Middle School AAP Center Expansion Plan & Timeline

Rationale 2
Current State 2
Program Standards for High Quality Implementation 3
Facility Capacity Utilization Analysis 4
    Plans to Address Overcrowding at Impacted Middle Schools 6
Grade Level Specific Numbers of Full-Time Eligible Students by Neighborhood School 7
Teacher Readiness Analysis & Professional Learning Plans 8
    Tiered Professional Learning 8
Timeline of School Phasing and Implementation of Full-Time AAP/Center 10
Appendix A: Middle School Facilities Program Capacity Analysis 12
Appendix B: New and Old Center Assignments 19
Appendix C: Percent of Middle School Advanced Coursework Taught by Teachers with VA Gifted Endorsement/FCPS AAP Certification 20
Appendix D: Budget for AAP Foundations for Middle School Teachers 20
Bibliography 22

draft

Middle School AAP Center Expansion Plan & Timeline

During the September 25, 2025 School Board meeting, the School Board voted to instruct the superintendent to develop and present to the Board, by March 2026, a comprehensive plan for establishing Advanced Academic Program (AAP) Centers in every middle school. This document outlines a proposed timeline for expanding Full-Time AAP Centers to every FCPS middle school by SY 2030-31. The plan includes a rationale and description of current state of FCPS middle schools' with Full-Time AAP, criteria for high quality implementation, analysis of the impacts to building facilities who will lose and gain student membership, eligible student counts to show availability of critical mass cohort sizes at each grade level, and an analysis of teacher readiness with professional development options.

Rationale

Offering Full-Time AAP Center services at all middle schools leverages the available cohort sizes of students eligible for Full-Time AAP to:

1. Increase equitable access to Full-Time AAP without leaving neighborhood schools
2. Prioritize peer group continuity for middle and high school pyramids
3. Reduce transportation costs and the complexity of facilities planning

Current State

As of SY 2025-26 and based on current grade configuration:

- 14 middle schools are AAP Centers (Carson, Frost, Glasgow, Hughes, Jackson, Kilmer, Lake Braddock, Rocky Run, Sandburg, and Twain serve neighborhood students and students from other feeder middle schools; Cooper, Johnson, South County, and Longfellow serve only students within the neighborhood school boundary).
- 1 middle school (Poe) was approved by the Board in December 2025 to become an AAP Center, starting with grade 6 for SY 2026-27. The Center will serve students in the Holmes and Poe boundaries and will have full implementation by SY 2028-29.
- 6 middle schools offer Local Full-Time AAP. Families have the option to attend their base middle school for services or attend the assigned AAP Center. The number of families who elect to stay for local services at each school is noted for SY 2025-2: Franklin (48), Herndon (84), Irving (156), Key (17), Thoreau (264), Whitman (40)
- 5 middle schools do not currently cohort students eligible for Full-Time AAP, but offer Honors courses in all four content areas (Hayfield, Holmes, Liberty, Robinson, Stone)

draft

Program Standards for High Quality Implementation

Standardizing the requirements for Full-Time Advanced Academic Programs is critical for maintaining division-wide equity and high instructional standards. By setting criteria and accountability structures, FCPS ensures that all eligible students benefit from a rigorous and supportive learning environment. FCPS has defined 5 program standard categories for AAP Centers: critical mass of students, rigorous instructional expectations, school leader readiness, teacher readiness, and structures for program monitoring and goal setting. Middle schools will submit annual Fidelity of Implementation reports, completed by local school instructional leaders (administrators, AART, department chairs), similar to the annual reports submitted by Full-Time AAP sites at the elementary level.

Program Standard	Description
Critical mass	Critical mass allows for a sufficient number of high-ability learners to be grouped together to allow for collaborative inquiry and peer-to-peer challenge (NAGC, 2025; Van Tassel-Baska et al, 2021; Steenbergen-Hu et al., 2016). FCPS considers critical mass to be a minimum of 2 full classes of Full-Time eligible students per grade level. This allows for whole class groupings while also providing opportunities for students to be in classes with different peers across content areas.
Rigorous instructional expectations and opportunities	Gifted education necessitates specialized curricula that cater to the unique cognitive and affective needs of gifted learners and moves beyond the standard curriculum (Gil, 2025; NAGC, 2026; NAGC, 2025; Oh et al., 2012; Tomlinson et al., 2009; Tyner, 2024; Van Tassel-Baska & Brown, 2007). The FCPS Honors Framework is founded on research-based models of curriculum and instruction to meet the needs of advanced learners. Students in advanced courses are assessed using extended standards that go beyond grade level standards and instructed using approaches such as: depth/complexity, acceleration, and research projects that increase discipline-specific and interdisciplinary expertise. In addition to academic opportunities during the school day, it is important to have a variety of academically-focused afterschool opportunities (e.g. Chess Club, Debate, MathCounts, Model UN, Science Olympiad, Chess Club) available at each school.
School leader readiness	The strength and effectiveness of advanced academic programs is influenced by school leaders with specialized training in research-based approaches to meet the instructional and social-emotional needs of

draft

Program Standard	Description
	advanced learners, yet few administrators have this specific background. Research emphasizes that without a leader's dedicated commitment to continuous evaluation and professional development, services for advanced learners remain disjointed and ineffective (Mun et al., 2020; Brown & Rinko-Gay, 2017; Lewis et al., 2007; Weber et al., 2003). The Advanced Academics team will work with school leaders (the Middle School Principals Association, Directors of Student Services) to provide tools for evaluating instruction in advanced courses (e.g. walkthrough and feedback tools). The AAP team will provide support for schools in doing walkthroughs if requested.
Teacher readiness	Although all teachers and leaders should have preparation grounded in evidence-based information about gifted education, this is rarely the case as there is no federal mandate requiring educators be prepared to serve advanced learners. Without training, achievement of advanced students suffers and excellence gaps among high-ability students from different demographic groups persist (Meyer et al., 2023; NAGC, 2026; Rambo-Hernandez et al., 2022; Rinn, 2022; Xiang et al., 2011). Teachers teaching advanced courses (AA/Honors) part-time (less than 5 sections) will complete 3 days of training on how to differentiate up and provide ascending levels of intellectual demand in instruction and assessment for advanced learners . They will complete 6 hours of job-embedded application of the FCPS Honors Framework through coaching cycles with the AART over the course of a school year. AARTs and teachers teaching advanced courses (AA/Honors) full-time (5+ sections) will earn the VA Gifted Endorsement or the FCPS AAP certification within 3 years of taking the position.
Structures for program monitoring and goal setting	Gifted Programming Standards from NAGC (2019) emphasize the importance of annual program evaluation and goal setting in multiple areas (e.g. understanding the learning needs and development of advanced learners, using evidence-based instructional approaches and curriculum, assessing students in alignment with programming, participating in professional learning related to programming for advanced learners). The Advanced Academics team will work with the Middle School Principals Association to support leaders in reflecting annually on programming and goal setting for fidelity of implementation aligned with FCPS' standards for advanced academic programming at the middle school level.

