



Internal Attendance Boundary Committee Aug. 5, 2019 Meeting Summary

Call to Order

The ninth meeting of the Internal Attendance Boundary Committee was called to order at 6:06 p.m.

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

Committee member not present: Gretchen Collins, Kathleen Franzen, Lisa Labissoniere.

Others present: Drew Howick, Mark Roffers, Dana Monogue, Sherri Cyra, Lori Ames, Jeff Fedler, Jessica Schwartz, Annette Ashley, Anne Bauer, Bob Green, Bob Hesselbein, Minza Karim, Paul Kinne, Katy Morgan, Perry Hibner.

Welcome and Orientation

Facilitator Drew Howick briefly reviewed agenda for Monday's meeting. He noted the meeting was moved to Kromrey to accommodate a larger audience, including the Board of Education. Board president Bob Green will address the committee and three committee members will review what the committee has accomplished so far.

The bulk of the meeting will be spent reviewing variations to Option A and Option D, Howick said. Like the first five options presented, he noted they aren't recommendations but efforts to help members decide what has the most potential. They will also review whether they meet or don't meet the criteria.

Howick shared feedback members provided after the July 22 meeting. Lots of positives were shared, including allowing members to go back and review the five original options. Members also appreciated being allowed to narrow down options. Members thought it was difficult to hear others at their tables and felt constrained by the lack of space at the District Services Center.

Director of Communications Perry Hibner reviewed logistics for the meeting. The Kromrey community room isn't equipped to film or record audio so a camera and two microphones were brought in. He reminded presenters and members who are sharing out table discussions to use one of the microphones so that community members who watch the video hear what has been covered. He also noted future meetings will at Kromrey unless a bigger space is needed once community feedback is solicited, likely in October.

Board president Bob Green reviewed the eight criteria the committee was asked to use to evaluate the options. He noted no additional criteria -- including balancing socio-economic numbers across all of the elementary schools -- has been added. He also noted the Board will be discussing at its regular meeting on Aug. 13 whether to share the online feedback that has been provided by residents with the

committee. If the Board approves sharing the e-mails, any personal identifiable information will be redacted, he noted.

Members Cecile Ballard, Julie Winkelmann and Deb Pickett reviewed the work of the committee. Each one shared personal information and why they offered to serve on the committee. Pickett noted attendance has been high at every meeting. They briefly reviewed information shared with members from the District related to enrollment projections, building capacity, and transportation. They also noted the committee have worked with lots of different members and heard multiple perspectives.

Winkelmann reviewed each of the first five options and how the committee felt about each one. She also reviewed efforts the District made to hear from some marginalized families in three areas in MCPASD and noted the committee asked for that feedback to make sure those voices were heard. Pickett noted the District has helped the committee better understand the equity work taking place. All three agreed the committee is trying to remove barriers for students and families who are most marginalized. They all noted a goal is to move the fewest number of children and have them go to the closest possible school.

Ballard said the committee also asked to hear from some school principals about what is working and what is not working and reviewed the questions members wanted the principals to answer.

Option A1 Overview & Evaluation

Consultant Mark Roffers briefly reviewed the work the committee did on July 22, noting Option E was discarded early, while Option C also had issues so it was dismissed. Of the remaining options, Options A and D rated best, except in regards to capacity challenges, so members requested that variations to those options be brought forward.

Roffers shared the top seven variations based on member voting from the last meeting. He indicated he didn't incorporate all of them into Option A1 partly due to practicality but also wanted to make sure it looked different from D1. He noted Option A1 has a fair amount of change from Option A.

In Option A1, the West Middleton attendance area shrinks to get its enrollment below the current capacity of 443. It has the southeast neighborhoods attending West Middleton, but other neighborhoods along Mineral Point Road moved to Pope Farm or Sunset Ridge. Two neighborhoods west of the Beltline would go to Elm Lawn. Neighborhood 25, which is within walking distance of Pope Farm but currently goes to Sauk Trail, would still move to Pope Farm.

Roffers noted no school is over capacity in 2025, although West Middleton is at 443. Roffers noted Park, Pope Farm and West Middleton may be over capacity by 2030, while Elm Lawn may be about 100 students under capacity so some neighborhoods could move there to help with overcrowding.

