

## Elementary Options Group Analysis from November 11, 2019 ECMAC Meeting

### Option: Oak View Addition; Boundary Changes

#### *What do you like about this option?*

- OAK has location that is central to the RL over-capacity area
- Keeps OAK similar to other schools who have already received addition
- Solves over-capacity for RL
- Not building on to GC saves money
- Relatively low disruption of only 400 families (x2)
- Gives relief for both schools
- We know BW (same size) works. OAK would be okay.
- Could complete/exercise option in short-term
- Can add space to OAK and monitor GC
- Simple, opens up capacity, relieves RL, same footprint as BW
- Utilize available space in other schools
- Eliminate extra taxpayer cost (x2)
- Similar footprint to other buildings
- Relieves pressure from RL (x2)
- Limited impact
- No impact to families previously impacted.
- Resolves urgent over-capacity
- Mirrors this school with sister schools
- Consistency of side across schools
- Aligned with racial equity work
- Localizes impact
- Time for notice
- Building was previously intended to house/accommodate more students like its sister schools (x2)
- Targets/impacts all three schools
- OAK can support an addition, including core space
- Could achieve more contiguous boundaries if that RL part were reassigned
- Only dealing with RL overcapacity, and adding on to RL itself is cheaper.

#### *How will our community respond to this option?*

- Negative about boundary change portion of the plan.
- How will boundary changes impact middle and high school alignment?
- Community will want to know how boundary changes will impact them
- Why change boundaries now and then again if a new school is inevitable
- Uproar with any boundary change
- Will cause disruptions
- Initial response may be delicate but OAK has great staff and great faculty
- Concerns around amount of time – frustration around no immediate relief
- Typical boundary changes
- Why add onto a school that sits next to another school
- OAK not in own boundaries
- Pulling small groups from their community – GC option (keep them together)
- Why make a short-term change?
- Community may not want to support a new school after displaced options
- Double impact potentially to OAK families
- How much will it cost us
- Under-capacity will be an issue with size of investment
- Lease levy – taxpayers don't get a vote.
- May wonder how this option impacts our community in a long-term sense.
- Possibly negatively due to perception about OAK but also because it involves a boundary change.
- May not be most economical impact

## Elementary Options Group Analysis from November 11, 2019 ECMAC Meeting

Option: Oak View Addition; Boundary Changes

### *What are the drawback/challenges to this option?*

- Unknown boundary change impact
- RL parents are “happy” reluctant to move
- Boundary changes not only impacting OAK, RL, GC
- More boundary changes will come with the new NW elementary
- Increased transportation time. Longer bus rides.
- Adding on to GC would be a drawback because there are schools in close proximity that are under capacity
- Disruption to so many families (drawback of GC – need to take it off)
- Boundaries are already not around school already
- How does this impact long-term thinking around new school in NW Maple Grove
- OAK is not in community it serves (boundaries)
- Short-term fix due to several unknowns like the continued growth in the area
- Boundary changes are difficult!
- Boundary changes would affect 400 kids
- OAK has a lingering reputation that is less favorable than some other MG schools
- Investing in a lower performing school (OAK) vs in a higher performing one (WVR). Is there a concern that these two schools will bump into each other (OAK and CI)

## Elementary Options Group Analysis from November 11, 2019 ECMAC Meeting

### Option: Oak View Addition; Boundary Changes

#### *How does this option align with ECMAC's guiding principles?*

- How many students will be affected
- Student centered
- It considers all principles
- It's a decision based on data
- Might disadvantage special education programs if they are moved again.
- Based on data – informed
- Is it in alignment with sustainable
- What does this do to the demographics of the school
- Two-year timeline; seems too long of a wait
- Data informed
- 2-year notification for relief is too long
- Racial equity work
- Small impact (400 is small percent of district)
- Drawback/not aligned
- Localized – so does not include all students in district
- Informed by data
- Contiguous
- It does provide relief for OAK and GC
- Data driven
- May not align because of impact to families
- Not most fiscally responsible.

#### *What (if any) alterations would strengthen this option?*

- Show how it fits into a long-term plan
- Is there wiggle room to shift RL kids to EC, EB or PB?
- Drop GC as an additional option (monitor GC for over-capacity)
- Describe bus routes and ride times for students
- Monitor GC
- It's a safe, low risk option
- Are there any positive impacts (e.g., shorter bus rides)?

