

## Meeting #4 Objectives

- Review parameters for making recommendations
- Evaluate long-term feasibility for three top recommendations from previous meeting
- Finalize recommendation

## Previous Meeting Review

- Prioritized possible recommendations
  - Grade-level centers
  - Adjusting boundaries
  - Moving 5<sup>th</sup> grade to Glen Crest

## Intended Outcomes for January 25<sup>th</sup> Meeting

- Determine most feasible, long-term recommendations for addressing increasing enrollment based on parameters:
  - Best for all students
  - Aligned to District Strategic Plan
  - Reduce administrative transfers
  - Fiscally responsible
  - Maximizes utilization of current buildings long term
  - Sustainable

## Committee Discussion

- Committee is an advisory group and not responsible for fine details of redrawing boundaries or determining facilities for grade-level centers. Administration has been working with experts in the field to determine long-term feasibility and best options for each scenario.
- Anticipated staff increases due to enrollment projections presented to the Board December 2016 as follows:
  - Additional 2.0 FTE in FY18
  - Additional 1.6 FTE in FY19
  - Additional 2.4 FTE in FY20
  - Additional 3.0 FTE in FY21
  - Additional 1.4 FTE in FY22
  - Total: 10.4FTE
- No Change
  - Current cost of administrative transfers is \$80,000 for additional bus routes
  - Five-year projection indicates possible administrative transferring of 240 students
  - Projected cost increases for transportation over next five years, however, still requires additional 10.4 staff
  - Students lose minimum of 10 minutes/day; approximately 29 hours a year
- Moving 5<sup>th</sup> Grade to Glen Crest
  - Not sustainable past five years, puts Glen Crest over capacity
  - Does not reduce administrative transfers
  - Integration to older students earlier
  - Impacts services provided to students (Intervention, Challenge, English Language supports)

- Change in structure of 5<sup>th</sup> grade curriculum
  - Few model schools to look at
- Eventually impacts all families
- Still requires projected additional 10.4 FTE
- Redraw Boundaries
  - Consulted experts from 5Cast
  - Accelerates hiring of estimated additional staff over next five years (10.4FTE) to earlier years
  - Minimizes student movement; reduces (possibly eliminates) administrative transfers
  - Grandfather 5<sup>th</sup> grade students; transportation responsibility of family
  - Optimal use of building
  - Sustainable, based on current enrollment and enrollment projections
- Grade-Level Centers
  - Not sustainable past three years due to amount of classrooms/buildings (Westfield and Park View)
  - Maximizes staffing/class sizes, increased professional development opportunities
  - Increased cost of transportation because all students would be transported at some point
  - Increases transitions; staggered starts, difficult for families
  - Additional staffing (6.0 FTE) projected for three years due to feasibility

#### Table Group Discussion

- Table groups vetted separately to discuss top three recommendations to review pros and cons
  - Group questioned if 5<sup>th</sup> graders were grandfathered in, could transportation be at the cost of the district?
    - Answer: No, want to eliminate/reduce transfer routes (cost not reimbursable by State)
  - Would families be able to apply for open boundaries?
    - Answer: Currently policy states a family could apply for open boundaries but approval doesn't take place till after 6-day enrollment (6 days into school year).
  - Transition would be difficult on all children but especially students with special needs.
    - Answer: Recommendations as slated do not move self-contained programs for the 2017-2018 school year.

#### Consensus

- After table group discussions and questions/answers, committee decision was to move forward with recommendation to the Board of Education to redraw boundaries

#### Communication Plan

- Communicate recommendation from Enrollment Committee internally – January 26<sup>th</sup>
- Communicate recommendation from Enrollment Committee to entire community – January 26<sup>th</sup>
- Question/Answer Session Wednesday, February 1
  - Intent is to have impacted families attend
  - Interactive meeting
- Public Board of Education Meeting Saturday, February 4, present recommendation
- Public Board of Education Meeting Monday, February 13, earliest possible Board action

#### Absent:

Stacey Hewick