

Focus Group Qualitative Data - Dublin City Schools Redistricting

For each question, focus group participants selected a response and provided a written explanation. The explanations have been organized below according to the selected response.

1. Account for future growth now OR impact fewer students now:

A. The district should prioritize impacting the least amount of students now

B. The district should account for future growth now to minimize future redistricting

Responding to current data enrollment vs. future projected outcomes that may or may not happen	This process has been very time consuming and costly for the district. We need to move now and not again in five years.
Impact fewer students now, keep Jerome full to minimize student impact	Redistricting is very hard on many people. The less often it needs to occur the better.
Based upon the angst that the last redistrict attempt caused I think this is the safest bet. Although I would personally rather vote for B, there are no guarantees that our projections that far out will be good, so we should make this a regular process	I believe it will benefit students to have consistency for as long as possible. This impacts families, siblings, etc.
The growth projection have consistently been off & too low. It seems like we may be moving kids based on an outcome that is way off & we will just have to do it all over again anyway. For example, my neighborhood was moved from Wyandot & now it is the only school way under capacity by over 100 students. Why move kids on a "hunch" when it's rarely useful. They keep having to redo elementary & high school because the numbers are too low for Jerome.	No one likes redistricting -> keeps from redo, saves \$, give Jerome a break :)
I understand the value of choice "Account for future growth", but "impact fewer students now" will lead to fewer parent upsets, greater community acceptance.	This helps to eliminate the issue of doing this process over again in 5 years. Overall it meets current and future district needs.
Yes, we have projection for future growth but no one has a crystal ball. Perhaps - if the Jerome area was redistricted more heavily - perhaps building growth would slow? Scioto is a good school that has many, many gifts to give its students. Families should not be afraid to have their children attend Scioto.	We should avoid this process as much as possible because it is costly (paying 3rd party companies to aid in redistricting) and it divides our community and pins neighborhoods against one another. The districting process is damaging to the community and creates animosity, discontent within the school district, stress, and more.

Impact least s's impacted in prior redistricting * Because we don't know what the future holds. If we are able to pass a bond for ES/MS, redistricting will be necessary, but easier. I'd prefer only s's causing growth, sse to be moved. Ex: Jerome to Scioto	We as a district need to have as little prospect of having the issue of redistricting our HS buildings in the future if possible. This is not a good topic for parents and it becomes tense among different HS parents
Affects the least amount of people, may need to redistrict sooner?? But would also keep maps more similar now. Transportation would stay together	The short term view continues to cause problems for the district given the unique factors of growth largely in one area, we should plan appropriately for this. To date, the projections for students in Jerome Township/the area where the growth is happening have underestimated the true growth.
They are the same. Move 500-600 kids from Jerome. Not 800-1200 as noted in previous maps. That's where all the growth is. LEave Jerome under capacity. 1700 kids.	This process will be difficult from the get go. I'd hate to see folks go through it again in a few years.
Statistical inaccurate projections. Unknown growth from Jerome, should allow flexibility to move more from there. What options exist for future growth due to land sales.	No one wants to "more" and then "more again" a few years later. There's always going to be a possibility going forward that the district would have to redistrict again but counting for future growth at the outset minimizes that possibility.
The pace of change/how change happens could change from what we see/project now. Particularly with the current economy. I just don't think you can accurately predict 10 years out.	Get it done now. Minimize need for future change
It impacts less students-mainly coming from emotional perspective that last year's redistricting process was a mess. Also future growth projection is not very reliable at the moment. Don't want to impact many students now based on the future projection which may not be very accurate and end up doing another redistricting again.	Already delayed. 1 year in process. Community has been patient. Now time to make forward with all plans. No more delays - even to grade levels.
Until you fix the middle school districts, which are not correct, you should move as few as kids as possible now. Then, down the road all schools should be reviewed based on convenience to neighborhoods (for safety) & to fix feeder problems which will solve the issues that currently exist.	Currently (3/2) there are 78 single family homes on market in Jerome District, 16 in Coffman district, 6 in Scioto
Too risky to rely on a 5 year projection. Prefer to impact the least amount of students.	Jerome area to grow

<p>District has been struggling to accurately predict future growth and I feel even if we think long term, we will most likely still have to redistrict. With a future levy in 2027, the more families that are effected by the redistricting, I feel the less likely the levy will be to pass. Should focus on moving kids from Jerome to Scioto directly.</p>	<p>We will be in a difficult situation financially if we do not account for future growth. But I do recognize that impacting the community would be significant.</p>
<p>Depends on accuracy of projections and pace of growth - redistricting turnaround.</p>	<p>Too often the district/community in the past has done short-term decisions + every 4-5 years there is an "add on" strategy. Just do it - we can project out major growth of boundaris with a lot of accuracy. Make it happen.</p>
<p>Dublin community cannot handle redistricting and the school district does not have a good track record w/ projections. Redistricting has so negatively impacted students & families.</p>	<p>Future growth -- this is an expensive and emotional process. We need to make the bset financial decisions how and then families will know what the future holds for their kids school.</p>
<p>Projections are not an exact science, previous redistricting in 2019/2020 has shown that. Disrupting current students for what may happen with enrollment is not in their best interest.</p>	<p>I believe the best option is to rip the band aid off and account for long term growth. This issue is clearly one that students & parents are passionate about. Having to do it all ovr again in 5 years seems time consuming, repetitive, and wasteful.</p>
<p>Because you can't predict the future with as many variables that will come into play, go with what we know.</p>	<p>More efficient. Continuing to move kids from school to school is not as conducive to a seamless education experience. We need certainty.</p>
<p>I choose this because in theory, option B makes the most sense. HOWEVER, being through this process multiple times in 13 years in the district your predictiions based on the company doing projections haven't been accurate. So I don't trust predictions. Especially with the volatility of the world right now. Futhermore, I 100% think the only solution is a new HS in Jerome Village at some point (should have been for 2028) and if we aren't doing that, stop moving everyone else for that growth area.</p>	<p>Doing a comprehensive, long-term plan is what we've put off but is best for long-term planning. We need to focus on what's best across the whole district not just look at the least # affected.</p>
<p>The same students who were just impacted by middle school redistricting shouldn't have to be affected again. The redistricting will cause social/emotional impact and we should limit the number of students going through this.</p>	<p>Not only more cost effective, but less numbers of change. Our community, and people in general, don't always adjust to change well, so make a sound decision and go with it</p>

<p>Long term projections and decision making is difficult; assumptions taken today are often not applicable in future years. It should be acceptable to create the expectation that future developments may warrant changes to the district.</p>	<p>Because of the anticipated growth we should account for our future rather than what would be best now</p>
<p>*10 year projections are not the most accurate. *Look at less impact toward current students.</p>	<p>Account for future growth now would lead to less redistricting in the future, impacting less students now could impact more students later</p>
<p>Impact fewer students now because it seems to me based on growth that a new high school will need to be built prior to ten years time. Our district has gone through so much redistricting, I think we should limit the impact to students and families everywhere possible.</p>	<p>By accounting for future growth, there will need to be less redistricting in the future. In the long run it will effect less people than it would to redistrict the other way now. It is also cheaper. It's more logical to redistrict this way.</p>
<p>Logical choice is that DCS should try and minimize future redistricting. However, a lot of home buying decisions are made because of highschools that kids will get into. Therefore, if Jerome is where parents want their kids to go, they will buy homes in that area. Therefore, planning for future is not that practical. Redistricting will always be a lagging problem.</p>	<p>Redistricting over and over disturbs students more, in my opinion. Account for it now so maybe there can be some students only affected once.</p>
<p>The DCS community has been so activated/enraged by the current redistricting process that moving as few students now and then having a few years for everyone to calm down before attempting a widescale redistricting process may be helpful to lower the temperature.</p>	<p>Going through redistricting again would be turbulent, and by the time that that would happen again w/ more students could be worse.</p>
<p>As a representative of the school district, I would not want my children to be transfered. We come from another country, and the adjustment process was difficult for them. They now feel safe at their school.</p>	<p>The future growth will keep many places stationary at their highschool rather than have the problem of figuring out new ways every four years.</p>
<p>To move current students to a different school would be disruptive for both parents and children. We chose our current home so that our children could attend the school we hoped for.</p>	<p>It's better to account for growth now, or we'll be stuck in this same situation very soon, which I imagine will cost more money & will obviously take time.</p>
	<p>If we keep putting districting off, than this will be a lng issue that affects more people rather than 1-2 year quick switch</p>
	<p>Best to just do it now. Don't drag it out</p>

	Allow alignment on the front end to avoid future redistricting since numbers are calculated through 2035. Peel the bandaid off now.
	The best option isn't going to be about the easiest path.
	This is the 2nd try at this so let's get it right for as long as possible so we don't have to do it again.
	Cost & long-range planning; concern over levy/constraints
	Less disruption overall to the community at large.
	HS redistricting is difficult on community, BOE + super. Let's do this well for long term since Dublin has put this off for too long. The community will thrive after decision (long-term) is made.
	Redistricting is a difficult process that is expensive and causes a community outcry. Doing a large redistricting now would prevent doing it again in the future.
	Minimize need for FUTURE redistricting -> gives more flexibility and prevents (or minimizes) the need to re-engage in this process in the future.
	Redistricting will always be a painful process. I would rather see us take an approach that would not require us to do it again in approx 5 years.
	We cannot have so many emotions within the community everytime we re-district cannot cause divisiveness. This would limit this.
	Redistricting is a painful experience of a district to go through & this may help with that. *One consideration is the potential for growth in the Columbus areas and what that could do to numbers.
	Less movement overall for students. Helps build community, more cost efficient. Educational supports can remain in place through the teams that serve them more easily.
	Central Ohio is growing at a fast pace and I believe this is an important point of consideration. Accommodating this rapid growth is key to enduring long-term efficiency.