## Elementary Options Group Analysis from November 11, 2019 ECMAC Meeting

### Option: Rice Lake Addition; No Boundary Changes

#### *What do you like about this option?*

- Holistic approach is favorable to fix walls.
- No disruption via boundary change.
- Cost less money
- Address the school that needs it; fixing problem directly for future asks – more favorable.
- Cheap option
- Solves immediate problem
- No boundary
- Cheapest option
- Like not having disruption now when we may need to down the road with a new school
- No impact to families.
- Timeline is self-contained
- Immediate relief
- No impact to families
- No capacity need at GC, so this plan acknowledges that.
- Help to push along the overall remodel of the school
- Least expensive of options

#### *What are the drawback/challenges to this option?*

- Taking away outdoor space – what about parking, buses, play \_\_\_\_ future needs down the road
- Doesn't solve long-term need of more space
- Doesn't address capacity issues on other side of district.
- Doesn't solve continuous boundaries issues.
- Don't like the language around GC, rather say "monitor"
- Only helps RL
- Parking and busing
- Fixes RL and no others
- Core space would need to increase

#### *How will our community respond to this option?*

- More accepting – no surprises  
less expensive, no one needs to move
- Shows immediate need and response
- Community may be concerned with updating RL and then be asked to spend monies for a new building
- Fiscally responsible
- Minimal/no disruption (Positive)
- Some will respond that it only helps RL. What about us?
- Seems like a short-term solution.
- People in Brooklyn Center will feel ignored (GC)
- Will need to communicate and acknowledge why we aren't addressing GC at this time.

## Elementary Options Group Analysis from November 11, 2019 ECMAC Meeting

### Option: Rice Lake Addition; No Boundary Changes

#### *How does this option align with ECMAC's guiding principles?*

- No disruption
- Informed by data
- Fiscally responsible
- Concise - no movement
- We didn't think it was equitable
- Costing
- Impact to students
- Monitoring all communities
- Informed by data
- Leaves non-contiguous boundaries in place.
- Is it sustainable?
- Will eventually need a boundary change.

#### *What (if any) alterations would strengthen this option?*

- Rice Lake – Dividing between two middle schools – could this be addressed
- Conversations around progression and could this be adjusted with comprehensive boundary changes
- The other strategic teams would provide ECMAC with solutions that meet the needs of other schools on east side. This cannot be done in isolation.
- Highlight options to monitor GC and FB.
- “We are doing our best now”
- Change “No Relief” to “Continue to Monitor GC”
- Could we fix RL's overpopulation by building a new elementary in NW Maple Grove?

## Elementary Options Group Analysis from November 11, 2019 ECMAC Meeting

### Option: Weaver Lake Addition; Boundary Changes

#### ***What do you like about this option?***

- Add more students to STEM
- Feels like we are investing in a high performing school and helps with FB pressure and safety value
- More access to STEM program
- More community (boundary) school created
- Cheaper option for now to delay new school cost
- Kids impacted by this would go to a better school
- Addressing capacity at FB and RL
- More kids get STEM
- Becomes a community school.
- Students could be walkers.

#### ***What are the drawback/challenges to this option?***

- We need to train more teachers with STEM curriculum
- Impacting a school that doesn't have a capacity issue.
- Largest boundary changes
- Could hurt the STEM program (school culture)
- Perception of offering more STEM to only certain communities
- More expensive
- All boundary changes will have challenges
- Would it dilute the integrity of the STEM program
- Can we keep integrity of magnet school adding 400 kids?
- Could mean multiple boundary changes over time if we build a new school in the near future.
- Site footprint is challenging.
- Thought GC was not meeting the 10%.
- Boundary change – large impact.
- Take away magnet option for some students – would it change demographics?
- Families may not want STEM option – lack of choice.

#### ***How will our community respond to this option?***

- Families living near school could potentially attend WL instead of another school.
- Solution may pull back students who have opted out of the WL attendance area which may increase capacity.
- Positive
- Some confused
- Relief value where needed
- Cost not positive
- It will break up FB and RL families
- Current WVR families might not want this
- RL families West of 494 and FB families near WVR might be happier because they are closer to their school
- Do we really need to build?
- What will the boundary changes look like?
- Negatively.