draft

Facility Capacity Utilization Analysis

Evaluating the facility capacity utilization if students were to attend their base middle school is an important factor in determining an implementation strategy. The Office of Facilities Planning Services (OFPS) provided each school's adjusted Program Capacity Utilization as if all the changes were fully implemented. This approach shows the full impacts to the facility. Projected student membership is adjusted by data regarding how many Full-Time eligible students each school would gain or lose. A year-by-year breakdown of membership projections and Program Capacity Utilization is available in Appendix A. Additional information about which schools will gain as other schools will lose enrollment is listed in Appendix B.

	Change in Full-Time AAP Eligible Student Enrollment	Total School Enrollment at Full Implementation	Current SY 2025-26 Program Capacity Utilization	Program Capacity Utilization at Full Implementation[2]		Change in Full-Time AAP Eligible Student Enrollment	Total School Enrollment at Full Implementation	Current SY 2025-26 Program Capacity Utilization	Program Capacity Utilization at Full Implementation[2]
Carson	-265	1,129	97%	82%	Kilmer	-85	963	92%	75%
Cooper	10	1,193	93%	109%	Lake Braddock	-216	1,120	90%	69%
Franklin[1]	+284	947	94%	112%	Liberty	+145	963	81%	88%
Frost	-56	1,122	92%	84%	Longfellow	-27	1,018	91%	76%
Glasgow	-136	1,595	92%	85%	Poe	+107	1,153	70%	93%
Hayfield	+128	986	81%	88%	Robinson	+52	1,233	94%	94%
Herndon	+121	897	90%	89%	Rocky Run	-266	673	81%	59%
Holmes	+126	944	85%	90%	Sandburg	-92	1,284	96%	88%
Hughes	-109	878	95%	84%	South County	+2	938	98%	97%
Irving	+89	1,247	108%	109%	Stone	+89	707	80%	82%
Jackson	-69	889	96%	85%	Thoreau	+158	1,442	93%	105%
Johnson	-2	1,111	104%	101%	Twain[1]	-159	915	102%	89%
Key	+95	751	72%	81%	Whitman	+101	891	77%	86%

[1] Schools are scheduled for a renovation to begin construction within five years in the FCPS Capital Improvement Plan.

Notes: 1) The *Change in Full-Time Eligible Student Enrollment* numbers reflect recently adopted boundary adjustments and the students who will be reassigned to their base middle school for Full-Time AAP using SY 2025-26 enrollment. The *Total School Enrollment* and *Program Capacity Utilization* are based on projected membership for SY 2030-31 and adjusted for full implementation of an AAP Full-Time Center.

2) Program Capacity Utilization is the percentage of program capacity that is utilized by the total membership within the school. It is calculated using that school year's program capacity which is based on the number of existing core classrooms used and the specific unique programs assigned to a school that differ from the original design of the building capacity.

3) Full implementation is met when all grade levels have been implemented and all students are being served at their neighborhood middle school.

Plans to Address Overcrowding at Impacted Middle Schools

If enacted to scale prior to the next boundary adjustment discussions in January 2031, this plan will cause overcrowding at 3 schools by adding more than 25 students (Franklin, Irving, Thoreau) and relieve overcrowding at 1 school that is currently a Full-Time AAP Center (Twain). One school is scheduled for a renovation in the next five years (Franklin).

FCPS generally uses the following potential solutions to accommodate changes in student membership in schools. Options are considered independently but may be contingent upon other potential solutions listed. Any option(s) chosen for implementation will be discussed and decided through a transparent process in accordance with School Board Policies and Regulations, as applicable.

A. Increase efficiency by reassigning instructional spaces within a school to accommodate an increase in membership.
B. Possible program changes.
C. Minor interior facility modifications to create additional instructional space and to help accommodate a capacity deficit.
D. Addition of temporary classrooms to accommodate a short-term capacity deficit.
E. Repurpose existing inventory of school facilities not currently being used as schools or build a new school facility.
F. Capacity enhancement through either a modular or building addition.
G. Utilize existing space on a school site currently used by non-school programs.
H. Potential boundary adjustment with other schools identified as having a capacity surplus.

The potential solutions listed above have been reviewed conceptually for the 3 schools where the plan will cause overcrowding. It is important to note option “H” is not used below due to the recently completed Comprehensive School Boundary Review. Options “E” and “F” are also not used below due to the length of the current renovation cycle unless a project is listed in the Adopted FCPS Capital Improvement Program for FY2027-31.

School	Potential Solutions	Conceptual Cost Estimate
Franklin	N/A: Renovation of school is estimated to begin construction FY 2030 (SY 2029-30)	
Irving	A, B, C, D	$225,000
Thoreau	A, B, C, D	$450,000

Note: All solutions identified below are conceptual and subject to detailed analysis, design, submittal, review, approval, and permitting by Fairfax County Land Development Services (which includes building permits) before work can commence.

draft

Grade Level Specific Numbers of Full-Time Eligible Students by Neighborhood School

The numbers below represent the cohort size by grade level for each school based on current grade configuration if all Full-Time AAP eligible students went to their assigned neighborhood middle school for the Full-Time advanced academic program. (Source: SY 2025-26 September certified student membership)

	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Total		Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Total
Carson	-	149	127	276	Kilmer	-	147	131	278
Cooper	-	181	178	359	Lake Braddock	-	130	119	249
Franklin[1]	-	169	163	332	Liberty	-	102	68	170
Frost	-	166	154	320	Longfellow	-	170	181	351
Glasgow	80	84	83	247	Poe	57	54	51	162
Hayfield	-	89	84	173	Robinson	-	147	140	287
Herndon	-	98	105	203	Rocky Run	-	91	82	173
Holmes	65	74	61	200	Sandburg	-	110	115	225
Hughes	-	95	95	190	South County	-	80	88	168
Irving	-	127	121	248	Stone	-	57	48	105
Jackson	-	100	112	212	Thoreau	-	214	206	420
Johnson	-	115	109	224	Twain[1]	-	84	81	165
Key	-	67	47	114	Whitman	-	71	67	138

[1] Schools scheduled for a renovation to begin construction within five years in the FCPS Capital Improvement Plan.

draft

Teacher Readiness Analysis & Professional Learning Plans

Regulation 3335 currently requires secondary teachers of 5 or more sections of advanced coursework to hold or be working towards their Virginia gifted endorsement or FCPS AAP certification and teachers with less than 5 sections of advanced coursework complete a minimum of one three-credit course in gifted education/advanced academics. Most schools do not schedule 5 advanced coursework sections for a teacher.