	This is an expensive, emotional, time consuming process. Let's not do it again too soon
	Choosing this option will hopefully negate or prolong the need for future redistricting. This option is a long term fix versus a band-aid approach.
	Responsible decisions must be forward thinking. Short-term thinking (A) is pragmatic, but avoids responsibility of committing & solve the problem.
	We don't want to be redoing this intensive process again anytime soon. Also, helps parents, kids, staff, etc plan.
	Set us up for future & end of "build" in JV is sooner than we think.
	Redistricting has high financial, logistical, and emotional costs, so I see minimizing these costs for the "longest" term possible as ideal.
	This experience seems pretty clear. H.S. redistricting is tough. If Jerome is below capacity for a while to grow again, so be it. No one wants to do this in another few years.
	Redistricting is an emotional, challenging time for families with the anticipated change. Setting up a long term solution would help to not have families experience this again in a few years.
	By moving more students from Jerome out of there, and re-distributing to Scioto/Coffman, it would accomplish both goals. It would affect the least amount of students (only Jerome students) and free up space in Jerome to account for future growth.
	Both should be considered, but assuming our projections are accurate, we should avoid putting ourselves in a position where redistricting would be required multiple times.
	I don't think the community can handle this again in 5 years!
	Rip the bandaid - it makes sense to address future enrollments now.
	Address redistricting for longer term. Leave room in Jerome + Scioto for future growth. Coffman could be pretty much at capacity due to no new growth.

	Families want stability long term, so changes now would be hard for families, but at least expectation can be set.
	This should be a long term plan, and consider moving more students from Jerome!
	The district should only use option B if it will use the comprehensive approach across all three HS attendance boundaries and for K-12 redistricting. If the district chooses to only consider HS boundaries in this process, then it should choose option A. and impact fewer students.
	Account for future growth now. The district is very aware of where the vast majority of growth is occurring (i.e. north/northwest section within the current Jerome boundary). Removing from this section and freeing up space in that high school seems most responsible. They are not immune from change.
	It is disappointing we are forced to make this decision given the recent redistricting of the middle schools. However, this issue is so divisive, an effort should be made to limit future redistricting. There should also be a consideration for the mental health of students.
	Redistricting has been a dark cloud over these kids + our communities for years - we need to be future minded so kids feel safe to settle in, make friendships, instead of wondering who/when will be moved next. This also decreases admin burdens from repeated redistricting mapping / meetings, etc.
	I am from Bristol Commons - and because we've been redistricted 3 other times in the past 5 years, I'd like to avoid having to redistrict and move (potentially) our kids again. However, I am understanding if the District is able to just move Jerome so as to solve the core root of this problem. If that relates to spot redistricting, I'd prefer that.

	Utilization matters to prevent redistricting in the future. Furthermore, the dynamics of our fast growing city requires a thorough consideration of feeder patterns based that don't unnecessarily hamper HS boundaries. Longer term projections should have decreased weighting to account for unpredictability.
	It would be good to do this redistricting once - and not have to do it again - anytime soon. This is very hard on this community - so let's trying and get it right so students can know what to expect in the years to come. I also think that if growth in Jerome Village is the issue - they should be considered more.
	Minimize future issues - avoid this again
	This minimizes constant change every five years. Provides better long term "community" feel for students.
	As a community member, I would rather all this happen once & have everything more "set" for future growth. It seems like th best choice for all staff + students long term.
	I think the fewer times opening up a redistricting process the better, as contentious as it has a tendency to be.
	HS redistricting is so emotional we should be BRAVE and do all the work now. We know there are many potential impacts coming, we should not act surprised. Balancing all 3 schools for future success in academic as well as extracurriculars success is a necessity now! This is best done w/ the best information possible & a long range view.
	Since future growth seems inevitable, it seems prudent to make more changes now as opposed to going through the process again in a few years which could mean impact on the same families.

	<p>Redistricting is challenging and emotional for the community. The more we can do now to eliminate the need in the future, the better. A lot of animosity from the community comes from the fact that redistricting has occurred so often when we were told that the previous time would be enough or last longer.</p>
	<p>Redistricting frequently is not a viable option for a district of this size. But it needs to be done with careful consideration of ALL students and look at unbiased data & criteria.</p>
	<p>Minimize the number of times moving students. Do it once! Maximize enrollment in all buildings.</p>
	<p>Plan now but expectations should be on a planned cycle to revisit every 5 years. Becoming the norm would help with the expectation that there would never be movement.</p>
	<p>Seems to be reluctant to redistrict, so do it less frequently seems smart. This has been a need for a while, so I prefer jumping in and doing it when we can. Lower cost helps too.</p>
	<p>It appears that future growth is predicted in the northwest so it would be better to not be doing this again in the near future.</p>
	<p>Jerome just expanded the building and one year in we are at and nearing full capacity. Going through this process again and the costs behind it seems wasteful.</p>
	<p>This was tough. I wanted to say A but then as we got down a few questions - especially right sizing MS/Elem schools - I think it should all be adjusted as necessary and that led me to choose - do it all at once. I also felt way more comfortable choosing B because I am going to choose the option to allow 9,10,11th grades to stay in their current HS (provide their own transportation).</p>
	<p>Needing to do this entire process every 5 years wastes everyone's resources - time and money. Let's do it right the first time and account for everything we can now.</p>

	Account for future growth - this redistricting process has been rough for the district, let's create a plan that will keep us from having to do this again for as long as possible.
	This has been a painful process & we should look at what is best for students/families now as well as future growth to minimize re-occurring impact to families/students.
	Redistricting is disruptive. We need to get it right now, including changing middle schools. If you only impact the fewest number of students you perpetuate the inequalities among schools.
	High school redistricting is very stressful and should be done correctly at a less frequent occurrence. Potentially less students will be moved without their friends if more students are moved. Spot redistricting can end pockets of students being impacted.
	Redistricting as we have seen is not an easy decision or process. We should aim to do it correctly the first time so more students don't have to move again in the future - however, the goal should still be to impact the least amount possible while getting closer to capacity #s (not perfect #s, Jerome will likely remain overcapacity in 10 years and need another solution).
	Redistricting is a stressful process for everyone involved. Going through this again, guaranteed in 5 years is a bandaid solution. Solving this problem for 10 years gives district flexibility in future building development and for new people to be involved, some of whom may have differing priorities than what we have today.
	Why would we want to go through this again. It would allow for families to plan (aka move) if they are unhappy with their new high school. Give the community peace of mind.
	Redistricting is hard; so let's get it done so it lasts for the near future (5-10 years) while considering the growth that will mostly likely happen. DCS is already spending a lot of resources on this effort now.

	Jerome enrollment will likely be faster than predictions. Reduces need for redistricting multiple times. Easier on kids & community to do this once. Addresses problem (over-enrollment) where it's occurring (Jerome) & sending kids to where there is capacity (Scioto).
	Accounting for future growth now will save the district money in the long run + save families the headache of redistricting again in less than 10 years. It will help families know that their neighborhood/home is set at a certain school.
	The least number of kids sometimes puts more burden on those kids. We should be able to plan for the future. Five years is too soon for some families. The community has gone through too many redistricting exercises already.
	Do it once + then live with it so we don't go through this again in 5 years.
	Trying to make a redistricting plan that will last as long as possible makes the most sense to me. I wouldn't want to have to go through this process again anytime soon.
	To minimize future expenditures - wisely using district money to plan for the future of our buildings/staff/students
	This redistricting process has divided our Dublin community. To not have to do it again anytime in the foreseeable future would give our community time to heal. The damage has already been done as far as community relations, so might as well get it right and impact more students now.
	We would like to avoid doing this again in 5 years. If we don't need a 4th high school then why would we need to do it again.
	Looking at growth is needed to reduce future redistricting.
	Minimize movement
	Do not want students and family to have to continue to go through this. BUT projections have to be right (not like many years ago when you did not realize Jerome village would have so many homes).

