

**Boundary Advisory Committee
06-19-2019
Summary of All Options Evaluation**

Criteria Description

- Criteria 1 = Projected Enrollment and Building Utilization
- Criteria 2 = Addresses Barriers to Student and Family Engagement
- Criteria 3 = Neighborhood Unity
- Criteria 4 = Duration of Boundaries/Minimize Impact on Students
- Criteria 5 = Fiscal Responsibility
- Criteria 6 = Elementary to Middle School Feeder Structure
- Criteria 7 = Contiguous Attendance Areas
- Criteria 8 = District Transportation Efficiency

Option A

Criteria Table	1			2			3			4			5			6			7			8		
	Y	N	DK	Y	N	DK	Y	N	DK	Y	N	DK	Y	N	DK	Y	N	DK	Y	N	DK	Y	N	DK
1	2	2	2	2			4	3	1	2	5	1				6	1	3	2	6				6
2		6		1	3	2	4		2	4		2				6	4	1	1	5	1		5	1
3	4		1	4			1	5			5			2		3	3		2	5			5	
4		4	2	1			5	4		2	4		2	2		4	2	2	2	6			6	
Summary	6	12	5	8	3	12	16	1	6	18	1	4	4	0	19	10	6	7	22	1	0	22	0	1
Average	1.5	3	1.25	2	0.75	3	4	0.25	1.5	4.5	0.25	1	1	0	4.75	2.5	1.5	1.75	5.5	0.25	0	5.5	0	0.25

Comments

- Table 1 We acknowledge that option A meets the criteria for 4,7 & 8
Uncertain whether we are meeting #2 & #1 with this option.
- Table 2 WM still over capacity on day 1 - NOT OK ->54 to Pope?
ST increases F/R lunch %, NS goes down. -> concentrating more in on school.
EL has "island" neighborhood 16 - go to ST?
Econ. Disparity @ Pope Farm 6% F/R & 46% students of color.
Only one E.S. split for middle school.
- Table 4 #5 - We need more fact based info to make a decision on this option
For #1& #2 we need the % change
Break down what we mean by students of color
- Questions
- Table 2 Where exactly will Pope Farm be situated? ->actual walkability of Pope Farm.
- Table 3 What info should be considered to evaluate fiscal responsibility?
What more can we do for WM to take the over capacity away from them?
i.e. can we break one of the larger neighborhoods up? #54 or #55 to SSR
How do we evaluate for #6 (data, etc) can we get more info?
- Table 4 Why do we have one elementary school start with over crowding when others are not at capacity?
Can we get an idea of neighborhoods distribution of : to help with answering #2.
Free & Reduced Lunch
ELL
Students of color
What should an ideal #2 look like?
What Services are at the current schools?

Option B

Criteria Table	1			2			3			4			5			6			7			8		
	Y	N	DK	Y	N	DK	Y	N	DK	Y	N	DK	Y	N	DK	Y	N	DK	Y	N	DK	Y	N	DK
1	2	4		6			2	1	3	2	3	1	1	2	3	1	1	4	3	1	2	6		
2	6			2	1	3	5		1	4	2		1		5	5		1	6				6	
3	4		1	1	4					5			1		4	3		2	4	1	5			
4	5		1	1	5		6			5	1		3		3	2		4	6				6	
Summary	17	4	2	3	13	7	18	1	4	16	6	1	6	2	15	11	1	11	19	2	7	18	0	0
Average	4.25	1	0.5	0.75	3.25	1.75	4.5	0.25	1	4	1.5	0.25	1.5	0.25	3.75	2.75	0.25	2.75	4.75	0.5	1.75	4.5	0	0

Comments

- Table 1 Concerns about concentrations of families with Free and Reduced.
Concerns about moving and changing learning environments for most marginalized students.
- Table 2 Sauk Trail percentages are concerning. (Respectfully for West Middleton)
- Table 3 PF & WM will be "brand new" school- start over with new blend of students. Neigh unity (#3, #7) > met that criteria
Fiscal Responsibility. Hugh?
- Table 4 25% Free/reduced @ ST
distruption to children's education team/planning in situations with established support staff (reading/IEP similar)
- Questions
- Table 1 Projecting changes in Free & Reduced lunch based n new multi-family developments?
How statistically accurtare are long term projections?
How would shifting F&R students affect the staffing based on need?
- Table 2 None listed
- Table 3 a. 66-71 are not approx. to schools
b. go to KMS

	c. availability of public transportation																						
	d. ST & EL share some staff																						
	e. ST qualifies for grants																						
	f. subject and oby benefits to the school.																						
Table 4	None listed																						