Instructional Services has worked with principals to survey the current number of middle school advanced coursework sections (Center or Honors) that are taught by a teacher holding a gifted endorsement or AAP certification.

- During SY 2025-26, 18% of advanced course sections were taught by teachers holding the VA gifted endorsement or FCPS AAP certification.
- The percent of gifted endorsed/AAP certified teachers in the core content areas are fairly consistent across the division with English (21%), Social Studies (18%), Science (17%), and Math (18%).
- The percentage of advanced course sections taught by teachers with VA gifted endorsement or FCPS AAP certification in middle schools that are currently designated as AAP Centers was 21%.
- The percentage of advanced course sections taught by teachers with VA gifted endorsement or FCPS AAP certification in middle schools that are not currently designated as AAP Centers was 14%.

Additional data by school is available in Appendix C.

Tiered Professional Learning

To ensure equitable access to advanced academics across all 26 middle schools, we must provide pathways for teachers to develop competency depending on whether they teach advanced courses (AA/Honors) part-time (less than 5 sections) or full-time (5 or more sections). This tiered approach allows the division to maintain high instructional standards while offering manageable entry points for educators, especially in the absence of direct compensation. Both levels of competency offer recertification points. For teachers required or interested in the deeper learning of the VA Gifted Endorsement/FCPS AAP Certification, credits can be applied for salary advancements (e.g. BA +15, BA +30, MA +30). Ideally, teachers' depth of AAP competency will be tracked in Lawson so that administrators and central offices have easy access to data.

The estimated cost to provide *AAP Foundations for Middle School Teachers* described below to any teacher teaching AA/Honors courses is $329,500. This estimate is based on current numbers of advanced course sections being taught by non-certified teachers and course sectioning practices where teachers predominantly teach 3 sections of AA/Honors courses. More information about the budget for AAP Foundations for Middle School Teachers can be found in Appendix D.

draft

Options for Depth of AAP Competency	Descriptions & Requirements
Tier 1 AAP Foundations for Middle School Teachers	*AAP Foundations for Middle School Teachers* is the minimum requirement for all middle school teachers who teach advanced courses (AA/Honors) part time (fewer than 5 AA/H sections). Points earned can count towards teaching license recertification. *Foundations* consists of: ● 18 hours/3 days of in-class learning surveying multiple topics related to advanced academics (e.g. using the FCPS Honors Framework, strategies and curriculum for advanced learners, understanding and serving 2e learners, FCPS Young Scholars, social-emotional needs of advanced learners). Substitutes will be provided. ● 6 hours of job-embedded coaching cycles with the AART to demonstrate application of approaches in units of study. Teachers can use the resources named in the middle school planning guides in their content area to teach extended standards and co-teach or debrief with the AART.
Tier 2 VA Gifted Endorsement or FCPS AAP Certification	AARTs and classroom teachers who teach 5 sections of advanced courses (honors or AA) are expected to earn the endorsement/certification within 3 years of taking their position. There are two options for this level of competency. Both options are completed outside of contract hours and may be counted towards salary credit and teaching license recertification. **Option1: VDOE Gifted Endorsement Add-on to Teaching License** ● The VA gifted endorsement is comprised of four graduate level 3-credit courses in specific topics related to gifted education and a practicum experience. Teachers submit their application to FCPS Human Resources to be sent to VDOE for processing and receive an add-on to their VA teaching license in gifted education. ● Teachers can apply for tuition reimbursement as the budget allows. ● After applying through FCPS Human Resources to the VDOE, this endorsement is added to the teaching license and is recognized throughout Virginia. **Option 2: Local FCPS AAP Certification** ● The local FCPS AAP certification consists of at least 9 credits of Foundational Coursework (course options are named on Atlas) and at least 3 credits/90 points of AAP professional development offerings. ● These courses and professional development offerings are free for FCPS staff through the FCPS Teacher Academy and inservice opportunities.

draft

Timeline of School Phasing and Implementation of Full-Time AAP/Center

The chart below lays out the phasing of each new Full-Time AAP Center, implementation of each grade level of programming, and monitoring of quality implementation by school year. Each new Center would have one year of preparation with teachers, school leaders, and the community, followed by implementation of one grade level per year until full implementation (development year).

School phasing was determined based on facilities readiness/school program capacity utilization, scheduled school renovations, and school plans for teacher readiness and curriculum expectations. Franklin will be under renovation through 2032 and two schools (Thoreau and Irving) will be over program capacity utilization. As noted in the *Facility Capacity Utilization Analysis* section above, this plan will require detailed review of space to understand constraints and opportunities to accommodate Full-Time AAP at these schools. Potential solutions such as increasing efficiency by reassigning instructional spaces within a school, possible program changes, minor interior facility modifications to create additional instructional space, and/or the addition of temporary classrooms. The conceptual cost estimate for these solutions is approximately $0.7 million.

