



Internal Attendance Boundary Committee July 22, 2019 Meeting Summary

Call to Order

The eighth meeting of the Internal Attendance Boundary Committee was called to order at 6:09 p.m.

Committee members present: Alejandra Adame Barcenas, Cecilie Ballard, Jenna Boyd, Carrie Brooker, Gretchen Collins, Julie Colmar-Davis, Joanna Cree, Kathleen Franzen, David Goeddel, Julie Johnson, Elizabeth Kemp, Meghna Kuckreja, Allison La Tarte, Lisa Labissoniere, Katherine McCallum, Kathy Nieber-Lathrop, Debra Pickett, Marina Probasco, Tami Shaw, Ryan Sippel, Kim Sloan, Justine Wegner, Julie Winklemann.

Committee member not present: Scott Neville (attended a small portion), Brian Shaw.

Others present: Drew Howick, Mark Roffers, Dana Monogue, Sherri Cyra, Lori Ames, Rainey Briggs, Jeff Fedler, Jessica Schwartz, Katy Morgan, Bob Hesselbein, Bob Green, Perry Hibner.

Welcome and Orientation

Facilitator Drew Howick briefly reviewed the agenda for Monday's meeting. After hearing about feedback from District families, members will spend most of the meeting re-evaluating the options after hearing from principals along with feedback from some neighborhoods not represented on the committee. He then reviewed the charge of committee and their commitments.

New superintendent Dana Monogue introduced herself to the committee. She noted she has spent a lot of time in the District in the spring before starting July 1. Her family will move into the District in late August. She also thanked the members for their time and effort doing this important work.

Director of Communications Perry Hibner reviewed some of the common themes coming from the online feedback form. He noted there have nearly 60 responses received since the form became available in May. The majority of the responses have come from the Northlake neighborhood, with High Point Estates and Timber Lane also providing multiple comments.

Mark Roffers then reviewed responses to options. He noted the last time the committee did this was June 5 and that this was third time responses and answers have been shared. He also noted a big part of the work at Monday's meeting will be reviewing options and variations that have been proposed.

Re-evaluating Existing Options & Potential Narrowing

Howick shared the results from previous meetings when the committee evaluated each option based on the eight criteria. He noted Option E, which had tried to even out the number of students on free or reduced lunch across the seven elementary schools, had received little support and members indicated they didn't think it was viable. As a result, District administrators recommended that Option E be

removed from further consideration in order to give the committee more time to evaluate the other ones. The members agreed.

Howick noted members will re-evaluate each of the four remaining options along with possible variations. He added at the next meeting in August members will in real-time see impact of any variation changes, which might result in Option A-1 or Option B-2, for example.

Howick then reviewed the process members will use:

1. Individually indicate on updated dashboard if option meets, doesn't meet or don't know if it meets each of the eight criteria.
2. Each table should identify facilitator and recorder.
3. Facilitator asks each table member about criteria for option and recorder keeps track of results.
4. After review the option, ask table members if worth retaining as is, worth retaining with variation or not worth retaining at all.
5. If worth retaining as is or not worth retaining, move on to next option. If worth retaining with variation, go through variations and record results.
6. Tables should spend 10-15 minutes on each option. However, it was noted that members identified 22 variations identified for Option A compared with 5 for Option C so some may take longer.
7. Hand in completed worksheet after finish work for each option.

Roffers noted some member suggestions and variations may result in overcrowding at a school due to the change unless something else happens that moves students to another school. He asked that members please make notes about it.

The table members were given approximately 90 minutes to go through each option and variations.

Assessment of Responses-Approach for Next Meeting

Roffers, who was tallying results and noting comments while members reviewed the options, provided a high-level summary of what was provided by each table.

Option A: He noted it performed well against many of the eight criteria. It scored lowest on No. 1 (Projected Enrollment and Building Utilization) and No. 5 (Fiscal Responsibility). Every member wanted Option A with variations to move forward. Roffers said the changes that had the most support relieved West Middleton of capacity issues, such as moving students north of Mineral Point Road to Pope Farm and-or Sunset Ridge.

Option B: He noted it performed well against many of the criteria. It scored lowest on No. 2 (Boundary Changes Should Address Barriers to Student and Family Engagement) and No. 4 (Duration of Boundaries/Minimize Impact on Students). Roffers suggested that might have to do with the free and reduced lunch percentage at Sauk Trail and moving Neighborhood 67 to Elm Lawn. Two wanted to move forward as is and seven said end it right now, while the rest supported it with variations. The changes suggested most included having Neighborhoods 66-71 at West Middleton, while Neighborhoods 63 & 65 would go to Pope Farm.

He suggested in order for Option B to remain viable it would take a lot of work and that each variation would have a domino effect.

Option C: Roffers noted it did well with a few criteria, but scored poorly on No. 4 (Duration of Boundaries/Minimize Impact on Students). He said that was likely due to the shift of Neighborhoods 66-71 to Pope Farm. More than two-thirds of members thought Option C wasn't worth retaining and the committee agreed to remove it.

Option D: Roffers noted 22 members wanted to move it forward with variations. He said there was lots of support for having part of Neighborhood 16 go to Sauk Trail and the other part to Sunset Ridge. There was also support for shifting Neighborhoods 68-69 to West Middleton and Neighborhoods 54 and 57 to Pope Farm. Nine supported having Neighborhood 7 remain at Northside, while four wanted Neighborhoods 8-10 going to Sauk Trail.

Roffers and the committee agreed the next step would be to explore one or more variations to Option A and Option D at the next couple of meetings.

Howick briefly reviewed the Aug. 5 meeting. He noted Board of Education members would like to attend the meeting. He asked if there was a few members who would share the work the committee has done so far and that possible talking points will be provided. Cecile Ballard, Kathy Nieber-Lathrop, Debra Pickett and Julie Winkelman volunteered to present a high level summary.

The meeting adjourned was at 8:23 p.m.