Option C																										
Criteria Table	1			2			3			4			5			6			7			8				
	Y	N	DK	Y	N	DK	Y	N	DK	Y	N	DK	Y	N	DK	Y	N	DK	Y	N	DK	Y	N	DK		
1	4		2			6		3	3	1	3	2			6	3		3		5	1	6				
2	4	1	1			6	2	3	1	1	4	1			6	4		2		5	1	5			1	
3	5				1	4	3		2		4	1			5	5				4		1	5			
4	5	1		2		4	6				3	3			3	3		3		3	4	1	4			2
Summary	18	2	1	2	1	20	11	6	6	2	14	7	3	0	20	15	0	8	8	8	11	4	20	0		3
Average	4.5	0.5	0.25	0.5	0.25	5	2.75	1.5	1.5	0.5	3.5	1.75	0.75	0	5	3.75	0	2	2	2.75	1	5	0		0.75	

Comments																							
Table 1	Lots of kids need to Concerns for removing high income Blackhawk from Sauk Trail and not replacing this demographic in the school.																						
Table 2	We might be moving the most marginal (69, 70) more even distribution of free/reduced lunches. More even distribution of Free/Reduced lunches Positive impact of moving to a new school (66-71) Building a scaffolding culture from the beginning @ Pope Farm.																						
Table 3	None listed																						
Table 4	Could not read what the comments were.																						
Questions																							
Table 1	How does moving neighborhood #14 change the cultural effects in schools?																						
Table 2	Why such an under utilization of Elm Lawn?																						
Table 3	We agree on brand new "West Middleton" In #2 is goal to make % more + or is the goal for good school environment?																						
Table 4	None listed																						

Option D																								
Criteria Table	1			2			3			4			5			6			7			8		
	Y	N	DK	Y	N	DK	Y	N	DK	Y	N	DK	Y	N	DK	Y	N	DK	Y	N	DK	Y	N	DK
1	2	3	1	3	1	1	1	1	4	1	5		1	1	5	1	1	5	1	3	2	1	1	4
2	5			2	1	1	4	1		5			2	1	2	3	1	1	3	1	1	4	1	
3	2	4		1	1	3	4	1	6				1	1	4	6			1	3	2	4	1	1
4	2	3	1	2		3	1	2	2	5					5	3		2		4	1	4	1	
Summary	11	10	2	8	3	8	10	7	4	21	0	1	4	2	16	13	1	8	5	11	6	13	4	5
Average	2.75	2.5	0.5	2	0.75	2	2.5	1.75	1	5.25	0	0.25	1	0.5	4	3.25	0.25	2	1.25	2.75	1.5	3.25	1	1.25

Questions:																							
Table 3	What does criteria #2 mean? What is the goal - getting percentages even?																						
Comments:																							
Table 1	Lots of thoughts on capacity - Wondering if there are simple neighborhood movements that might alleviate, but that goes against the goal of this option. Concerns about the neighborhood split in 68-70 were voiced from beginning, and that is shown in our responses to 1,2,3,7.																						
Table 3	Criteria 1 - Building capacity issue can be adjusted. Minimizing impact on families is an important goal.																						
Table 4	Under utilization of NS and ST these schools should be colser to capacity @2020. Under utilization of SSR Limits movement of marginalized pop.																						

Option E																								
Criteria Table	1			2			3			4			5			6			7			8		
	Y	N	DK	Y	N	DK	Y	N	DK	Y	N	DK	Y	N	DK	Y	N	DK	Y	N	DK	Y	N	DK
1	2	1	3		1	4		5	1		4	2		4	2		2	4		6			6	
2	5				3	2		5			5			1	4	1	2	2		5		1	4	
3	1	4	1	1	1	4		4	2		6			3	3	4	2			5	1		6	
4	1	4		1	3	1		5			5			1	4		4	1		5			5	
Summary	9	9	4	2	8	11	0	19	3	0	20	2	0	9	13	5	8	9	0	21	1	1	21	0
Average	2.25	2.25	1	0.5	2	2.75	0	4.75	0.75	0	5	0.5	0	2.25	3.25	1.25	2	2.25	0	5.25	0.25	0.25	5.25	0

Questions																							
Table 1	Is it possible to not be in the red? Shift families around? Equality vs Equity? No fiscal responsibility?																						
Table 3	Underutilization of NS and ST is (troubling???) WM to moving to higher over capped, would quickly make them strained. Could we get the table in #2 to include % walkable? It could help ansewr accessible schools. What would spreading out Free and Reduced lunch, answer the change of #2 (part B)																						
Comments																							
Table 2	If we need to divide a school, this way was the best option (Criteria 6)																						
Table 4	Putting walkable neighborhoods on a bus - negative.																						

