

### **FOCUS PANEL OVERVIEW**

- Conducted on September 24 and 25
- Represented key demographics in MPS
  - Midland Public Schools High School Students
  - Long-time Residents (two groups)
  - Business/Community Leaders
  - Non-profit Partners
  - Support Staff
  - Pre-school/Elementary Parents
  - Pre-school/Elementary Teachers
  - Secondary Parents
  - Secondary Teachers
- Each session began with participants watching a 10-minute pre-recorded video
- Participants were then asked a series of questions regarding facility needs



#### **COMMUNITY SURVEY OVERVIEW**

- An online survey was open to all community and staff members from September 27 until October 12
- Community and staff members had the opportunity to review a pre-recorded video used in the focus panels
- Following the video, survey respondents were asked about addressing facility needs
- Over 1,600 participants completed the survey
- Over 17,000 open-end responses are included in the tabulation
- Over 200 people asked to be contacted about their questions







**FOCUS PANEL** 

Net Promoter Score:

+48



**COMMUNITY SURVEY** 

Net Promoter Score:

+37

### **SCENARIO A - Focus Panel Summary**

This scenario was preferred by focus panel participants.

- Focus panel participants like that Scenario A...
  - Maintains the current grade-level structure
  - Constructs new facilities (elementary and replacing Northeast)
  - Increases opportunities for students
- Focus panel participants don't like that Scenario A...
  - Moves Pre-K into the elementary schools
  - Is a temporary fix for the high schools and their aging infrastructure
  - Has a high project cost
  - Does not include auxiliary facilities



## SCENARIO A - Community Survey Summary

This scenario was preferred by survey participants.

- Survey participants like that Scenario A...
  - Keeps the middle schools and high schools separate
  - Maintains the current grade configuration
  - Allows for more academic and extracurricular opportunities for students
- Survey participants don't like that Scenario A...
  - Impacts the elementary level boundaries and efficiencies
  - Moves Pre-K to the elementary buildings
  - Is costly and increases the tax rate
  - Will require the school district to maintain more buildings



### FOCUS PANEL & COMMUNITY SURVEY COMPARISON - SCENARIO A

OVERALL FOCUS PANEL FAVORABILITY

Weighted average:

6.17

OVERALL
COMMUNITY SURVEY
FAVORABILITY

Weighted average:

5.08

### **SCENARIO B - Focus Panel Summary**

- Focus panel participants like that Scenario B...
  - Consolidates program offerings into one building
  - Grade reconfiguration
  - Costs less than Scenario A
  - Updates all school facilities
- Focus panel participants don't like that Scenario B...
  - Includes large buildings for a smaller populations of students
  - Could provide fewer academic and extracurricular opportunities for students
  - Changes the grade configuration
  - Could increase transportation costs
  - Relocates Pre-K to elementary buildings
  - Will require students to attend multiple school buildings
  - Doesn't have an identified site for the new high school



## SCENARIO B - Community Survey Summary

- Survey participants like that Scenario B...
  - Addresses declining enrollment
  - Constructs a new high school
  - Improves facility infrastructure
  - o 386 survey respondents stated they like "nothing" about Scenario B.
- Survey participants don't like that Scenario B...
  - Reduces student participation
  - Changes the grade configuration
  - Could lead to overcrowding by moving two buildings into one
  - The loss of school pride
  - Has a high cost without clear benefits







OVERALL FOCUS PANEL FAVORABILITY

Weighted average:

4.10



OVERALL
COMMUNITY SURVEY
FAVORABILITY

Weighted average:

3.16

## SCENARIO B WITH AUXILIARY FACILITIES - Focus Panel Summary

- Focus panel participants like that Scenario B with auxiliary facilities...
  - Will enhance Arts and Athletics
  - Improves school facilities to attract new talent
- Focus panel participants don't like that Scenario B with auxiliary facilities...
  - Has a high cost and operational dollar capacity concerns
  - Lack of collaboration with the community
  - Reduces the number opportunities for students
  - Requires multiple building transitions



# SCENARIO B WITH AUXILIARY FACILITIES - Community Survey Summary

Survey participants like that Scenario B with auxiliary facilities...