	It doesn't make sense to do the redistricting piecemeal -> in many respects this is what has gotten DCS into the current mess that has needed redistricting at present.
	Small fixes seem to create more cost, more upset/disruption, I would think this would also get us far enough to know if HS #4 is necessary or not and plan accordingly.
	Planning to redistrict again in 5 years is irresponsible from a cost and student mental health standpoint. Absolutely zero appetite for this. I do think the district, when considering future growth, should plan for MS 6 + requiring the fewest moves when that comes online.
	Please account for future growth now and make these changes last as long as possible! These moves are so disruptive to our community, families, teachers, and students. These changes should be set for as long as possible.
	Will have to redistrict again too soon. City planners should be held more accountable for allowing high density housing while the district is adjusting. Redistricting was started b/c of overgrowth at Jerome and that is where major growth will continue to happen. This is where students need to be moved from.
	I believe that this decision needs to provide a long term solution to end the weariness of this topic. Constant redistricting is a negative for the district and needs to be resolved for more than 5 years. The north end of the district (Jerome) must feel the change for once, and not just the rest of the district.
	I think this also depends though on WHO you are redistricting. If its option one and you keep taking the same kids who have been redistricted over and over that's unfair. Take a bigger contingency from the north to make biggest impact now.

	<p>There needs to be more EQUITY across district! Looking at district as a whole & accounts for a more balanced longterm plan (LESS impact on students overall). This option also allows for hopefully redistricting where the most growth is happening!</p>
	<p>District should be looking to minimize redistricting in the future as it is very disruptive. We have been redistricted multiple times and it has taken an emotional toll on our family. This should be taken into consideration when choosing areas to move.</p>
	<p>If demographic studies indicate sustained growth, I think it's best that the redistribution happens as soon as possible.</p>

2. Move students at one time OR allow grandfathering in over time:	
A. Kids who are already in high school should get to choose whether they move or finish at current high school	B. The district should move all kids at one time for the start of the 27-28 school year
The kids should not be penalized in their decisions. They do not have any control over where they live - allow them to make this one decision.	While it is reasonable to grandfather, I think it is best to make a one time change that gets the transition done. It worked okay to do that with Jerome.
Softens the blow from B above, may keep numbers more balanced, allows kids only 1 HS all 4 years	Although I think it would be better for individual kids (to have the choice to grandfather), moving kids all at once would be better for the district as a whole. Seems more fair to do it this way.
To me - this helps minimize disruption across the district and makes it more palatable for the community. This is what was offered before and should be offered again.	Rip off the bandaid. The Grandfather process will just create more issues. This creates less movement with staffing over time.
Again, I would probably go with ripping off the bandaid (B) but due to what we have already been through, I think if we don't grandfather we will have more angst. If they started and they want to finish AND provide transportation, let them.	There is no sense in delaying the inevitable. The process has already been delayed as it is and to delay it again would be an inconvenient and irresponsible use of our staffing, time, and resources.
I'm assuming the higher cost here is really due to increased complexity, and I would expect DCS to be able to manage this appropriately. The grandfathering approach will be more palatable across the district so the increased complexity is worth it for the limited time.	I struggled with this question. For Jerome, they will benefit with a one-time decision. The incoming classes are large and will put a huge strain on space and resources. However, the assumption already exists for grandfathering in.
The public will greatly appreciate having a little say or flexibility in the process. Will allow students time to settle in & to the future location.	Just get it done. Don't drag it out and cause more tension over several years. Its reality of parents need to just deal with it.
Kids are already invested in teams, organizations, clubs, friend groups, etc. It's just completely unfair to them to readjust their last years if they do not want to do so. High school is hard enough. This goes for the families as well - but more concerned about the students.	Not efficient to do A, seems like admin headache, make it cut + dry in who is moving.

<p>It's cruel to leave kids out in such a difficult time. Juniors will never have a chance to lead or play in a sport on a team when the kids already know the coach & will get preference. Same for band, theater, student council...how will they get elected when no one knows them. How will they get references or anything for college applications? We paid for 25 new social workers because kids are in crisis! How can we say that and then tear 16/17 year olds from their friends? It's cruel. If saving \$ is the goal. Then leave them at their current school & send the social workers back to the classrooms. Also you promised them. What does it teach them when you lie??</p>	<p>Same as question 1 - already delayed their process time to rip the bandaid off and move forward</p>
<p>Less disruption for families unless decision to have students find own way to school if not going to assigned H/S</p>	<p>Grandfathering is a terrible choice. 1. It fragments friendships. 2. Logistics are a nightmare</p>
<p>Emotionally that would be devastating for kids to leave the high school they started in</p>	<p>Most important issue</p>
<p>As long as the financial impact is not significant...choice always helps families to feel better about decisions.</p>	<p>This would deal with "unhappiness" at one time (LOL). Increase cost for bussing? Increased costs to administration...? Grandfathering mixes up the feeder school policy.</p>
<p>Kids should finish where started or at least have a choice as to whether they want to go/stay. Yes for grandfather.</p>	<p>Better for school personel</p>
<p>Is it possible to allow only freshman & sophomores the choice to stay or go? this cuts back on the timeframe of getting students to other buildings and impacts less students.</p>	<p>This is a hard one. I believe it would be best to move all at one time, but let seniors pick</p>
<p>Our HS student start to form leaderships in future roles as early as freshman - not necessarily for academics but all extra-curricular activities that round out a HS experience. Ex kid that has been working for that lead role since freshman year. Or athelete that made varsity as a freshman.</p>	<p>Efficiency is key. Option A leads to confusing boundaries, varying experiences with students, we should maximize efficiency and aim to put less strain on administration and staff</p>
<p>The education varies greatly, grandfathering would keep peers together when they are most vulnerable. Less change & allows choices for most.</p>	<p>You've accounted for seniors, have others move in and begin the family's transition to either stay where they live or move. They've got a year to decide. Put your home up for sale or stay -> either have kids in 2 schools or one.</p>

Kids like choice, and to alleviate some of the anger with redistricting, this could help	The juniors and seniors can stay. It should be based on if students are able to transport themselves or not.
I believe it would be better for kids to get to know each other as well as types of learning. I believe that if everyone moved out at the same time it would be hard for teachers & students having to account for a lot more students.	Move all now! This way we know where all the students are going.
I think allowing Juniors and Seniors to stay makes the most sense for student happiness.	Have a one time impact and move on to allow students to adjust
Most students have options available, and for most high schoolers, they have so many commitments at their original high school that would be detrimental. Furthermore, when applying for colleges, they don't want this shift on their transcripts.	Simply not equitable to allow grandfathering in because it would involve parent transportation - something not all kids have.
Because the kids can choose to stay because of clubs and sports teams they are apart of, and if they like teachers, coaches, and got to know things at that school, should have the option to stay. It would be awful moving a junior who spent 3 years at a school, got to know it. The people and restarting that struggle like a freshman but as a senior, for they wouldn't want that to happen.	Again cost & complexity due to long term rollout, might help get a better picture need, too, as time goes on
I think logistically option A might be harder, however for many people in the community, they would like this a lot more. I can see people being angry if siblings get split up or just having to go to another school after being there for years. Maybe 1 mediation could be if an underclassmen has a sibling they can stay, but others must go.	Most cost effective, easier to plan for student needs, siblings stay together, immediate results w/ academic, sports, PTO establishments
If students start at a school they should be able to finish there. It will result in less backlash and if you can get grandfathered into laws than you should be grandfathered in to school changes.	A much more amenable choice for families
Able to enact needed change with the least amount penalized	I could have easily gone with option A as well. I see solid arguments for both.