School with Grade Levels and Projected Program Capacity Utilization at Full Implementation	**SY 2026-27**	**SY 2027-28**	**SY 2028-29**	**SY 2029-30**	**SY 2030-31**
PHASE 1 SCHOOLS **Poe Middle** (gr 6-8, SY 30-31 Capacity Util.93%)	Implement Grade 6	Implement Grade 7	Implement Grade 8	Monitor	Monitor
PHASE 2 SCHOOLS **Hayfield Middle** (gr 7-8, SY 30-31 Capacity Util. 88%) **Key Middle** (gr 7-8, SY 30-31 Capacity Util.81%) **Whitman Middle** (gr 7-8, SY 30-31 Capacity Util. 86%) **Holmes Middle**	Develop	Implement Grade 7 (Hayfield, Key, Whitman) Grade 6 (Holmes)	Implement Grade 8 (Hayfield, Key, Whitman) Grade 7 (Holmes)	Monitor (Hayfield, Key, Whitman) Implement Grade 8 (Holmes)	Monitor

draft

School with Grade Levels and Projected Program Capacity Utilization at Full Implementation	SY 2026-27	SY 2027-28	SY 2028-29	SY 2029-30	SY 2030-31
(gr 6-8, SY 30-31 Capacity Util.90%)					
PHASE 3 SCHOOLS **Herndon Middle** (gr 7-8, SY 30-31 Capacity Util. 89%) **Liberty Middle** (gr 7-8, SY 30-31 Capacity Util. 88%) **Robinson Middle** (gr 7-8, SY 30-31 Capacity Util. 94%) **Stone Middle** (gr 7-8, SY 30-31 Capacity Util. 82%)		Develop	Implement Grade 7	Implement Grade 8	Monitor
PHASE 4 SCHOOLS **Franklin Middle**[1] (gr 7-8, SY 30-31 Capacity Util. 112%; does not reflect renovation) **Irving Middle** (gr 7-8, SY 30-31 Capacity Util. 109%) **Thoreau Middle** (gr 7-8, SY 30-31 Capacity Util. 105%)			Develop	Implement Grade 7	Implement Grade 8

[1] School scheduled for a renovation to begin construction within five years in the FCPS CIP.

Note: The *Projected Program Capacity Utilization* reflects recently adopted boundary adjustments and the students who will be reassigned to their base middle school for Full-Time AAP using SY 2025-26 enrollment. The *Total School Enrollment* and *Program Capacity Utilization* are based on projected membership for SY 2030-31 as in the Adopted FY2027-31 FCPS CIP and adjusted for full implementation of an AAP Full-Time Center.

draft

Fairfax County PUBLIC SCHOOLS
ENGAGE • INSPIRE • THRIVE

Appendix A: Middle School Facilities Program Capacity Analysis

Carson MS

		SY 25-26					Projected Membership					Projected Program Capacity Utilization				
SCHOOL	DESIGN CAPACITY	PROGRAM CAPACITY	MEMBERSHIP	PROGRAM CAPACITY UTILIZATION %	TEMPORARY CLASSROOMS	MODULAR CLASSROOMS	SY26-27	SY27-28	SY28-29	SY29-30	SY30-31	SY26-27	SY27-28	SY28-29	SY29-30	SY30-31
Carson MS	1,539	1,385	1,343	97%	8	-	1,369	1,375	1,409	1,393	1,394	99%	99%	102%	101%	101%
Adjustment	-	-	-265				-265	-265	-265	-265	-265	-	-	-	-	-
Carson MS	1,539	1,385	1,078	78%	8	-	1,104	1,110	1,144	1,128	1,129	80%	80%	83%	81%	82%

Cooper MS

		SY 25-26					Projected Membership					Projected Program Capacity Utilization				
SCHOOL	DESIGN CAPACITY	PROGRAM CAPACITY	MEMBERSHIP	PROGRAM CAPACITY UTILIZATION %	TEMPORARY CLASSROOMS	MODULAR CLASSROOMS	SY26-27	SY27-28	SY28-29	SY29-30	SY30-31	SY26-27	SY27-28	SY28-29	SY29-30	SY30-31
Cooper MS	1,107	1,098	1,021	93%	-	-	1,050	1,045	1,107	1,133	1,086	96%	95%	101%	103%	99%
Adjustment	-	-	107				107	107	107	107	107	-	-	-	-	-
Cooper MS	1,107	1,098	1,128	103%	-	-	1,157	1,152	1,214	1,240	1,193	105%	105%	111%	113%	109%

Franklin MS

		SY 25-26					Projected Membership					Projected Program Capacity Utilization				
SCHOOL	DESIGN CAPACITY	PROGRAM CAPACITY	MEMBERSHIP	PROGRAM CAPACITY UTILIZATION %	TEMPORARY CLASSROOMS	MODULAR CLASSROOMS	SY26-27	SY27-28	SY28-29	SY29-30	SY30-31	SY26-27	SY27-28	SY28-29	SY29-30	SY30-31
Franklin MS	1,215	844	792	94%	-	-	792	758	718	697	670	94%	90%	85%	83%	79%
Adjustment	-	-	277				277	277	277	277	277	-	-	-	-	-
Franklin MS	1,215	844	1,069	127%	-	-	1,069	1,035	995	974	947	127%	123%	118%	115%	112%

Frost MS

		SY 25-26					Projected Membership					Projected Program Capacity Utilization				
SCHOOL	DESIGN CAPACITY	PROGRAM CAPACITY	MEMBERSHIP	PROGRAM CAPACITY UTILIZATION %	TEMPORARY CLASSROOMS	MODULAR CLASSROOMS	SY26-27	SY27-28	SY28-29	SY29-30	SY30-31	SY26-27	SY27-28	SY28-29	SY29-30	SY30-31
Frost MS	1,496	1,337	1,233	92%	-	-	1,232	1,212	1,180	1,183	1,178	92%	91%	88%	88%	88%
Adjustment	-	-	-56				-56	-56	-56	-56	-56	-	-	-	-	-
Frost MS	1,496	1,337	1,177	88%	-	-	1,176	1,156	1,124	1,127	1,122	88%	86%	84%	84%	84%

Fairfax County PUBLIC SCHOOLS
ENGAGE • INSPIRE • THRIVE

Glasgow MS

		SY 25-26					Projected Membership					Projected Program Capacity Utilization				
SCHOOL	DESIGN CAPACITY	PROGRAM CAPACITY	MEMBERSHIP	PROGRAM CAPACITY UTILIZATION %	TEMPORARY CLASSROOMS	MODULAR CLASSROOMS	SY26-27	SY27-28	SY28-29	SY29-30	SY30-31	SY26-27	SY27-28	SY28-29	SY29-30	SY30-31
Glasgow MS	1,959	1,885	1,739	92%	-	10	1,727	1,748	1,725	1,754	1,754	92%	93%	92%	93%	93%
Adjustment	-	-	-159				-159	-159	-159	-159	-159	-	-	-	-	-
Glasgow MS	1,959	1,885	1,580	84%	-	10	1,568	1,589	1,566	1,595	1,595	83%	84%	83%	85%	85%