- Will update important auxiliary facilities
- Will have accessible facilities for all schools
- Supports athletics and extracurricular activities
- Survey participants don't like that Scenario B with auxiliary facilities...
  - Has a high cost
  - Doesn't put community needs first
  - Is replacing facilities that have been recently updated



## FOCUS PANEL & COMMUNITY SURVEY COMPARISON - B WITH AUXILIARY FACILITIES

OVERALL FOCUS PANEL FAVORABILITY

Weighted average:

4.81

OVERALL
COMMUNITY SURVEY
FAVORABILITY

Weighted average:

3.76

## RECOMMENDED SCENARIO TO BE PLACED ON THE MAY 2025 BALLOT



**SCENARIO A** 

FOCUS PANELS
53.76%
COMMUNITY SURVEY
49.66%



**SCENARIO B** 

FOCUS PANELS
15.1%
COMMUNITY SURVEY
4.66%



SCENARIO B - AUXILIARY FACILITIES

FOCUS PANELS
19.35%
COMMUNITY SURVEY
14.37%

FOCUS PANELS NO RECOMMENDATION ON ANY SCENARIO

NOT SURE: **4.3%** 

CAN'T SUPPORT ANY SCENARIO: 7.5%

COMMUNITY SURVEY - NO RECOMMENDATION ON ANY SCENARIO

NOT SURE: **5.33%** 

CAN'T SUPPORT ANY SCENARIO: 25.98%

### SURVEY DEMOGRAPHIC BREAKDOWN

Totals will not equal 100% due to survey respondents being able to "check all that apply"

22.86%

A parent with children attending Midland Public Schools 69.32% of survey participants	<ul> <li>Scenario A 54.99%</li> <li>Scenario B 3.87%</li> <li>Scenario B with auxiliary facilities 13.65%</li> <li>Not sure/Can't say 4.89%</li> <li>I cannot support placing any of the scenarios on the ballot 22.61%</li> </ul>
A parent with children attending another school district 3.46% of survey participants	<ul> <li>Scenario A 36.73%</li> <li>Scenario B 0.0%</li> <li>Scenario B with auxiliary facilities 8.16%</li> <li>Not sure/Can't say 6.12%</li> <li>I cannot support placing any of the scenarios on the ballot 48.98%</li> </ul>
A parent who homeschools their children 0.92% of survey participants	<ul> <li>Scenario A 23.08%</li> <li>Scenario B 15.38%</li> <li>Scenario B with auxiliary facilities 7.69%</li> <li>Not sure/Can't say 7.69%</li> <li>I cannot support placing any of the scenarios on the ballot 46.15%</li> </ul>
A Midland Public Schools student 4.94% of survey participants	<ul> <li>Scenario A 45.71%</li> <li>Scenario B 8.57%</li> <li>Scenario B with auxiliary facilities 20.0%</li> <li>Not sure/Can't say 2.86%</li> </ul>

• I cannot support placing any of the scenarios on the ballot

### SURVEY DEMOGRAPHIC BREAKDOWN

14.88% of survey participants

Totals will not equal 100% due to survey respondents being able to "check all that apply"

A non-parent (currently do not have children attending school) 20.17% of survey participants	<ul> <li>Scenario A 38.38%</li> <li>Scenario B 6.69%</li> <li>Scenario B with auxiliary facilities 15.85%</li> <li>Not sure/Can't say 6.69%</li> <li>I cannot support placing any of the scenarios on the ballot</li> </ul>	32.39%
A business owner in the Midland Public School District 8.18% of survey participants	<ul> <li>Scenario A 43.10%</li> <li>Scenario B 4.31%</li> <li>Scenario B with auxiliary facilities 12.07%</li> <li>Not sure/Can't say 6.03%</li> <li>I cannot support placing any of the scenarios on the ballot</li> </ul>	34.48%
An elected official residing in the Midland Public School District 0.85% of survey participants	<ul> <li>Scenario A 58.33%</li> <li>Scenario B with auxiliary facilities 0.0%</li> <li>Not sure/Can't say 0.0%</li> <li>I cannot support placing any of the scenarios on the ballot</li> </ul>	33.33%
A Midland Public Schools employee	<ul> <li>Scenario A 52.15%</li> <li>Scenario B 4.31%</li> </ul>	

Scenario B with auxiliary facilities

• Not sure/Can't say 4.31%

22.97%

• I cannot support placing any of the scenarios on the ballot 16.27%

### **NEXT STEPS**

### Planning for a May Election



INDIVIDUAL REVIEW OF DATA



STUDY COMMITTEE



NOVEMBER 11 BOARD WORKSHOP



NOVEMBER 18 BOARD CONSENSUS



DECEMBER 16 BOARD DECISION -RESOLUTION

