



Internal Attendance Boundary Committee Oct. 7, 2019 Meeting Summary

Call to Order

The 12th meeting of the Internal Attendance Boundary Committee was called to order at 6:08 p.m.

Committee members present: Alejandra Adame Barcenas, Cecilie Ballard, Carrie Brooker, Jennay Boyd, Julie Colmar-Davis, Joanna Cree, Kathleen Franzen, Julie Johnson, Elizabeth Kemp, Meghna Kuckreja, Lisa Labissoniere, Allison La Tarte, Katherine McCallum, Scott Neville, Debra Pickett, Marina Probasco, Tami Shaw, Ryan Sippel, Kim Sloan, Justine Wegner, Julie Winkleman.

Committee member not present: Gretchen Collins, David Goeddel, Kathy Nieber-Lathrop, Brian Shaw

Others present: Drew Howick, Mark Roffers, Colette Spranger, Sherri Cyra, Rainey Briggs, Maria Dyslin, Ken Metz, Adrienne Emerson, Jessica Schwartz, Perry Hibner.

Welcome and Orientation

Facilitator Drew Howick briefly reviewed the agenda for the meeting. He noted the goal was to narrow to no more than three options to present at the community forums later this month. Howick said feedback was positive from the committee from the last meeting, with a number of members liking that options were narrowed down. Members also noted they wanted to keep moving forward.

Howick reminded members there are two additional meetings scheduled on Nov. 6 and 20 for the committee to further refine and narrow elementary options and work through the middle school attendance area, while also taking into consideration feedback from the two community forums.

Director of Communications Perry Hibner reviewed new feedback received via the online form since Sept. 18. He noted there were responses from Neighborhoods 51-52 regarding options that would move students from Park to Sunset Ridge. Hibner also noted a handful of residents of Neighborhood 25 in Blackhawk had reached out about the middle schools.

Howick reviewed what was done at the last meeting and reminded members they had removed four options from further consideration. The committee also reviewed, evaluated and then ranked Options D2 and D3 and the remaining variations.

Howick noted Options D2.1, D3, D3.1 and D3.7 were the highest-rated ones from the last meeting. He also reminded members that Option A1 was still being considered. It was recommended that Options D2, D2.2, D2.5, D3.2, D3.5 and D3.6 be removed from further consideration and members had no concerns with doing so.

Reviewing Options

Consultant Mark Roffers then reviewed each of the remaining options. Roffers reminded the members that all of the remaining options don't exceed building capacity by 2025, which is the No. 1 criteria of the eight the committee is using to evaluate options. He also noted all of the remaining options send more children to their closest school than the 71% currently doing so.

Option A1: He noted it was reviewed by the committee on Aug. 5. The option would send neighborhoods in the southeast corner of the District to West Middleton. As a result, in this option several neighborhoods in southwest corner would be shifted to Pope Farm or Sunset Ridge. He reminded the members that Sunset Ridge can take on those students because it is losing more than 100 from the Blackhawk neighborhood to Pope Farm. The option would also move 16E to Sauk Trail, while 16W students would remain at Elm Lawn.

The Sauk Trail free and reduced student population in this option is estimated at 44%, while 28% of current students would change schools along with 23 of 76 neighborhoods and 83% of students would attend the closest school. This option would also require two more bus routes than the others.

Option D3: Roffers noted it was presented and evaluated on Sept. 4. In this option, students in the southeast neighborhoods would continue to go to the school they currently attend, while three neighborhoods in northeast corner of the District (8, 10 and 11) would move from Northside to Sauk Trail. He also shared the option allows for better enrollment balance between Park and Sunset Ridge.

The Sauk Trail free and reduced student population in this option is estimated 39%, while 18% of current students would change schools along with 15 of 78 neighborhoods and 83% of students would attend the closest school.

Option D2.1: Roffers noted it was developed at the Sept. 4 meeting and looked at more closely at the Sept. 25 meeting. In this option, Neighborhoods 7, 10 and 11 would go to Sauk Trail, while 16E would move from Sauk Trail to Elm Lawn and 16W would move from Elm Lawn to Northside.

The Sauk Trail free and reduced student population in this option is estimated at 34%, while the option also better balances diversity, Roffers noted. Twenty percent of current students would change schools along with 18 of 78 neighborhoods and 83% of students would attend the closest school.

Option D3.1: Roffers noted it was developed at the Sept. 4 meeting and looked at more closely at the Sept. 25 meeting. This option is very similar to D2.1 with the exceptions being a small portion of Neighborhood 37 east of Highway 12 would move from Sunset Ridge to Northside, and a small portion of Neighborhood 67 would remain at West Middleton rather than joining the rest of the neighborhood at Pope Farm. In this option, Neighborhoods 51 and 52 would remain at Park rather than going to Sunset Ridge. This option also has students in Neighborhood 16W going to Northside, while those in 16E remain at Elm Lawn. Neighborhoods 7, 10 and 11 would also shift from Northside to Sauk Trail.