Hayfield MS

		SY 25-26					Projected Membership					Projected Program Capacity Utilization				
SCHOOL	DESIGN CAPACITY	PROGRAM CAPACITY	MEMBERSHIP	PROGRAM CAPACITY UTILIZATION %	TEMPORARY CLASSROOMS	MODULAR CLASSROOMS	SY26-27	SY27-28	SY28-29	SY29-30	SY30-31	SY26-27	SY27-28	SY28-29	SY29-30	SY30-31
Hayfield MS	1,283	1,125	909	81%	-	-	908	920	918	892	858	81%	82%	82%	79%	76%
Adjustment	-	-	128				128	128	128	128	128	-	-	-	-	-
Hayfield MS	1,283	1,125	1,037	92%	-	-	1,036	1,048	1,046	1,020	986	92%	93%	93%	91%	88%

Herndon MS

		SY 25-26					Projected Membership					Projected Program Capacity Utilization				
SCHOOL	DESIGN CAPACITY	PROGRAM CAPACITY	MEMBERSHIP	PROGRAM CAPACITY UTILIZATION %	TEMPORARY CLASSROOMS	MODULAR CLASSROOMS	SY26-27	SY27-28	SY28-29	SY29-30	SY30-31	SY26-27	SY27-28	SY28-29	SY29-30	SY30-31
Herndon MS	1,176	1,005	902	90%	6	-	919	826	864	834	776	91%	82%	86%	83%	77%
Adjustment	-	-	121				121	121	121	121	121	-	-	-	-	-
Herndon MS	1,176	1,005	1,023	102%	6	-	1,040	947	985	955	897	103%	94%	98%	95%	89%

Holmes MS

		SY 25-26					Projected Membership					Projected Program Capacity Utilization				
SCHOOL	DESIGN CAPACITY	PROGRAM CAPACITY	MEMBERSHIP	PROGRAM CAPACITY UTILIZATION %	TEMPORARY CLASSROOMS	MODULAR CLASSROOMS	SY26-27	SY27-28	SY28-29	SY29-30	SY30-31	SY26-27	SY27-28	SY28-29	SY29-30	SY30-31
Holmes MS	1,176	1,045	892	85%	-	-	896	894	876	838	818	86%	86%	84%	80%	78%
Adjustment	-	-	126				126	126	126	126	126	-	-	-	-	-
Holmes MS	1,176	1,045	1,018	97%	-	-	1,022	1,020	1,002	964	944	98%	98%	96%	92%	90%

Fairfax County PUBLIC SCHOOLS
ENGAGE • INSPIRE • THRIVE

Hughes MS

		SY 25-26					Projected Membership					Projected Program Capacity Utilization				
SCHOOL	DESIGN CAPACITY	PROGRAM CAPACITY	MEMBERSHIP	PROGRAM CAPACITY UTILIZATION %	TEMPORARY CLASSROOMS	MODULAR CLASSROOMS	SY26-27	SY27-28	SY28-29	SY29-30	SY30-31	SY26-27	SY27-28	SY28-29	SY29-30	SY30-31
Hughes MS	1,162	1,051	1,000	95%	-	-	1,002	983	1,008	993	987	95%	94%	96%	94%	94%
Adjustment	-	-	-109				-109	-109	-109	-109	-109	-	-	-	-	-
Hughes MS	1,162	1,051	891	85%	-	-	893	874	899	884	878	85%	83%	86%	84%	84%

Irving MS

		SY 25-26					Projected Membership					Projected Program Capacity Utilization				
SCHOOL	DESIGN CAPACITY	PROGRAM CAPACITY	MEMBERSHIP	PROGRAM CAPACITY UTILIZATION %	TEMPORARY CLASSROOMS	MODULAR CLASSROOMS	SY26-27	SY27-28	SY28-29	SY29-30	SY30-31	SY26-27	SY27-28	SY28-29	SY29-30	SY30-31
Irving MS	1,152	1,149	1,238	108%	-	-	1,254	1,239	1,246	1,199	1,158	109%	108%	108%	104%	101%
Adjustment	-	-	89				89	89	89	89	89	-	-	-	-	-
Irving MS	1,152	1,149	1,327	115%	-	-	1,343	1,328	1,335	1,288	1,247	117%	116%	116%	112%	109%

Jackson MS

		SY 25-26					Projected Membership					Projected Program Capacity Utilization				
SCHOOL	DESIGN CAPACITY	PROGRAM CAPACITY	MEMBERSHIP	PROGRAM CAPACITY UTILIZATION %	TEMPORARY CLASSROOMS	MODULAR CLASSROOMS	SY26-27	SY27-28	SY28-29	SY29-30	SY30-31	SY26-27	SY27-28	SY28-29	SY29-30	SY30-31
Jackson MS	1,314	1,052	1,015	96%	6	-	968	999	1,006	999	958	92%	95%	96%	95%	91%
Adjustment	-	-	-69				-69	-69	-69	-69	-69	-	-	-	-	-
Jackson MS	1,314	1,052	946	90%	6	-	899	930	937	930	889	85%	88%	89%	88%	85%

Katherine Johnson MS

		SY 25-26					Projected Membership					Projected Program Capacity Utilization				
SCHOOL	DESIGN CAPACITY	PROGRAM CAPACITY	MEMBERSHIP	PROGRAM CAPACITY UTILIZATION %	TEMPORARY CLASSROOMS	MODULAR CLASSROOMS	SY26-27	SY27-28	SY28-29	SY29-30	SY30-31	SY26-27	SY27-28	SY28-29	SY29-30	SY30-31
Katherine Johnson MS	1,311	1,101	1,143	104%	-	-	1,159	1,155	1,173	1,157	1,131	105%	105%	107%	105%	103%
Adjustment	-	-	-20				-20	-20	-20	-20	-20	-	-	-	-	-
Katherine Johnson MS	1,311	1,101	1,123	102%	-	-	1,139	1,135	1,153	1,137	1,111	103%	103%	105%	103%	101%

