



## **Internal Attendance Boundary Committee Sept. 25, 2019 Meeting Summary**

### **Call to Order**

The 11th meeting of the Internal Attendance Boundary Committee was called to order at 6:50 p.m.

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

Committee member not present: Scott Neville, Kim Sloan.

Others present: Drew Howick, Mark Roffers, Colette Spranger, Dana Monogue, Sherri Cyra, Lori Ames, Rainey Briggs, Chris Dahlk, Katrina Krych, Bob Schell, Annette Ashley, Bob Green, Katy Morgan, Todd Smith, Perry Hibner.

### **Welcome and Orientation**

Facilitator Drew Howick welcomed members and those in audience. He noted the meeting had been moved back to Kromrey Community Room 510 because of acoustic challenges in the cafeteria. He also reminded the committee the meeting was only 2 hours instead of the usual 2 hours and 30 minutes. He then briefly reviewed the agenda.

Howick shared the feedback from members from the last meeting, noting there were no themes or patterns. Members did like how the data was updated in real time when looking at variations. Members also supported starting to narrow the options still being considered.

Director of Communications Perry Hibner then reviewed the feedback from the community since the last meeting. He reminded members they should have received an electronic copy of the feedback via e-mail on Wednesday morning and paper copies for each member were also on their tables at the meeting.

He said the District has heard from about 140 residents and reviewed which neighborhoods have provided the most feedback. He noted letters have come in from the Northlake and High Point Estates areas and that letters from Neighborhoods 54-58 and Neighborhood 70 missed the deadline but will be shared with the members at the Oct. 7 meeting.

He also noted the District attended bus stops and an event at Elm Lawn to get feedback from Neighborhood 16, which the committee had requested. Residents were concerned about the impact of moving to a new school would have on marginalized families in that neighborhood, Hibner said.

Hibner said two community forums will be held, on Oct. 21 at Kromrey and Oct. 24 at Glacier Creek. Howick noted committee members will be observers at the community forums and hear what residents

think about the options that right now have the most promise. Howick then reviewed timeline for making a decision. He said the Board of Education hopes to approve the new boundaries no later than December.

Howick reminded members the work done at the last meeting on Sept. 4. He noted there were 12 variations suggested by members to either Option D2 or Option D3.

Howick also reminded the members the criteria they are to use to evaluate the options are in order of importance. He noted again there is unlikely to be any option that meets all of the criteria. He also asked members to try and look District-wide and not focus on the impact on a specific neighborhood when evaluating options, although he added he knows that is challenging.

Consultant Mark Roffers then reviewed how Option D2 and D3 did against criteria. Members scored it well with the first criteria, building utilization and projected enrollment, however, each option scored lower in No. 2 (addressing barriers to student and family engagement), No. 3 (neighborhood unity) and No. 7 (contiguous attendance areas).

He then reviewed the seven variations members suggested to D3, which weren't covered at the last meeting due to time constraints. Roffers noted there were parallels between some variations proposed for Option D2 and Option D3.

### **Narrowing Options**

Roffers reviewed eight options and variations members have looked at so far – apart from the several D2 and D3 variations -- and noted more recent options or variations have received more votes supporting them as is, which is a promising sign. The members were then asked consider removing three options from further consideration. It was noted a majority vote would decide whether an option remained or not.

**Option A:** Roffers noted in this option the neighborhoods in the southeast corner of the District would attend West Middleton. When the committee voted in July, no one wanted to keep Option A as is. Howick asked everyone to vote at their tables if they wanted to remove it from further consideration and by a 23-0 vote it was removed.

**Option D:** Roffers noted this option had Neighborhood 7 moving from Northside to Sauk Trail. When the committee voted in July, 22 wanted to consider it with variations and three voted to keep it as is. Howick again asked everyone to vote at their tables and by a 20-3 vote it was removed.

**Option D1:** Roffers noted this option had Neighborhood 7 staying at Northside and split Neighborhood 16 into two, with 16E going to Sauk Trail and 16W going to Sunset Ridge. Previously, 18 voted to keep with variations and three voted to keep as is. Howick again asked everyone to vote at their tables and by a 17-5 vote (with one did not know) it was removed.

### **What to do with Option B**

Howick noted Option B was presented in June. It wasn't removed from consideration but the committee had focused its attention on Options A and D at the last couple of meetings because they had more original support. In a previous vote, two members liked Option B as is, 13 wanted it considered with further variations and seven voted it did not merit further consideration.

Roffers briefly reviewed Option B, which had the neighborhoods in the District's southeast corner going to Elm Lawn. It also sent Neighborhood 16 to Sauk Trail. In Option B, Park, Sauk Trail, and West

Middleton were projected to be over capacity by 2030. Sauk Trail's free and reduced population was estimated at 50 percent based on current numbers. Nineteen percent of students would change schools, while 14 neighborhoods would change schools and 85 percent of students would attend the closest school. Roffers also reminded members that every option presented had more children attending their closest school than the current 71 percent.

Howick reminded members they had 10 minutes at their tables to and offer pros or cons to Option B before being asked if it should be kept as is, with variations or removed. Thirteen voted to remove it and nine voted to keep with variations so it was removed.

### **Options D2 and Options D3**

Roffers reminded members they had suggested 12 variations to Options D2 and D3 at the last meeting, although because some don't meet the first criteria, projected enrollment and building utilization, the number of viable variations is less than that.

Mark reviewed the variations to Option D2. He noted there were five suggested variations but D2.3 (Neighborhoods 67 and 70 to Elm Lawn and 16W to Northside) and D2.4 (Neighborhoods 68 and 69 to West Middleton) don't meet the first criteria so no further consideration was necessary.

Roffers then reviewed variations to Option D3. He noted there were seven suggested variations but D3.3 (Neighborhoods 67, 70, 71 to Elm Lawn) and D3.4 (Neighborhoods 68 and 69 to West Middleton) don't meet the first criteria so no further consideration was necessary.

Members were given 30 minutes at their tables to discuss high level observations, use a ballot to circle their top two or three among Option D2, Option D3 and their variations, and then share their preferred variations and why. After that, each member was asked to rank 1-10 of all the remaining D2 and D3 options and variations on a secret ballot.

The ones to receive the most support were Option D2.1 (3.38 average and 2.32 standard deviation), Option D3.1 (3.59 average and 2.64 standard deviation), Option D3.7 (4.64 average and 3.35 standard deviation), and Option D3 (4.80 average and 2.06 standard deviation). Roffers noted with standard deviation the closer to zero the closer there is to unity.

Howick briefly reviewed what will happen at the next meeting on Oct. 7, including the impact the elementary options will have on middle school boundaries. The committee will also be asked to identify three options to advance to the community forums. Roffers also reminded the members that Option A1 is also still being considered.

The meeting adjourned was at 8:47 p.m.