<p>Option A is okay with the stipulation that the district would not provide transportation outside of the individual school boundary.</p>	<p>Parents may have students playing against one another on sports teams and may have conflicts in schedules. They will receive double newsletters, etc. and it seems like a mess. They are essentially part of two high school communities. People are tired of redistricting.</p>
<p>Students should be able to continue in a building where they began HS. Option B feels like an adult centered decision, not a student centered one.</p>	<p>I think the responsibility is with the schools and student choice is a secondary consideration. If the need is for students to move, delaying the solution over years seems inefficient.</p>
<p>This is the student centered approach. If students are involved in extracurricular activities within their school they can continue their involvement. The burden it creates for us is temporary.</p>	<p>People are going to be upset regardless. Might as well get it over with.</p>
<p>While this may provide additional strain, the well-being of communities and students should be taken into account. A phased in approach would support students in adjusting.</p>	<p>This is the most challenging, but a one year transition is better than a prolonged transition.</p>
<p>Moving current students to a new high school during their four years could cause other issues/stressors with social/mental health concerns and struggles to assimilate to a new environment.</p>	<p>This option will best minimize staffing shifts from year to years as it would happen more so at once.</p>
<p>I chose A, but this is tough. I think this blunts some of the political fallout, plus we were willing to do this the first time around. If it creates too many staffing moves and other logistical problems, then don't do it.</p>	<p>Kids are adaptable. They will feed off the energy of the community, past redistricting - I was a student in DCS when this happened, did not have grandfathering, this would be unprecedented.</p>
<p>As stated above, redistricting can bring various emotions with potential change. Allowing students the choice to stay where they started their high school journey is a nice feature to help ease the transition.</p>	<p>Tough decision and conflicted, peel the band-aid may reduce chaos over 3 years of a 5 year plan</p>
<p>High School is a very hard time in adolescence and to have kids out of their HS, away from friends & their sports teams, could significantly negatively affect mental health, adjustment, social groups & lead to anxiety & depression & poor adjustment.</p>	<p>The district and schools need to build a sense of community as quickly as possible. I'm not sure how effectively they could manage the anticipation of who would/would not move. Also - Jerome needs relief now!</p>

<p>They should allow all kids to stay. It is not the fault of the children and their families that the initial redistricting process was done so poorly. Where is the data to support mental health & previous redistricting.</p>	<p>Option B creates less chaos for students & hopefully it results in fewer involuntary transfers of staff over the long term as well. Constantly shuffling staff is not good for building morale.</p>
<p>This is critical - being able to stay @ current HS is very important. College planning, friendships, teacher reccs, team cohesion, etc. Not providing transportation if they chose to stay at school makes sense.</p>	<p>The strain on administration, staff & families would be immense. I am also concerned about how this would impact relationships of students + neighborhoods in general. It would be most efficient to make a decision + execute it. Also what if many choose to "stay put"? That wouldn't allieviate numbers.</p>
<p>Community is HUGE and at least all rising JRs + SRs should be able to stay. But ideally all can choose once you begin school at current HS. Negatives outweigh the cons of MAKING kids move. Some will opt to go.</p>	<p>The prolonged move only keeps wounds open. Make the decisions, and allow the HS's to build the culture they will be developing over the long term. A slow role doesn't allow for this kind of reset & prolong change.</p>
<p>This provides flexibility to families. I know impact on staff/admin is greater, but provides opportunities for families to make best decision for them.</p>	<p>Probably not the popular choice but feel like it will be hard to feel the benefits of redistricting if the process tkaes place over several years. Can be difficult on families being at 2 different high schools. Also seems more expensive for the district if they allow grandfathering. However, this should only be done if these students would be moving with a large group of classmates & neighbors - not singling out small groups of kids.</p>
<p>This seems most kind to the students, however it could be stressful on them to have to "choose" and scenarios where kids on the same block are different schools. However, the bonds are important and gives kids/families more feeling of control over the change.</p>	<p>Be efficient with moving schools - can follow the lead of other districts who have had to move mass amounts of students @ the high school level.</p>
<p>Allow student stay at their high school and finish, unless they decide to move! All grades!!!</p>	<p>Consistency. But could grandfathering of maybe juniors & seniors but not all grades.</p>
<p>Students should be allowed to choose to stay put or move. The district should allocate administrative and educator staff to allow for this.</p>	<p>As educator this is my answer. As parent or student, response would be different.</p>

<p>I believe allowing students to stay is a pragmatic and good faith gesture. I do think it is easier to require non-seniors to move is more compatible with a comprehensive approach to redistricting. Should the district choose that approach.</p>	<p>Logistically better to move at once - I know it's difficult for families but overcrowding leads to more problems.</p>
<p>From the standpoint of a student, I feel the mental/emotional toll of uprooting at this point in their life would be of negative consequence.</p>	<p>Opening Jerome (as a new building) and seniors staying. We had many families who were split between either Coffman or Jerome and from what I recall there were no issues.</p>
<p>Every effort should be made to limit the impact on individual students and their siblings/families. If they are being asked to make a sacrifice for the district, there should be some benefit for them.</p>	<p>Emotionally, this was a difficult choice. This is going to be a challenge for those students in HS. But, given that there are already talks at challenges in 5 years, this seems to be the only way to get redistricting complete successfully from day one.</p>
<p>This should not be on the table ever - it was not there last year's plan. (1). Every high school student has a compressive 4-years plan - this disrupts that plan and significant impact on education. (2). Friends and community will be divided.</p>	<p>Option B is lower administrative burden.</p>
<p>Less traumatic for HS kids. (1). Community now expects grandfather since it was initially offered. (2). If accounting for future growth, should have room. (3). Most HS drive not bus.</p>	<p>It creates too much strain on schools & administration. Assume new mapping is fair to current HS students.</p>
<p>They should get to choose as to lessen the impact to their social groups. I really hope the district is strongly thinking about the impact of moving students away from their friends going into high school. For Bristol Commons, if we move from Grizzell to Scioto. They will have very few friends go to Scioto. This is a negative impact for their mental well-being.</p>	<p>This needs to be fair to all. Allowing some with means to stay is not fair. The youngest should not bear all the burden. This will force a better map and engagement.</p>
<p>Grandfathering is always a good idea for kids already at a HS. Let them choose to stay or not. HS is hard enough for kids!</p>	<p>Efficiency in filling up additional spaces makes most sense.</p>
<p>Engaging with a cohort through your HS career is critical for establishing lifelong bonds to that group and your alma matter. Be it team sports, band, theater, or other extracurriculars, the ability to grow with a core group is key.</p>	<p>Just get it over with!</p>

<p>Moving kids to a new high school during high school is very hard on families have a child in high school. It is important to have that 4 year stability and staying in the same high school for 4 years should be a huge priority for the district. Mental health would be my main concern</p>	<p>Only if seniors are guaranteed to stay</p>
<p>Minimize public outcry, helps students to maintain established peer relationships, more community to begin.</p>	<p>It lessens the impact for choice. The overall goal is for friends/neighbors being able to STAY TOGETHER. More efficient and far less disruptive. Makes things more equitable as well versus picking & choosing (causes more separation than unity).</p>
<p>As a former DCS student, I remember how important my HS community was to me. Having to chang schools would've crushed me. I'm sure there are others who would appreciate the option.</p>	<p>In my option, it would be an abrupt change to do so without consultation, and it could affect each student's educational process.</p>
<p>Understanding that this may put extra strain on the administration and staff I think giving the fresh, soph, JR students the option to stay feels like the option that would be less disruptive to their academic success and better for their socioemotional wellbeing.</p>	
<p>As a parent with high schoolers, I think grandfathering is always easiest on the kids. However, this is the least important criteria to me, so either option is okay.</p>	
<p>Allowing students to choose is better for their mental and social health. High school is an age where kids really start to find themselves and their people, becoming immersed in sports, clubs, and activities. It is much more difficult for a high school to transition schools than the younger ages, so they should be given a choice.</p>	
<p>Redistricting a HS student during their four yeas should be avoided - I have selected choice A. I feel every family should have the option (as tax payers) to choose if their student moves and when. Moving schools is a big event for a teenager and while yes they are resilient - if a family is willing to transport their student to maintain consistency for them socially, academically, etc. That should be moved.</p>	

<p>I think this is more emotional, and I think puts kids first. This would be a temporary challenge.</p>	
<p>Based on past experience, I would like DCS to satisfy students & parents to the highest degree possible. They make everyone miserable when angry. *I really do not care a tiny bit if this is a manual process and harder for admin. Too bad. That's not remotely close to the hardship of a kid changing schools. Please don't let this make the decision.</p>	
<p>Definitely allow high schoolers to grandfather in and decide if they want to stay or move. I currently have a 10th + 11th grader, they are kids but mini adults. There is a lot going on - if they have transportation let them decide. Some kids can't wait to have the comfort of being in HS with a sibling or competing in a sports team with them.</p>	
<p>This question partially depends on how many students would potentially need grandfathering in. If huge chunks of the student population is moving, grandfathering might not make sense. The other consideration is transportation - certain populations might be more able to provide their own and stay at their current school - how would this affect things?</p>	
<p>Continuity is important and high school students should be able to finish where they started their high school career.</p>	
<p>I think the parents should have a grace period to adjust to the new redistricting.</p>	
<p>Because so many kids use EC as well I do think the district can absorb letting kids do grandfathered in or at least juniors and seniors.</p>	
<p>Highschoolers have established friends/social groups, sports, etc. To move them, in the middle of high school would cause unnecessary stress. They have planned their schedules, know teachers and administrators and feel established.</p>	