Fairfax County PUBLIC SCHOOLS
ENGAGE • INSPIRE • THRIVE

Key MS

		SY 25-26					Projected Membership					Projected Program Capacity Utilization				
SCHOOL	DESIGN CAPACITY	PROGRAM CAPACITY	MEMBERSHIP	PROGRAM CAPACITY UTILIZATION %	TEMPORARY CLASSROOMS	MODULAR CLASSROOMS	SY26-27	SY27-28	SY28-29	SY29-30	SY30-31	SY26-27	SY27-28	SY28-29	SY29-30	SY30-31
Key MS	1,164	923	662	72%	-	-	660	670	690	716	656	72%	73%	75%	78%	71%
Adjustment	-	-	95				95	95	95	95	95	-	-	-	-	-
Key MS	1,164	923	757	82%	-	-	755	765	785	811	751	82%	83%	85%	88%	81%

Kilmer MS

		SY 25-26					Projected Membership					Projected Program Capacity Utilization				
SCHOOL	DESIGN CAPACITY	PROGRAM CAPACITY	MEMBERSHIP	PROGRAM CAPACITY UTILIZATION %	TEMPORARY CLASSROOMS	MODULAR CLASSROOMS	SY26-27	SY27-28	SY28-29	SY29-30	SY30-31	SY26-27	SY27-28	SY28-29	SY29-30	SY30-31
Kilmer MS	1,422	1,277	1,174	92%	4	10	1,183	1,173	1,163	1,180	1,157	93%	92%	91%	92%	91%
Adjustment	-	-	-194				-194	-194	-194	-194	-194	-	-	-	-	-
Kilmer MS	1,422	1,277	980	77%	4	10	989	979	969	986	963	77%	77%	76%	77%	75%

Lake Braddock MS

		SY 25-26					Projected Membership					Projected Program Capacity Utilization				
SCHOOL	DESIGN CAPACITY	PROGRAM CAPACITY	MEMBERSHIP	PROGRAM CAPACITY UTILIZATION %	TEMPORARY CLASSROOMS	MODULAR CLASSROOMS	SY26-27	SY27-28	SY28-29	SY29-30	SY30-31	SY26-27	SY27-28	SY28-29	SY29-30	SY30-31
Lake Braddock MS	1,644	1,631	1,466	90%	-	-	1,342	1,356	1,388	1,361	1,336	82%	83%	85%	83%	82%
Adjustment	-	-	-216				-216	-216	-216	-216	-216	-	-	-	-	-
Lake Braddock MS	1,644	1,631	1,250	77%	-	-	1,126	1,140	1,172	1,145	1,120	69%	70%	72%	70%	69%

Liberty MS

		SY 25-26					Projected Membership					Projected Program Capacity Utilization				
SCHOOL	DESIGN CAPACITY	PROGRAM CAPACITY	MEMBERSHIP	PROGRAM CAPACITY UTILIZATION %	TEMPORARY CLASSROOMS	MODULAR CLASSROOMS	SY26-27	SY27-28	SY28-29	SY29-30	SY30-31	SY26-27	SY27-28	SY28-29	SY29-30	SY30-31
Liberty MS	1,350	1,100	895	81%	-	-	880	853	826	818	818	80%	78%	75%	74%	74%
Adjustment	-	-	145				145	145	145	145	145	-	-	-	-	-
Liberty MS	1,350	1,100	1,040	95%	-	-	1,025	998	971	963	963	93%	91%	88%	88%	88%

Fairfax County PUBLIC SCHOOLS
ENGAGE • INSPIRE • THRIVE

Longfellow MS

		SY 25-26					Projected Membership					Projected Program Capacity Utilization				
SCHOOL	DESIGN CAPACITY	PROGRAM CAPACITY	MEMBERSHIP	PROGRAM CAPACITY UTILIZATION %	TEMPORARY CLASSROOMS	MODULAR CLASSROOMS	SY26-27	SY27-28	SY28-29	SY29-30	SY30-31	SY26-27	SY27-28	SY28-29	SY29-30	SY30-31
Longfellow MS	1,374	1,338	1,219	91%	-	-	1,172	1,190	1,248	1,207	1,142	88%	89%	93%	90%	85%
Adjustment	-	-	-124				-124	-124	-124	-124	-124	-	-	-	-	-
Longfellow MS	1,374	1,338	1,095	82%	-	-	1,048	1,066	1,124	1,083	1,018	78%	80%	84%	81%	76%

Poe MS

		SY 25-26					Projected Membership					Projected Program Capacity Utilization				
SCHOOL	DESIGN CAPACITY	PROGRAM CAPACITY	MEMBERSHIP	PROGRAM CAPACITY UTILIZATION %	TEMPORARY CLASSROOMS	MODULAR CLASSROOMS	SY26-27	SY27-28	SY28-29	SY29-30	SY30-31	SY26-27	SY27-28	SY28-29	SY29-30	SY30-31
Poe MS	1,356	1,235	861	70%	4	-	894	936	989	1,016	1,023	72%	76%	80%	82%	83%
Adjustment	-	-	130				130	130	130	130	130	-	-	-	-	-
Poe MS	1,356	1,235	991	80%	4	-	1,024	1,066	1,119	1,146	1,153	83%	86%	91%	93%	93%

Robinson MS

		SY 25-26					Projected Membership					Projected Program Capacity Utilization				
SCHOOL	DESIGN CAPACITY	PROGRAM CAPACITY	MEMBERSHIP	PROGRAM CAPACITY UTILIZATION %	TEMPORARY CLASSROOMS	MODULAR CLASSROOMS	SY26-27	SY27-28	SY28-29	SY29-30	SY30-31	SY26-27	SY27-28	SY28-29	SY29-30	SY30-31
Robinson MS	1,334	1,311	1,228	94%	-	-	1,307	1,295	1,249	1,219	1,181	100%	99%	95%	93%	90%
Adjustment	-	-	52				52	52	52	52	52	-	-	-	-	-
Robinson MS	1,334	1,311	1,280	98%	-	-	1,359	1,347	1,301	1,271	1,233	104%	103%	99%	97%	94%

Rocky Run MS

		SY 25-26					Projected Membership					Projected Program Capacity Utilization				
SCHOOL	DESIGN CAPACITY	PROGRAM CAPACITY	MEMBERSHIP	PROGRAM CAPACITY UTILIZATION %	TEMPORARY CLASSROOMS	MODULAR CLASSROOMS	SY26-27	SY27-28	SY28-29	SY29-30	SY30-31	SY26-27	SY27-28	SY28-29	SY29-30	SY30-31
Rocky Run MS	1,389	1,132	918	81%	-	-	923	925	949	938	914	82%	82%	84%	83%	81%
Adjustment	-	-	-241				-241	-241	-241	-241	-241	-	-	-	-	-
Rocky Run MS	1,389	1,132	677	60%	-	-	682	684	708	697	673	60%	60%	63%	62%	59%

