needs, to include student needs during school hours (to include after-school sports). I concur with the recommendations as noted for studies and engagement. Development of commercial and large residential parcels should also consider possibilities of privately built facilities that have community use agreements, to include for school purposes. These can be for fields, labs, technical learning, etc. These public-private models may attract companies for the win-win potential of growing certain industries – such as cyber security expertise – through skills development.
37	Take out "Since the County may be financially constrained in moving forward for the next decade or more." Simply state that the county should investigate public/private partnerships.... They already know that they are financially constrained.