<p>To move high school kids from one school to another can be very challenging to those students. The student should have the choice to stay or move based off what is best for him/her.</p>	
<p>Redistricting is disruptive; allowing students to make a choice helps lessen the disruption. Any 8th grade middle student impacted should get to stay too.</p>	
<p>Students in HS should be able to decide if they stay at their current HS due to sports, relationships w/ teachers and friend groups.</p>	
<p>Kids are most important in the redistricting process. If they feel strongly about finishing at their school and with their friends let them!</p>	
<p>It should be the families decision.</p>	
<p>I know this may be difficult (to allow grandfathering in), but it seems the best choice when considering student mental health - including friendships, school belonging, relationships with teachers, etc).</p>	
<p>Juniors and Seniors should definitely & absolutely be grandfathered/given the option. School should evaluate cost + benefit of moving sophomores/freshman.</p>	
<p>Kids deserve stability & to finish at high school where they started w/ their friends, teachers, and staff. This is paramount to kids development & how they process their experience over time.</p>	
<p>Because students who are being move should be given time and space to adjust to the decision. Moving everyone will force people who are not ready.</p>	
<p>Students should be grandfathered over time. Kids should not be allowed to finish at the school they started at. Or if grandfathering, 3 grades is too much at least grandfather juniors + seniors (not just seniors). But I could see how families with multiple kids in high school would want the move to happen all at once.</p>	
<p>Hard to keep moving kids around, allow option for parents to move kids but keep kids with peer cohorts.</p>	

I do not think this is a big deal either way.	
This is about political goodwill. The redistricting will be disruptive, but every effort can be made to hold the students harmless in the process and allow them to finish out at their current high school.	
100% grandfather - I would have understood if initially this was considered but the delay is the result of a poorly executed initial plan which is not something that should be on the kids.	
Especially in light of Option B in Question 1, If we are planning more long term, there is no reason to force kids to move. I would actually recommend a required phase - in to minimize disruptions to the student experience.	
Moving is incredibly stressful for kids and families once they are in place at a school, particularly at a high school level. If the student can provide their own transportation, I think it is important to give them a choice. Siblings can make this more complicated, but I do think letting current students stay is important.	
Student's mental health needs to be considered and moving at a pivotal time in their lives can be very difficult to adjust to, with everything online, admin jobs won't be as strained as mentioned on the slide. Siblings going to different high schools would be avoided for most part as well. -> would add more bussing routes if diff HS	
I believe it is important in high school to provide a constant for current students rather than uprooting them at the end of their Dublin education.	
I think allowing grandfathering as well as allowing siblings to stay at a school where there sibling already is is absolutely essential and should be given the highest priority. Moving kids in high school can negatively impact their future plans from an academic and athletic perspective and separating siblings is way too hard on parents.	

<p>Allow kids to stay. Period. Administration can handle this paperwork for the few years it overlaps. If middle school redistricting happens, 8th graders should be given same option.</p>	
<p>Kids should absolutely be grandfathered in. My soon will be a Jr and has worked hard to create relationships with staff and develop in leadership positions that are important for college application process. This would be devastating to start all over at a new schol jr year. Not to mention socially to leave their friends at that point.</p>	
<p>Their ability to continue attending the same school without anxiety should be the top priority. Students in the EL programs already fasce many challenges and uncertainties.</p>	
<p>I think it's better for children to continue with their existing groups and friends. It's better for their education and socialization. It allows for better organization for the family.</p>	

3. Spread impacts evenly OR impact less students overall:	
A. Spread out impacts of redistricting evenly across all high schools	B. Impact less students by moving students directly from where growth is happening to where there is capacity
In fairness to all, all schools should be included	With growth the newer students will know where they will be going as moving in.
I believe proximity distance in driving time or miles is most important, so I believe option A is better for families and students.	Spreading out the impact would be more costly and would impact more families
Proximity is key for me, prioritize that, but don't like cost	The less students impacted the better. If busing is the same on both then make as little impact on kids/families as needed
There will be multiple schols impacted. This is the best way to make sure all schools are well within their capacity level.	I'm all for impacting as few students as possible. Jerome Township continues to not feel the impact of their development and that has to change. Jerome Township -> Scioto, all for that
I believe in order to select OPTION A for consideration 1 (re: long term planning) you need to make to do a comprehensive redistricting	I think if we don't want to further divide the district, we need to impact the newest families. It will cause a lot of angst to the new families, and I'm sure they will lawyer up on this - but it seems that this is really the fair way to impact the whole community.
This does not make a lot of sense. Regardless, if you live within a certain distance from a school, that should be your school.	You need to move just Jerome to Scioto. Muirfield & Shawnee Hills and are almost as far if not farther from Jerome than Scioto. Coffman neighborhoods are closer to Jerome & Coffman than these Jerome neighborhoods. Why can't you just move them directly? Why disrupt everyone when you can reach your goal by moving Jerome directly to Scioto. Then you minimize future need to destrict as well. A win-win. Jerome always thinks it is untouchable. Moving everyone else to make them happy is not fair.
Seems like it makes more sense logistically	Since area of the district are functioning well - why fix/change what is not broken. This would ^ Scitos characterization - creating a nice balance.
Question too broad, but being able to bring population diversity to buildings w/ realistic proximity to schools is best for the district as a whole.	All the growth is taken place in Jerome which is making the bigger impact to the community
I'm divided, had a hard time making this choice.	Move s's from where growth originates

Misery loves company.	This is hard to answer. On one hand, I see the logic of making the whole district even and I see the logic for only shuffling boundaries where it is necessary. Why move evryone when the growth impact isn't happening everywhere? And if we truly believe all of DCS is an elite education, then it shouldn't matter where the kids go - any building will provide a similar outcome/opportunity
Spread evenly	Would keep boundaries mostly the same, less costly, affects less kids
Spread out and make best one *** break to plan for future so that in the future kids who live in homes closer to their high school -> they will attend -> the long term	Areas that aren't growing as much shouldn't be penalized by the move
This is the time to do what is best for the district, so I think we should spread out the students now. It will affect more students at once, but then it is done.	Trying not to impact as many students is the most logical option. You don't want to affect people who don't need to be involved.
I think the Dublin community as a whole feels frustrated by how population shifts APPEAR to benefit one part of the community. I think if we are planning for long term, we need to try to evenly impact all areas of Dublin.	Do what will account for a need to do less redistricting in the future. Also, it's cheaper
Look at the district as a whole. Every building should be considered to make the best plan for all students and staff. We need to stop "sheltering" certain pockets	Scioto needs more people and Jerome needs less
Choice B is more disruptive, I believe. I actually think this will cause more negativity, even though on paper, it might make sense? This is a consideration where community/educational mindset might meet resistance if we go with option B.	Some areas don't need to be moved. And some areas really need to be moved.
All high schoolers could be equally looked at to redistrict because areas could have multiple neighborhoods move to one place, so friends could go together to make it easier.	This makesm most sense for redistricting populations. The rates & population are different so the movement makes sense to be different.
We need to do this right the first time. If we are just moving the least amount of students it will not have the right impact.	More backlash when affecting more people could result in unnecesary movement.
Option B has too many holes, becomes political. Would rather impact everyone at one time = fair.	Impacts where growth happens will require less *** student movement. No need to upset mre than necessary if redistricting done correctly.

Not sure how to answer this question. Seems like other more important factors controls this outcome.	But only within reason. How can we draw lines to ensure 3 HSS of similar composition and opportunity. Need to move some north neighborhoods east.
Let's do it right, not limit ourselves to great options by trying to impact fewer students now.	This would help the established community keep their current schools.
This approach mitigates future issues due to growth	Believe the community may appreciate a more targeted, intentional, and surgical approach.
Although there may be an initial impact that affects more students overall, this option provides the opportunity for the district to emphasize One Dublin Vision.	Moving from Jerome to Scioto would help potentially balance the social economic status of the 2 buildings. *This may anger families in the DJHS area.
A presents an option that seems more fair & equal to all students in the district & places emphasis on boundaries that make the most sense in all facets.	I think moving the fewest kids and staff would be best.
Holistic thinking is necessary and responsible. All boundaries must be on the table to keep options open.	As the majority of growth is happening in Jerome, this is where the move should happen. This will be easier & allow for a better set-up in the future. Moving Jerome -> Scioto would be the most simple options.
To make the most of space we want to consider all buildings. Bigger thinking = more options.	Move Jerome to Scioto. Recognize where the need is.
I think it should be as comprehensive as makes sense. Don't move just to move, but make meaningful lasting boundaries.	I'm not sure either/or should be applied to this. If we're truly looking at long term growth, all options should be considered while also minimizing disruption.
Tough choice. Goal - not to have to redistrict anytime soon. Let's do what's best for Dublin.	The problem is primarily in Jerome area. The capacity exists in Scioto. This isn't much complicated. Also, if moving, more - Murfield is not a sacred cow.
Based on taking a long term approach to this, we should do what makes sense long-term. Be as comprehensive as we need to be.	This one is tough. I believe it will impact travel time for those who would be moved from growth -> capacity building. But, the least amount of families impacted would be ideal. However...would these boundaries remain for 10+ years?
I think the boundaries need to be more sensible -? There will be pushback if there is less impact where people feel the pressure is coming from. Use this opportunity to make the boundaries "make sense" even if more kids are affected.	Address where growth is happening - Coffman is landlocked- not fair to folks in Coffman area whose boundaries haven't grown to be moved.