Fairfax County PUBLIC SCHOOLS
ENGAGE • INSPIRE • THRIVE

Sandburg MS

		SY 25-26					Projected Membership					Projected Program Capacity Utilization				
SCHOOL	DESIGN CAPACITY	PROGRAM CAPACITY	MEMBERSHIP	PROGRAM CAPACITY UTILIZATION %	TEMPORARY CLASSROOMS	MODULAR CLASSROOMS	SY26-27	SY27-28	SY28-29	SY29-30	SY30-31	SY26-27	SY27-28	SY28-29	SY29-30	SY30-31
Sandburg MS	1,460	1,458	1,393	96%	-	-	1,387	1,344	1,384	1,424	1,399	95%	92%	95%	98%	96%
Adjustment	-	-	-115				-115	-115	-115	-115	-115	-	-	-	-	-
Sandburg MS	1,460	1,458	1,278	88%	-	-	1,272	1,229	1,269	1,309	1,284	87%	84%	87%	90%	88%

South County MS

		SY 25-26					Projected Membership					Projected Program Capacity Utilization				
SCHOOL	DESIGN CAPACITY	PROGRAM CAPACITY	MEMBERSHIP	PROGRAM CAPACITY UTILIZATION %	TEMPORARY CLASSROOMS	MODULAR CLASSROOMS	SY26-27	SY27-28	SY28-29	SY29-30	SY30-31	SY26-27	SY27-28	SY28-29	SY29-30	SY30-31
South County MS	1,426	970	953	98%	-	-	938	915	918	930	936	97%	94%	95%	96%	96%
Adjustment	-	-	2				2	2	2	2	2	-	-	-	-	-
South County MS	1,426	970	955	98%	-	-	940	917	920	932	938	97%	95%	95%	96%	97%

Stone MS

		SY 25-26					Projected Membership					Projected Program Capacity Utilization				
SCHOOL	DESIGN CAPACITY	PROGRAM CAPACITY	MEMBERSHIP	PROGRAM CAPACITY UTILIZATION %	TEMPORARY CLASSROOMS	MODULAR CLASSROOMS	SY26-27	SY27-28	SY28-29	SY29-30	SY30-31	SY26-27	SY27-28	SY28-29	SY29-30	SY30-31
Stone MS	1,104	861	688	80%	1	-	662	633	622	626	618	77%	74%	72%	73%	72%
Adjustment	-	-	89				89	89	89	89	89	-	-	-	-	-
Stone MS	1,104	861	777	90%	1	-	751	722	711	715	707	87%	84%	83%	83%	82%

Thoreau MS

		SY 25-26					Projected Membership					Projected Program Capacity Utilization				
SCHOOL	DESIGN CAPACITY	PROGRAM CAPACITY	MEMBERSHIP	PROGRAM CAPACITY UTILIZATION %	TEMPORARY CLASSROOMS	MODULAR CLASSROOMS	SY26-27	SY27-28	SY28-29	SY29-30	SY30-31	SY26-27	SY27-28	SY28-29	SY29-30	SY30-31
Thoreau MS	1,395	1,375	1,281	93%	-	-	1,293	1,277	1,271	1,228	1,175	94%	93%	92%	89%	85%
Adjustment	-	-	267				267	267	267	267	267	-	-	-	-	-
Thoreau MS	1,395	1,375	1,548	113%	-	-	1,560	1,544	1,538	1,495	1,442	113%	112%	112%	109%	105%

Fairfax County PUBLIC SCHOOLS
ENGAGE • INSPIRE • THRIVE

Twain MS

		SY 25-26					Projected Membership					Projected Program Capacity Utilization				
SCHOOL	DESIGN CAPACITY	PROGRAM CAPACITY	MEMBERSHIP	PROGRAM CAPACITY UTILIZATION %	TEMPORARY CLASSROOMS	MODULAR CLASSROOMS	SY26-27	SY27-28	SY28-29	SY29-30	SY30-31	SY26-27	SY27-28	SY28-29	SY29-30	SY30-31
Twain MS	1,027	1,026	1,049	102%	4	-	1,079	1,064	1,080	1,113	1,074	105%	104%	105%	108%	105%
Adjustment	-	-	-159				-159	-159	-159	-159	-159	-	-	-	-	-
Twain MS	1,027	1,026	890	87%	4	-	920	905	921	954	915	90%	88%	90%	93%	89%

Whitman MS

		SY 25-26					Projected Membership					Projected Program Capacity Utilization				
SCHOOL	DESIGN CAPACITY	PROGRAM CAPACITY	MEMBERSHIP	PROGRAM CAPACITY UTILIZATION %	TEMPORARY CLASSROOMS	MODULAR CLASSROOMS	SY26-27	SY27-28	SY28-29	SY29-30	SY30-31	SY26-27	SY27-28	SY28-29	SY29-30	SY30-31
Whitman MS	1,344	1,031	791	77%	-	-	782	741	734	762	767	76%	72%	71%	74%	74%
Adjustment	-	-	124				124	124	124	124	124	-	-	-	-	-
Whitman MS	1,344	1,031	915	89%	-	-	906	865	858	886	891	88%	84%	83%	86%	86%

Appendix B: New and Old Center Assignments

The chart below represents the connection between the prior center assignment/school that will lose students as each new center opens.

New Center to Open	Connected School(s) Losing Students
Hayfield	Twain MS / Lake Braddock MS
Key	Twain MS / Lake Braddock MS
Whitman	Sandburg MS
Holmes	Frost MS / Poe MS
Herndon	Hughes MS / Carson MS
Liberty	Rocky Run MS
Robinson	Lake Bradcock MS / Robinson MS
Stone	Rocky Run MS
Franklin	Carson MS / Rocky Run MS
Irving	Lake Braddock MS
Thoreau	Jackson MS/ Kilmer MS

draft

Appendix C: Percent of Middle School Advanced Coursework Taught by Teachers with VA Gifted Endorsement/FCPS AAP Certification

The following data shows the percent of sections of advanced courses (honors and AA center) taught by teachers holding the VA gifted endorsement add-on to their teaching license or the local AAP certification by school, overall, and by content area.

