

2016 Realignment Committee Notes*

JANUARY 28, 2016

MEMBERS PRESENT

Bill Bays, Debbie Bendick, Barry Blagowsky, Scott Burger, Justin Coffelt, Jamila Crawford, Amy Downey, Brian Eccellente, Cordell Ehrich, Bryan Evans, Karen Flores, Jason Galloway, Jason Hayes, Sara Hudson, Kartina McDaniel, Eileen McGuire, Michele Milner, Jason Galloway, Keith Paulter, Shana Perry, Dana Renner, Ruthie Riggs, Susie Schinnerer, Gabe Schmidt, Kristen Stahel, Miriam Teifke, Allison Timberlake, Tara Warwick, Cassandra Weides, Scotti Wilson

PRELIMINARY INFORMATION

Discussion of Possible Transfer Options

Bendick began with and reiterated the following reality: "I will always tell you the truth as I know it; if the truth (or a situation changes), I will share that as soon as I know it to be true." With that "disclaimer," Bendick shared that the following would be the case regarding transfers:

- All current high school students, grades 9-11, will remain at the high school they are attending until graduation.
- Only ROTC transfers to North will be approved.
- Eighth grade will be able to remain in the school they are currently attending.
- Heartland Middle School will open in the fall with 6th and 7th grades.
- There will be no bus transportation provided to students who attend school outside of their assigned attendance area.
- Elementary students currently on a transfer may finish in their present elementary, but they will attend the middle school based on newly drawn lines.

MAP WORK

Mr. Gardiner took the floor and began by seeking confirmation that all agreed that at the end of session #1 a parent representative had posed that he return to session #2 with a map that reflected the input and effort the group had submitted up to that time as a starting place for the Jan 28 meeting. By a verbal response of affirmation, all agreed.

As requested at the end of meeting #1, Mr. Rocky Gardiner presented 2 middle school realignment plans for the group's consideration. The large group was divided into 4 small groups (2 parent groups and 2 school admin groups) to revise/adjust plans. This exercise lasted about 30 minutes, followed by a break. While the group took a break, TD entered commonly suggested maps into the demographic software to determine if the numbers would work. As in meeting #1, various additions and deletions were suggested by the committee members with the goal being to balance the populations. While middle schools were beginning to reach an agreeable pattern of attendance zones, when switching those

boundaries into the high schools, then those schools seemed to get out of balance a bit. Looking on the elementary side of the issue, among the most perplexing were areas anticipated earlier to be problematic, such as Cross Timbers, Sunset, Ida Freeman, and Northern Hills. Areas not originally considered likely to be affected with regard to elementary to middle school feeding patterns, but now suggesting that possibility, included Frontier, Washington Irving, West Field, and Centennial. High density and locations near two or more middle schools suggested these schools might also be split between middle schools.

RELATED CONVERSATION

- The transfer issue and their numbers in the high schools presently, added to new students added by virtue of new attendance zones was discussed. This appeared to be the greatest problem for Memorial.
- Information was shared about upcoming construction at high schools, including classrooms and athletic facilities, with particular regard to how this might help the high schools in the three year period of adjustment from the current transfer policy to the future policy.
- Questions were raised about changing the order of upcoming construction projects.
- Attention was given to the need to invite additional elementary representatives, given the potential for a change in feeder patterns.
- Concerns were raised that both Central and Cimarron were well below student-building capacity numbers, which would impact their ability to staff and function in alignment with middle school philosophy.
- Uncertainties about the plans for honoring existing or future transfers remains a challenge in accurately forecasting student body sizes in the context of new boundary lines.

MEETING CONCLUSION

As it was nearing 6 pm, and no consensus was in sight, the group began to make plans for a Feb 3 meeting. It was agreed that TD would return on Feb 3 with cleaned up versions of the two maps (referred to as Map #2 and Map #3) the committee had been working on through the afternoon, keeping a careful eye on the balance of attendance numbers through the entire 12 year progression. TD was also asked to review the two remaining plans for any other extraneous or otherwise previously unnoticed problems and report such on Feb 3.

Similar to the end of the January 21 meeting, one of the committee members asked if the district would prefer to keep the options being considered under wraps to avoid an onslaught of email and phone call objections. Dr. Bendick clarified that answering patron inquiries was the job of the district, and they would do their best to meet that objective.

(* These notes represent as nearly as possible the comments, exchanges, and activities of the committee's work, considering the possibility for error or omission given the various small group conversations, table talk, work group efforts, and all-group discussions.)