<p>Just do it ONCE and get it right so families don't have to suffer this again.</p>	<p>Be more strategic to affect less kids in areas that are landlocked like Coffman. Take straight from Jerome -> Scioto. When able, leave Coffman near capacity if at all possible. Why move kids outh when you don't have to.</p>
<p>I believe the best approach for the district is a comprehensive redistricting of all three HS areas AND K-12 boundaries. If the district chooses to only do HS redistricting & leave Elem and MS boundaries as is, then they should impact fewer students.</p>	<p>Move kids from Jerome high school! The area continues to grow!</p>
<p>Going off of my response to question #1, I believe that moving kids from where growth is happening to where there is capacity makes most sense. Eventually, those that live close to schools will continue to minimize if the boundaries are stretched where they should not be. Move a large, targeted area from the north, out of Jerome to Sicoto. A significant portion are already busing distances as is.</p>	<p>The very reason we are redistricting is due to the growth. So, the growth area should be the one to consider redistricting. This option is going to help all the other criteria such as feeder pattern, proximity, etc.</p>
<p>This is a tough question. Either everyone bears some part of the burden or a small cohort does, but gets some benefit in return. Whatever the solution, it should be well thought out and not reactionary.</p>	<p>Last redistricting you pitted Bailey v. Thomas when we don't even live near the school that has the capacity problem. If you're going to move Amberleigh - why not Murfield / Shawnee Hills hat are Jerome and by a bridge instead.</p>
<p>I don't feel particularly strongly about this consideration.</p>	<p>Since the growth is happening at Scioto, the district should look strategically at moving Jerome areas into Scioto. This would impact the district the least amount and casue the least amount of disruptions. This would also solve the socio-economic discrepancies. I really feel very strongly about spot redistricting, moving the growth at Jerome to Scioto.</p>
<p>Better longterm. Option B is just a "bandaid."</p>	<p>Until you get all the schools districted correctly to be near the schools in their backyard - only move a few kids. Don't upset everything all at once. Do it slowly.</p>
<p>My choice here steems to align best w/my Q1 choice...Big picture moves should address future growth - I am not sure how you can only move kids where growth is happening & plan for the future.</p>	<p>If growth is happening in the north, then the northern families should be in the mix to move - to help balance. Homes in Muirfield and/or Shawnee Hills should be considered to move to help balance. Muirfield should not be required to stay together as one - as they are too big and should be in consideration to move.</p>

<p>We should be looking at all options long term. It might impact more now but would be better for all in the future.</p>	<p>The simplest solution might be the best in this case. Simple as in minimizing overall impact.</p>
<p>There is no need to purposefully affect everyone, but to take a long range view...we can't think surgical. Small pocklet movement ends up with a huge messy puzzle after a few years and we are back right where we are now.</p>	<p>I believe impacting the least amount of students is best, as this is the least disruptive. Also, it is clear wher growth is happening and will continue, as well sa where there is capacity.</p>
<p>Understanding that it may affect more kids, spreading the impact out seems like a more hollistic approach that will allow for more balance across the district, not just in terms of sheer numbers but balance across other measures. That will create more diversity in each of the 3 buildings.</p>	<p>I think we need to focus on where the growth is happening and moving those kids to where there is room (Jerome to Scioto). The less kids impacted, the better because otherwise more students are moving farther away from their closest high school. We need to stop consistently moving students in central Dublin, due to the growht in the NW.</p>
<p>Truly the issue is district wide and our district is complex. This isn't just an issue with one area of growth, the district as a whole is changing. When factoring in all of the considerations, moving just one area does not make sense. If we wanted to impact the fewest students, building another high school is your best option.</p>	<p>If not allowing students to be grandfathered, would want to impact least smount of students with knowing that in first consideration we wold need to redistrict and balance at that time.</p>
<p>The district has the chance to correct & course correct. Growth is one factore, and should not be the only criteria considered when redistricting students. Many boundaries have been re-drawn with elementary & middle school already and the "One Dublin" approach is not reality. A new lense is needed and if we as a district have a chance to improve and reduce inequity then we should now even if it means impacting more students.</p>	<p>I chose B because I am reading this question a moving a mass of students from one place to another, rather than a trickle down effect.</p>
<p>One Dublin! If we are One Dublin, then we need to show this to our community. We can no longer participate in the haves v. have nots. All schools are strong! Can become stronger!</p>	<p>Disrupting the least amount of children.</p>
<p>Move where they need to be as part of the plan. Band-aidng each time will create more issues down the road tht just compounds.</p>	<p>I think people new to the system (ie Jerome Village) should have to be the ones who get bussed.</p>

<p>I'm not sure how to avoid this because of where the schools are and where the houses are. Also seems like we would otherwise ship kids from far Northwest to Scioto which seems inefficient. Affecting more people might create less of a "Why me?" response in the community.</p>	<p>Because the district has chosen to keep putting off the inevitable 4th HS (and 6th MS) which would allow for the continuity of neighborhood schools, take the area of growth and move them to where you have chosen to create space. Olentangy seems to be able to do this not sure why we can't.</p>
<p>Keeping students at least somewhat close to their home/school and more opportunities to keep neighborhoods together.</p>	<p>It makes more sense to strategically move less students from areas with more growth to schools with more capacity. Why would you move students from areas of little to no growth and further isolate those students and not solve the issue.</p>
<p>Proximity, friends, neighborhoods</p>	<p>Coffman is landlocked. That school's current feeders/boundaries should remain. The growth location should be taken into heavy consideration and it would impact far fewer students to move only those where growth is occurring to where there is capacity.</p>
<p>A could effect more kids but to me it would be a more geographical based decision which makes more sense. 10 years from now - say if you chose option B - which in my mind would be Jerome Village moving to Scioto - is odd. I do not like in Jerome Village btw :)</p>	<p>The areas in the North + East are causing growth, yet they have been impacted the least by redistricting. The central part of Dublin has the oldest facilities and has been impacted significantly over years, including students at sells who have not been relocated but experienced a major change in performance/classroom environment.</p>
<p>This ties back to looking at a short-term 5-year fix v. looking at a long-term fix. Do it right now, even if, it affects more students, so we don't have to do it again so soon.</p>	<p>It allows families that consciously live within Dublin City Zone to maintain their school of choice without being disrupted by the growth in neighboring areas/townships.</p>
<p>All 3 high schools are Dublin schools, all 3 should bear the burden and repeat the benefits of redistricting. If we are one district then no one is an exception.</p>	<p>We need to address the growth issue & this would allow new subdivisions full transparency into where they will go to school. If we don't do this we will just be kicking the can down the road as building continues.</p>

<p>The redistricting should be done correctly so that it lasts. The last redistricting was terrible for Sells Middle School and now potentially needs redone. I also agree w/ option B to move the growth from Jerome to Scioto. This did not seem considered last time. Sports, PTOs, student academics, balanced performance of all HS needs to be considered. Free and reduced lunch matters.</p>	<p>Growth = Jerome -> Capacity -> Scioto. It's that simple. But really need a 4th high school (Jerome will grow faster than predictions). (Money for Scioto addition should've been saved for 4th high school).</p>
<p>For long term success I think all schools need to be considered. As nice as it sounds to let Jerome students pay the burden of the current redistricting needs and move them to Scioto, it's not realistic (for most pockets of Jerome, some across Glick Rd could certainly make the move to Scioto). I knew Coffman has been stuck in the middle of a lot of redistricting, but that doesn't protect them from more.</p>	<p>Redistricting is a lagging problem. Therefore impacts should not be evenly spread. For example, why was capacity added to Scioto when Jerome was where most growth was happening?</p>
<p>Wow, this is a challenge. Seriously, option B makes the most sense, but looking at this from the district prospective, is probably healthier. This is the chance to get it done correctly. I will be unpopular for supporting this option. Really, either way could be accomodated. This is a coin flip...</p>	<p>Move the least number of kids, move kids from the over-capacity school to the under capacity school. In fact, some neighborhoods that currently go to Jerome are equidistant/time (both drive time + distance) from Scioto. Look at Shawnee Hills. They are the same drive time to all 3 schools (within 1 minute).</p>
<p>Gives the district more flexibility to implement the correct changes and not bond by growth/less growth areas.</p>	<p>The middle cannot be always pushed for the growth on the edges. If this is not the case, then they all need to be affected. This is a very hard problem.</p>
<p>This is difficult because it would impact more students but if moving only the new growth (ie Jerome Village) to Scioto and then building a new HS in the growth area in the future and moving those Jerome Village families back, I think that's unfair.</p>	<p>Moving from growth and to the area with most capacity many shifts moving forward. I am not opposed to a large impact, but don't think it is great for middle of district (brand road vicinity) to be continuously disrupted.</p>

