



## Elementary Facility Plan Citizen Task Force Outcomes from Meeting 10 – December 18, 2024

**29 Task Force members in attendance** (this was an additional meeting called 2 weeks prior)

**Planning/Facilitation consultants in attendance:** Nick Johnson, Mark Roffers (virtual), MD Roffers Consulting

**District staff in attendance:** Cale Bushman, Superintendent; Diana White, Coordinator of Communications & Marketing; Joshua Viegut, Assistant Superintendent of Operations; Julie Schell, Director of Elementary Education; Jon Euting, Assistant Superintendent of Academics; Kara Rakowski, 4K Principal and Early Childhood Coordinator; Tabatha Gundrum, Director of Human Services; Ryan Urmanski, Director of Buildings & Grounds; Ralph Williams, Director of Technology & Media Services.

**Presentation:** MD Roffers described the reason another Task Force meeting was called, generally because there was refined information since its 12/4/24 meeting and the District wanted to confirm that this information did not impact the Task Force's recommendation. As the presentation shared at this tenth Task Force meeting was generally in the form of the Task Force's recommendation/report to the School Board, this meeting also provided an opportunity for the Task Force to confirm, enhance, or tweak the report.

**Large Group Questions and Comments:** During and following the presentation, the following questions and comments from Task Force members were offered in a large group setting:

- Of the 55 students for which AGR funding are projected to be lost, could some of them instead transfer to Franklin (current AGR school) and not lose that funding? This is possible but there would not appear to be much excess capacity at Franklin to handle more students than initially assigned.
- If some consolidation alternative shifted students from a closed John Marshall to Hawthorn Hills, would the District receive a similar *increase* in AGR funding? It was not clear to District officials. This alternative option was considered by the Task Force but it would have required shifting students out of Hawthorn Hills to Franklin to make that work.
- Would the Hawthorn Hills' student AGR status transfer to John Marshall? It is not clear that this could happen.
- Thinking long-term, sacrificing \$140,000 in AGR funding shouldn't drive the decision, especially compared to investing in a separate gym and cafeteria at Hawthorn Hills in the alternative.
- In Bundle 2, could G.D. Jones take on more 4K students? Yes. 4K has always been flexible, often based on where parent's wrap-around care provider is located.
- Consolidating 4K Academies as suggested in Bundle 1 could also make bus routing more efficient—include this in Board presentation.
- What percentage of total AGR students do the estimated 55 for which funding would be lost? Estimated to around 5%. Recommend including this in the final report.
- Pleased with the school mapping exercise and the additional assurance it provides.

Members took a hand vote reaffirming their recommendation from the 12/4 meeting.

Administration will schedule a special/Board meeting ASAP.



## Elementary Facility Plan Citizen Task Force Outcomes from Meeting 10 – December 18, 2024

Cale asked whether the Task Force thought the transition should happen in the 2025-26 school year or the 2026-27 school year. The vote from Task Force members was nearly unanimous support for the transition occurring in the 2025-26 school year, with two members stating support for the transition occurring later than the 2025-26 school year.

A member asked whether there would be referendum improvements associated with the transition. Cale responded that the transition could likely happen without a referendum, but that a referendum would enhance and improve elementary schools, particularly the receiver schools that are receiving more students and require deferred maintenance. This will be further discussed by the Board as to what a potential referendum could include.

A Task Force member indicating that the shift should be deferred to after the 2025-26 school year expressed concern that “receiver” schools would not be improved before more students were transferred to them if the shifts happened in the 2025-26 school year.

Cale noted that there are pros and cons to moving more quickly versus slower, with the “quicker” approach having the disadvantage just stated and the “slower” approach providing more time for momentum to be lost and/or potential disagreement to emerge.

A member suggested that there should be concerted effort to welcome students from “sender” to “receiver” schools. Cale noted that this is one of several opportunities. He asked Task Force members to continue to be advocates for their recommendation and the District’s decisions.