In Option A1, 28 percent of students would change schools, compared with 22 percent in Option A. Of the 76 neighborhoods, 23 would change schools in Option A1, compared with 20 in Option A. In Option A1, 83 percent would attend their closest school, compared with 84 percent in Option A. He noted today 71 percent currently attend their closest school. Parts of Blackhawk and 16E would also shift to walking zones.

Howick then reviewed how to review Option A1 and briefly went through the option evaluation process. Members at the four tables were given 30 minutes to evaluate the option using the dashboard and share their voting and ideas with rest of table. Each table then shared their thoughts.

Some wondered why two neighborhoods close to West Middleton were moved to Sunset Ridge, which is much farther away. Some variations suggested made it look similar to Option D1. Most were concerned that West Middleton was still at or over capacity, while others worried about Elm Lawn being way under. Some suggested that Northside and Elm Lawn perhaps should operate closer to capacity because it appears they would have few marginalized students. Others expressed concerns about the middle school division. Some wondered about sending 16E and 16W to different schools and suggested moving each neighborhood to Northside.

There were also concerns about enrollment challenges by 2030 at some schools. Roffers suggested focusing on 2025 numbers because they get less reliable further out. He thinks enrollment will reach the 2030 numbers his firm projects eventually but it could be 2028 or 2033, for example.

Roffers also noted in any district there are stable enrollment schools and others are growth schools. Because of projected growth in the south part of the District, he notes Pope Farm will likely be a growth school, which is one reason why the options don't start Pope Farm at its capacity of 525 students. He also noted at some point a growth school, such as West Middleton, will become a stable school. He also reminded members just because West Middleton's projected enrollment in 2030 is 478 doesn't mean it will be 578 in 2040.

Option D1 Overview & Evaluation

Roffes reviewed the top seven Option D variations based on member voting from the last meeting. Just like with Option A1, Roffers noted he didn't incorporate all of variations in D1 because it wasn't practical to make all of them. He also wanted to make sure didn't look similar to A1.

In Option D1, Neighborhood 7 returns to Northside, but Roffers noted that means other neighborhoods would need to be sent to Sauk Trail. In Option D1, Mineral Point Road between Pioneer and Junction Roads is used as a dividing line for West Middleton and Pope Farm.

In Option D1, West Middleton is under capacity, while Elm Lawn remains about 100 students under capacity. Pope Farm and Park would be over capacity by 2030. Roffers also noted the diversity numbers in Options A1 and D1 are similar.

In Option D1, 18 percent of students would change schools, compared with 17 percent in Option D. Twelve neighborhoods would change schools, compared with 11 in Option D. Roffers also noted 83 percent of 2025 students would attend their closest school.

Roffers also reviewed why the options keep changing Sauk Trail's attendance area. He reminded members that Neighborhood 25, which is within walking distance of Pope Farm, currently attends Sauk Trail and has about 80 elementary-aged students. If those students moved to Pope Farm without backfilling, Sauk Trail's enrollment would only be about 283 with a capacity of nearly 400, while the free and reduced lunch percentage would jump to about 50 percent.

Members then had 25 minutes to evaluate Option D1 using the same process as before.

Some had concerns with Elm Lawn under-utilized and Neighborhood 16 moving again. Some wondered about separating High Point Estates and Elver Park. Some wondered if 4K enrollment at Elm Lawn was being factored, although Deputy Superintendent Sherri Cyra noted later that once CSCS moves into the rebuilt MHS the current CSCS building will be converted into an early childhood

center and all 4K students at a District school would move there. Some wondered if Neighborhoods 10-11 should go to Northside instead of Sauk Trail or where Neighborhood 7 should go. Others suggested sending Neighborhoods 38-39 back to Park instead of Sunset Ridge.

Cyra said Neighborhood 16 last changed schools during a small boundary change in 2010-11.

Conclusion

Howick briefly reviewed what was covered at tonight's meeting. He also provided a synopsis of members thoughts on Options A1 and D1 and noted they liked many of the variations to Options A and D, but thought another iteration of each had merit.

Members were reminded to fill out the meeting evaluation form and submit before they leave. Howick also noted the next meeting is Sept. 5. Members will receive the agenda and documents in advance.

The meeting adjourned was at 8:22 p.m.