<p>A lot of time + resources are being devoted to this process. The entire DCS boundary should be looked at and considered for the best map. Allowing some grandfathering (at minimum for seniors + juniors can offset the impact on these students close to graduation).</p>	<p>Growth has consistently happened out in Jerome area. We (Waterford) continue to pay price in past redistricting. We also pay price -> consistently vote YES on levys while losing complete trust in the district. Jerome has been left UNTOUCHED. This absolutely needs to change. The option impacts less kids (our goal). Also allows most kids to continue feeder pattern. A large portion of Jerome (Eversol?) should move.</p>
<p>Seems like looking at a whole vs. small pockets makes the most sense for long term redistricting.</p>	<p>Kids should be moved from Jerome area where growth is happening. Coffman is underutilized and kids should not be moved from there. Moving from Jerome directly to Scioto will help long term as well. There are areas that go to Jerome that are closer to Scioto than Jerome HS. Glick Rd bridge is not a problem at school hours. I drive it regularly.</p>
<p>Long term planning</p>	<p>Move kids where the growth is happening. Take out of Jerome by moving directly to Scioto where there is space. It makes less sense to make bigger waves moving Jerome to Coffman and Coffman to Scioto. We need to stop redistricting the same kids who live within walking distance to Coffman (Bristol, Brandon). If busing costs are minimal difference, more growth areas to Scioto.</p>
<p>Let's get this right! We don't want to do this again in 5 years.</p>	<p>This option would lead to areas that have been impacted repeatedly to accommodate Jerome Village growth to have some stability and not constantly feel like they are being sacrificed to cater to the wealthiest parts of the district.</p>
<p>Let's not just impact kids because a building has space, let's look at it overall bigger picture so we don't have to do this again.</p>	<p>I understand urban growth, but I am not comfortable with my children being transferred to another school.</p>
<p>We are a community so change for the future</p>	<p>It would be better to choose an option that affects the fewest number of students. I hope students can spend their days in an environment with as little confusion and disruption as possible.</p>

<p>I think it's time to look at the entire district, not just a section or two. Just moving one section is still pitting sections of Dublin against each other and breaks off parts of neighborhoods and elementary/middle.</p>	<p>I believe that affecting fewer children allows us to focus on those children and families.</p>
<p>As with #1, it is necessary to be logical and comprehensive about redistricting.</p>	
<p>Having disorganized feeder patterns disproportionately impacts Coffman families in the middle of the district. This creates an inequitable student experiences between students who are forced to separate from relationships multiple times vs. some students in the district who never experience this. This places an inequitable burden on a minority of students & can't continue.</p>	
<p>To create better, more cohesive feeder patterns, ALL of our district should be looked at. This is an opportunity to make all schools in Dublin have a balanced population and create more equal opportunities. The Dublin experience is VERY different depending what school you go to - please take this into consideration when drawing new boundaries!</p>	
<p>Looking to avoid redistricting again in near future. Could help avoid redistricting based on politics and school board members who have voiced often to use race as way to move students even though that's illegal. Depending on interpretation either question could be the choice made.</p>	
<p>This is a difficult decision for the district, so all portions of the district should, at least potentially have a change. I personally am extremely tired of the Jerome section of the district receiving the new buildings but never facing redistricting.</p>	

4. Keep current feeder patterns together OR make changes to create better flow for high school:	
A. Keep feeder patterns (keep current middle school boundaries)	B. Implement significant changes to middle school attendance boundaries to create better
We just deistricted middle schools. It is challengng to support doing this again. I don't think middle schools should feed into three different high schools.	Open up boundaries - if we don't more students will be split up. Drawing boundaries again will hopefully keep more middle schoolers together -> HS
The feeder patterns matter. Bailey splits to Karrer, Grizzell & then some kids split to a tiny group to Coffman & rest go to Jerome. DCS made a mess. It's heartbreaking for these kids. Especially, when Davis & Eversole have 100% feeder patterns (Karrer almost never does).	Use the most flexibility to get the right feeder patters to follow high school growth.
Let's not again redistrict middle school feeds.	Streamlining earlier can keep classes of kids together. Thinking about Hilliard's strucuture, it would be nice to have less divide between middle school's and high school's pipelines.
Keeps patern similar, less movement	Like kids to get to stay together
To make people less angry now, this would probably help the most	In the long-term, allowing the feeder patterns to change will create more flexibility in high school redistricting and allow for a "flow" to the high schools that makes the most sense and prevents "strange and disconnected" feeder patterns.
MS was just redistricted, so maybe adjust that later. Plus, 5 middles doesn't cleanly feed into 3 tradition high schools.	Some changes to middle school for better flow may just be needed.
I know we just adjusted the middle school boundaries, but if we are making a change, let's all change.	I think you have to go this route for the flexibility and allow a more open plan as you consider redistricture overall, not just HS
You just redistricted middle school students. When the community asked about middle to high school, it would have been nice to have enacted it then. *Feeder patterns are important to all school districts & families!	I think as the district changes - we need to make changes to really focus on the flow for the HS. Nothing is ideal, but in reality these kids will make new friends and continue to get a great education.
We just went through middle school redistricting. I don't believe the feeder patterns are that important, more friends in more places is never a bad thing.	Again the bet long term solution realigns things across the district. It will be less popular now, but it will lead to a better outcome eventually.
I'd say keep as much as possible with perhaps a spot here or there, but I wouldn't reopen everything, as it goes against student impact.	Getting it knocked out at once seems to make the most sense

<p>I am choosing not because it's the bst answer. "Spot" redistricting still puts the burden on a small group of kids. It should be broadly applicable.</p>	<p>I feel if you are accounting for future growth right away, this is what makes the most sense. Make changes now that you can keep for a very long time.</p>
<p>It's been only few years that middle school redistricting happened - it's not fair for them to go through again. However, elementary to middle to high school feeder pattern should be considered such that there is not small block of elementary left out of a particular high school.</p>	<p>Keep MS to HS flow as much as possible for students</p>
<p>I am on the fence here but DCS already upended lots of lives in the last redistricting - just this school year! - and changing those again will create absolutely fury. The community needs to heal, and this won't help.</p>	<p>Middle school and high school boundaries should have done together. Best to admit when wrong and correct. It will make high school boundaries make more sense by touching MS too.</p>
<p>The previous redistricting moved students, they should not be moved again. It was also said if the levy passed, the following MS redistricting would only affect those schools in the north who were over capacity.</p>	<p>We really need MORE DATA, re: enrichment - we don't know if the current feeder patterns work efficiently - if I had to make a choice I would say B. Stop busing to high schools that have low attendance in afterschool patterns - or even mornings. Why waste money with few students in big feeders.</p>
<p>Because it keeps with established patterns for established neighborhoods.</p>	<p>May be required to growth</p>
<p>Honestly torn on this because if you don't you are going to be in the same situation as last time unless you move JV to Scioto. However, it really angers me that this wasn't thought of when MS redistricting was done because at the time it was so clear to me that it was a mistake to not be doing both at the same time, even if you implemented a year after each other. It was a missed opportunity and now I feel you have to del with the consequences and work with what you have created.</p>	<p>The efficiency of this makes more sense long term</p>
<p>This may make sense in the future but if you do this now, you will punish the same students. Middle school students were just separated from their friends. I think you need to wait.</p>	<p>I feel moving patterns before HS is better than doing it later. However, please do not move all the "middle of district" families without talking to them</p>
<p>Allowing changes to MS boundaries adds another variable and complexity in solving the 'best' map for HS.</p>	<p>Feeders are important to support families and align resources in neighborhoods. MS to HS (and ideally elementary to MS) are important for transitions, family support-centered models, & each community/climate/culture</p>

My child/family is happy with the current middle school - location, teachers, staff & atmosphere.	Changing the feeder for better. Flow is important. Start with high school then adjust MS & Elem feeders
Spot redistricting doesn't sound to tackle the problem if I'm reading question/answer correctly. Current feeder pattern stays same helps students stay at school closest to them/travel time.	If changes are made at the HS level, it will work best if the MS feed into each HS properly. I know this may be emotional for those being moved, but when they enter HS they will be with their classmates
I agree with keeping the current distribution patterns unchanged.	When I consider this answer I am considering the effects on students and where the student is developmentally. It would be hard to move a student to a new HS after spending K-8 with the same group; however, if you move the same student at 6th, they are more malleable to make a wider set of friends & can adjust to a move that may be different than a majority of peers.
We strongly prefer the current school assignment and hope it will remain the same.	I think we need to choose the most effective approach to redistricting which will allow for greater flexibility and flow to achieve the right balance.
	We need to look top down -> HS to MS to ES. Feeder patterns don't need to have high priority. We need to teach kids and families to make new friends, this is lacking in our social, emotional teaching.
	Move Bailey back to Sells. When we vacated Bailey out of Sells, the school lost its footing. It's still not back. Then do a district feeder pattern after 6th MS opens. Sells & Davis lead to Scioto. One and done. :)
	This would cause less kids at the high school level to be affected by redistricting which is where most friendships & important educational turning points occur: redistricting on the middle school level would make the least impact on everyone.
	Change what needs to be changed now so it doesn't have to be in the future
	Middle schoolers will survive and this sounds like the more long term option
	There's less of an impact on students academically (although socially is another story), and allowing more flexibility here means it doesn't clog up in the high schools later on.