	Overall Percent	English	Social Studies	Science	Math		Overall Percent	English	Social Studies	Science	Math
Carson	31%	20%	32%	41%	30%	Kilmer	22%	11%	26%	22%	27%
Cooper	15%	8%	15%	12%	21%	Lake Braddock	15%	0%	0%	58%	0%
Franklin	24%	22%	16%	25%	36%	Liberty	41%	13%	47%	17%	83%
Frost	25%	54%	25%	25%	0%	Longfellow	34%	64%	25%	33%	6%
Glasgow	4%	0%	0%	0%	18%	Poe	14%	22%	0%	0%	29%
Hayfield	4%	0%	0%	0%	19%	Robinson	8%	27%	0%	0%	14%
Herndon	4%	0%	0%	20%	0%	Rocky Run	62%	46%	57%	74%	70%
Holmes	14%	12%	0%	38%	16%	Sandburg	7%	0%	13%	0%	17%
Hughes	17%	15%	22%	29%	0%	South County	34%	38%	35%	19%	42%
Irving	12%	25%	15%	7%	0%	Stone	4%	0%	20%	0%	0%
Jackson	15%	0%	42%	0%	18%	Thoreau	20%	26%	19%	34%	0%
Johnson	30%	24%	30%	14%	46%	Twain	25%	32%	42%	21%	0%
Key	14%	15%	0%	31%	11%	Whitman	6%	0%	0%	0%	21%

Appendix D: Budget for AAP Foundations for Middle School Teachers

Year	Schools/Participants	Total Approximate Cost: $329,500
SY 2026-27	• Phase 1&2 schools (develop year) • 1/3 of teachers at current centers who are not gifted endorsed/AAP certified • estimated 229 teachers	$111,500
SY 2027-29	• Phase 3 schools (develop year) • 1/3 of teachers at current centers who are not gifted endorsed/AAP certified • estimated 227 teachers	$111,000
SY 2029-30	• Phase 4 schools (develop year) • 1/3 of teachers at current centers who are not gifted endorsed/AAP certified • estimated 218 teachers	$107,000
sustaining	• newly hired teachers	variable based on additional sections or teacher turnover

Note: All costs are estimates based on the projected number of teachers who will teach 3 sections of advanced courses (the predominant advanced (AA/Honors) course load in SY 2025-26 data collection of middle school teaching assignments).

draft

Bibliography

Brown, E. F., & Rinko-Gay, C. (2017). Moral frameworks for leaders of gifted programs and services. *Roeper Review, 39*(2), 121–131. https://doi.org/10.1080/02783193.2017.1289485

Gil, T. (2025). Curriculum Models in Gifted Education: A Comparative Study for 21st-Century Schools. *Journal of Education Research*, *6*(4), 945–960. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.37985/jer.v6i4.2885

Lewis, J. D., Cruzeiro, P. A., & Hall, C. A. (2007). Impact of two elementary school principals' leadership on gifted education in their buildings. Gifted Child Today, 30(2), 56–62. https://doi.org/10.4219/gct-2007-35

Mun, R. U., Ezzani, M. D., & Lee, L. E. (2020). Culturally relevant leadership in gifted education: A systematic literature review. Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 43(2), 108–142. https://doi.org/10.1177/0162353220912009

National Association for Gifted Children. (2019). *NAGC pre-K–grade 12 gifted programming standards*. https://www.nagc.org/national-standards-in-gifted-and-talented-education

National Association for Gifted Children. (2026). *Challenging gifted and advanced learners through differentiated curriculum & instructional strategies*. https://www.nagc.org/news/challenging-gifted-and-advanced-learners-through-differentiated-curriculum--instructional-strategies

National Association for Gifted Children. (2025). *Acceleration*. https://www.nagc.org/news/acceleration

National Association for Gifted Children. (2025). *Grouping for gifted learners*. https://www.nagc.org/news/grouping-for-gifted-learners

Oh, S. S., Hailey, E., Azano, A. P., Callahan, C. M., & Moon, T. R. (2012). *What works in gifted education: Documenting the model-based curriculum for gifted students*. Society for Research on Educational Effectiveness.

Rambo-Hernandez, K. E., Makel, M. C., Peters, S. J., & Worley, C. (2022). Differential return on investment: Academic growth in mathematics and reading based on initial performance. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 92*(3), 817–842. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjep.12479

Rinn, A. N., Mun, R. U., & Hodges, J. (2022). *2020–2021 state of the states in gifted education*. National Association for Gifted Children & Council of State Directors of Programs for the Gifted. https://nagc.org/page/state-of-the-states-report

Steenbergen-Hu, S., Makel, M. C., & Olszewski-Kubilius, P. (2016). What one hundred years of research says about the effects of ability grouping and acceleration on K–12 students' academic achievement: Findings of two second-order meta-analyses. *Review of Educational Research, 86*(4), 849–899. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654316675417

draft

Tomlinson, C. A., Kaplan, S. N., Renzulli, J. S., Purcell, J. H., Leppien, J. H., Burns, D. E., Strickland, C. A., & Imbeau, M. B. (2009). *The Parallel Curriculum: A Design to Develop Learner Potential and Challenge Advanced Learners* (2nd ed.). Corwin Press & National Association for Gifted Children.

VanTassel-Baska, J., & Brown, E. (2007). Toward best practice: An analysis of the efficacy of curriculum models in gifted education. *Roeper Review*, 29 (4), 211–218.

VanTassel-Baska, J., Hubbard, G. F., & Robbins, J. I. (2021). Differentiation of instruction for gifted learners: Collated evaluative studies of teacher classroom practices. In S. R. Smith (Ed.), *Handbook of giftedness and talent development in the Asia-Pacific* (pp. 945–979). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-3041-4_45

Weber, C. L., Colarulli-Daniels, R., & Leinhauser, J. A. (2003). A tale of two principals. *Gifted Child Today, 26*(4), 55–65. https://doi.org/10.4219/gct-2003-112

Xiang, Y., Dahlin, M., Cronin, J., Theaker, R., & Durant, S. (2011). *Do high flyers maintain their altitude? Performance trends of top students* (ERIC Document No. ED524344). Thomas B. Fordham Institute. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED524344

draft