The Sauk Trail free and reduced student population in this option is estimated at 34%, while the option also better balances diversity, Roffers noted. Nineteen percent of current students would change schools along with 15 of 78 neighborhoods and 83% of students would attend the closest school.

Option D3.7: Roffers noted it was developed at the Sept. 4 meeting and looked at more closely at the Sept. 25 meeting. This option would shift Neighborhoods 68-69 in the southeast corner to Sauk Trail

instead of Elm Lawn, while Northside adds Neighborhood 37E from Sunset Ridge. Neighborhood 16W would remain at Elm Lawn, while 16E would move from Sauk Trail to Elm Lawn.

The Sauk Trail free and reduced student population in this option is estimated at 37%, while 18% of current students would change schools along with 13 of 78 neighborhoods change schools and 81% of students would attend the closest school.

Middle School Scenarios

Roffers reviewed why the middle schools are impacted and told members that every elementary option still being considered has multiple middle school scenarios that would be used.

He noted there are multiple reasons why the middle schools have to be addressed. Glacier Creek is already over capacity and much of the new development in the District is projected to be in the current Glacier Creek attendance area. The District also needs to decide where students at Pope Farm will go to middle school. This is also a chance to better realign attendance areas for greater transportation efficiency, Roffers noted.

Neither Kromrey or Glacier Creek has the capacity to handle students from four elementary schools, which means at least one elementary school would need to feed into each middle school. Roffers also suggested a goal is to send a large enough group of students from an elementary school to each middle school, along with trying to keep students from moving twice and not splitting neighborhoods.

Four potential middle school scenarios were shared. In each scenario, Park students would still go to Glacier Creek, while Elm Lawn, Northside, and Sauk Trail would still go to Kromrey.

One scenario would split Sunset Ridge, which has the largest geographical area and also might create busing opportunities. Another scenario would split West Middleton, thereby allowing neighborhoods in the southeast corner to attend Kromrey, which is much closer than Glacier Creek. Another scenario would split Pope Farm, possibly sending those north of Mineral Point Road to Kromrey and those south to Glacier Creek. A fourth scenario would transition students from Pope Farm and West Middleton to each of the two middle schools.

Roffers then showed maps of how each scenario might work. He noted again it wouldn't make sense to send a small number of students from one elementary school to one middle school and the vast majority to the other. He also noted the middle school scenarios pretty much look the same over every elementary option.

In order for West Middleton to send students to each middle school, the boundaries would have to go pretty far west. Roffers noted with Option A1, Neighborhood 58 in the southwest corner would go to Kromrey as it wasn't possible to balance enrollment between the two middle schools simply by taking students from the southeast corner of the District.

Narrowing Options

Howick noted because Options D2.1 and D3.1 were so similar the first goal was to have the members decide which one to advance. Members had 15 minutes at their tables to share which option they preferred based on the criteria. A vote was held at each table and results were shared out to the large group. By a vote of 17-3 members voted to advance Option D3.1.

Members were then given 20 minutes at their tables to review and evaluated the remaining four options: A1, D3, D3.1 and D3.7. Each person was allowed to a pro and con for each option. Once they finished, another 15-20 minutes was allocated for members to express their views on any option using an “open microphone” format.

Opinion was split on Option A1. A couple of members spoke in favor of it, believing it does the best job of focusing on the needs of marginalized students and that it keeps Neighborhoods 66-71 together. A couple of members spoke against it because it divides the West Middleton area and moves Neighborhood 16 again.

There was little discussion about Option D3: One member wanted it to move on and liked that it didn't move Neighborhood 16 and helped reduce the Sauk Trail free and reduced student population. There was also little discussion about Option D3.1.

A few members spoke in favor of Option D3.7: One member liked that it kept Neighborhood 16W at Elm Lawn. Another liked that it kept Neighborhoods 68-69 at Kromrey even though they would change elementary schools in this option. Another noted it had fewest amount of neighborhoods changing schools. However, another member noted this option variation was so new it was possible the residents hadn't had a chance to provide feedback yet.

Members then voted on the four options.

- Option D3.7 had a 1.65 average and 0.65 standard deviation.
- Option D3.1 had a 2.20 average and 1.03 standard variation.
- Option A1 had 2.7 average and 1.19 variation.
- Option D3 had a 3.45 average and 0.59 standard deviation.

Roffers suggested advancing Options D3.7, D3.1 and A1 to the community forums and the members supported that suggestion.

Hibner then reviewed the format for the community forums. He noted one will be held at Kromrey on Oct. 21 and at Glacier Creek on Oct. 24. Each forum will start at 6:30 p.m. and last 2 hours. Roffers and Superintendent Dana Monogue will provide a presentation. Details are still being worked out on the best format to get feedback and questions from attendees, Hibner noted. Members are expected to attend at least one, he added.

Howick reminded members to fill out the meeting evaluation form before leaving.

The meeting adjourned was at 8:24 p.m.