## Elementary Options Group Analysis from November 11, 2019 ECMAC Meeting

### Option: Weaver Lake Addition; Boundary Changes

<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Students could come in during 3<sup>rd</sup>/4<sup>th</sup> grade – no progression of programming.</li></ul>	
<p><b><i>How does this option align with ECMAC's guiding principles?</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Aligned/advanced notice</li><li>• It will dilute WVR's ideal diversity</li><li>• It will throw off the racial mix of WVR (unfavorably)</li><li>• Magnet schools have diversity targets, what is the demographic of the neighborhood – how does that impact non-diverse students?</li><li>• May negatively impact racial demographics at WVR</li></ul>	<p><b><i>What (if any) alterations would strengthen this option?</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Need to unite GC</li><li>• Could be strengthened if this option prevents (delays) the building of a new \$38 million school (only do a boundary change once).</li><li>• Neighborhood and community option like BMS and ZW.</li></ul> <p>Other?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Where do WVR students go after leaving to middle school?</li></ul>

## Elementary Options Group Analysis from November 11, 2019 ECMAC Meeting

### Option: New Elementary; Boundary Changes

#### *What do you like about this option?*

- Impacts everyone.
- Solves long-term needs
- Addresses long-term concerns
- Maximizes spending
- Gives time to process, plan
- Allows us the opportunity to address other issues, e.g. non-contiguous boundaries.
- It's a long-term solution
- Sustainable
- Makes all other plans look like a band-aid
- Keeps mid-size schools and eliminates creating more jumbos
- Potential to fix all under/over-capacity across the district.
- Long-term solution
- Looks at entire district
- Can fix a lot within the district
- Minimal disruption to families
- Solves immediate issues

#### *What are the drawback/challenges to this option?*

- Expensive, slow, timing
- Over-capacity may be at higher risk.
- Referendum approval process is a risk.
- Delays relief at some schools.
- Requires plan B if not approved.
- Risks: (1) Need a referendum; (2) Capacity estimates correct?
- Tough to pass a levy before homes are built
- Doesn't relieve RL or FB until new school is built
- Impacts a lot of students/families (800 minimum)
- Shifts boundaries everywhere
- Voters have to approve
- Takes longest time to complete
- Doesn't help RL and FB now
- What about the problems today?

#### *How will our community respond to this option?*

- Uncertain
- Risky
- It will be expensive so the request will have to be clear and compelling.
- It could be a draw for non-district residents who live near our boundaries.
- It is needed
- Tax impact?
- Is building this school inevitable? Why do anything else if we have to do this anyway.
- Stakeholders district-wide could be happy that their school needs are being addressed or upset about district-wide changes
- Something is happening to or for us
- What will the boundary change look like?
- Do we need to build or can we leverage our capacity.
- Not enough of a current need.
- Not a strong perception of being overcrowded
- Large ask – (approx. \$34 million)
- Lack of investment in current schools.
- Operating and tech levy costs – coming due soon.
- Presidential election year??
- Is high school need greater than elementary?
- BW and RL families would not respond favorably to boundary changes
- They might wonder where their student's cohort would go to middle school



## Elementary Options Group Analysis from November 11, 2019 ECMAC Meeting

### Option: New Elementary; Boundary Changes

<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• What is the price point of the housing?</li><li>• Everyone would have to stick it out – no relief.</li><li>• Pending voter approval to fund</li><li>• Ambiguity around the growth – tough sell.</li><li>• Unknown timeline</li><li>• Three years of learning in hallways.</li><li>• Nobody who lives near OAK lives near OAK</li><li>• Not recommending an addition to GC</li><li>• Nothing wrong with OAK – using this school to solve issues with other schools</li></ul>	
<p><b><i>How does this option align with ECMAC’s guiding principles?</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Sustainable</li><li>• Gives greatest opportunity to examine implications for all students out of all options.</li><li>• It is informed by data</li><li>• Made with advance notice</li><li>• Would need to explore implications for all students and alignment with racial equity work.</li><li>• Racial equity??</li><li>• Impacts a significant number of students.</li><li>• Looks at the entire district.</li><li>• Data driven but hard sell</li><li>• Boundary changes are comprehensive.</li></ul>	<p><b><i>What (if any) alterations would strengthen this option?</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• What’s the back-up plan if it doesn’t get approved?</li><li>• Be clear about the plan to deal with overcapacity concerns at current schools.</li><li>• Clarify value to all community members</li><li>• Need to include updating all buildings in order to gain voter approval.</li><li>• Guarantee funding</li><li>• Communicate clearly</li><li>• What does everybody districtwide “get” or benefit from this plan?</li><li>• Need a short-term relief plan.</li><li>• Boundary changes to GC</li><li>• Move families on east side of RL to under-capacity schools.</li></ul>