	Middle schoolers can start and do all 4 years at one highschool rather moving a highschooler where they have been for a few years. They can adapt socially and academically and stay all 4 years like they would at a normal highschool which benefits them more than like 2 years at one and 2 years at another school.
	I think how the schools got this way are in part due to the middle schools, so some changes should probably be made
	If you change the highschools you should change middle school. I see it as a chain and you can't more one link without affecting the others.
	We need to fix the feeder patterns. If we are trying to "make it work" we paint ourselves into a corner.
	Holistic approach to realign the entire district. More impact but FAIR.
	Option A just causes constraints on making good boundary changes
	More flexibility = longer time before we do this again. Be sure to check elementary feeders too!
	Opening option allows us to be more precise around ground, possibly extend timeframe of when we could have to redistrict again.
	Make the change required now to avoid constantly coming back to the community for additional changes.
	Grizzell is not full -- this is a problem. SMS/DMS very full -- also a challenge b/c high need buildings need more intervention spaces. Ideally we get clean feeder patterns with minimal splits.
	This would allow more students/neighborhoods to stay together
	Better flow may reduce the need for future redistricting @ the high school level and helps keep students w/ peers in movement from MS to HS.
	This is a better option in the spirit of keeping kids together.

	It seems like students come & go from peer groups and it may make sense to help the redistricting community conversations. Middle also does not feel evenly redistricted currently from the last one.
	Sells MS was negatively impacted by the last redistricting and this option would/could be used to adjust numbers and needs.
	It is important to consider the now, especially as enrollment continues to trend upward.
	Better for kids to get in MS groups that stay together.
	This option seems more forward thinking and hopefully will be a long term solution.
	Mixed feelings here, vertical flow from E.S. to M.S. to H.S. is important. If different effective flow patterns are found, they should be considered. However, the M.S. have already redistricted twice.
	If we are redistricting high school then the middle school should follow that.
	Mistakes were made in last 2 redistricting of MS - needs fixed
	Makes sense to do when middle school 6 opens, the feeders will be tough until then. Whatever it takes to keep elementary to H.S. (cohorts together as much as possible for as long as possible).
	M.S. Feeder patterns in H.S. must be considered. Children need to be able to move from school <> school with a continuous group of friends, otherwise their mental health will be impacted negatively.
	Feeder patterns are critical. I'd advocate for a comprehensive look at elementary > MS > HS. There needs to be a standard threshold of % split of students from one level to the next. And, should not be determined by HDA. Apply proximity filters here too.
	Keep as many middle school feeding to the same HS is important. I.e: Karrer should all feed to Coffman. Been hard when only 20-25% of school goes to one high school.

	<p>*Feeder pattern from ES->HS is most important to keep peers together longterm. Some redistricting at MS is okay to keep ES kids together once they get to HS. MS is only 3 years. Most relationships start in ES (6 yrs) and want them to be together again in HS as much as possible.</p>
	<p>Same reason as above. Flow is important. That was lacking in previous boundaries. It should all be connected; and continuous.</p>
	<p>This is my #1 complaint about DCS -> the feeder patterns are awful and split kids multiple times -> and the redistricts happen on top of this! Elementary flow should also be fixed. Don't have different guiding principles for elem vs. HS. Example - Murfield splits into 3 elem but they keep Murfield together for HS. Makes redistricting very difficult.</p>
	<p>Better feeder pattern, maybe even changes at elementary level? Consider proximity!</p>
	<p>Feeder patterns from MS->HS should flow logically</p>
	<p>I believe the district should be comprehensive in their approach - considering all 3 HS attendance boundaries AND K-12 redistricting. Changing criteria for assignment for HS, but not ES and MS creates confusion and chaos.</p>
	<p>As long as a large enough section of students is moved together from a middle school, the boundaries today should be fine. It is when a very minor group is cherry picked and ostracized from their known peer groups (K-8) that this would become a major issue.</p>
	<p>This is an impossible choice - I mean we did not have to change the VERY recent redistricting BUT I think we should prioritize kids going with as many peers as possible. So if changing a middle helps to keep more neighbors together for HS, I think that's best for the district.</p>

	<p>This is a difficult one - I am more of an inbetween. Currently, Bristol Commons goes to Grizzell, but not many of Grizzell students go to Coffman. I am concerned about my kids losing their friendship groups. I am ok with Bristol Commons going to Karrer if it helps minimize mve in high school. Karrer would then feed into Coffman, and our neighborhood could stay at Coffman.</p>
	<p>Yes, do the spot redistricting for middle schools. You have some middle schools clearly wrong - which is messing with the feeding patterns. Lots of neighborhoods are equal distance to Karrer & Grizzel but are diefinitely in Jerome's backyard, if so, put them at Grizzel so the kids feed to Jerome together. If closer to Jerome - they should be at a middle school that feeds to Jerome!! If you can walk to Jerome go to Jerome! Why have kids at Donegal Cliffs at Grizzel but not neighborhoods south of Brand Rd?? Makes no sense!!</p>
	<p>I would advocate for a level further down than spot redistricting. If we have a (hopefully only) once in a 10th year shot to make the most optimal solutin for feeder patterns, I am an advocate for ensuring no cohort of students ever becomes the minority in their next level from elem -> middle, middle -> HS. Keep the funnel neutral or growing, never shrinking.</p>
	<p>Making changes in middle school boundaries will provide more flexibility for its redistricting and will help align the HS for proximity being the most important factor that should be considered for all schools. Not addressing middle schools again will limit the districts ability to draw maps that make sense.</p>
	<p>If you're going to do it right and think big picture/lng term, then do it across the board.</p>

	<p>I don't feel like you keep the present pattern and not impact long term size of the high schools. It seems if you don't redistrict the MS those will also become overcrowded & not redistricting now only prolongs something that will have to be done long-term. As you can tell, I am a long term planner, so I am most aligned w/ whatever solves the most problems long term.</p>
	<p>I am open to this & think it would be best long term but I am not sure the community would be open based on that we just redistricted in the last year. We need to be more in tune w/ "one Dublin" & that there is opportunity in all spaces.</p>
	<p>I think this should be on the table to allow for flexibility, but changes should be minimized if possible.</p>
	<p>Taking A long term approach may have some minor impacts on the other levels to keep families close to others in their neighborhood.</p>
	<p>Coming from a 100% feeder pattern, I appreciate that the school is looking at making changes to the middle school feeder patterns that would seem to allow more flexibility w/ the flow to HS.</p>
	<p>The goal should be least impact over time, so if middle schools need to change again to allow for less impact later than it's the best option.</p>
	<p>Better flow for new high school boundaries is important/ As a Karrer parent over the past 9 years, I have seen some classes with almost equal division between CHS and JHS, and others with a small percent of kids going to JHS. This really makes a difference in terms of unity, feeling whole as a class, and sometimes kids making friend choices depending on where students attend high school.</p>
	<p>Assuming growth is not the only criteria being examined then I do not feel that the middle schools should be impacted/changed if it will improve feeder patterns and create more equitable schools at both the middle & high school level.</p>

	I think the district messed up by not considering high school when doing the middle school redistricting. Some of the feeder patterns for middle school don't make sense & the growth at Eversole is already higher than anticipated, so I think for better flow, growth, & to have more options, it makes sense to tweak some of the middle school feeder patterns.
	This just makes sense. However, middle school have gone through 2 redistricting processes in last several years. Many families keep this fresh in their minds.
	It should become the norm to look on a regular cyclic. The issue we ran into w/ the past attempt was feeders. This could cause additional concerns + limitations that compound if not addressed.
	Improving feeder patterns help with these transitions for students.
	Leave as much flexibility as possible, and this would keep kids together longer rather than splitting them apart from MS to HS. Seems like the other option could prevent us from making the smartest decisions available.
	Flexibility - able to keep future peer groups together.
	Following my pattern from previous question (Q3, A)
	Opportunity is here to "fix" "adjust" to what makes sense based on the current/more accurate information we have now. Not last year or 5 years ago. Current information.
	While no one wants to re-look at the feeder patterns, I think doing so in order to accommodate groups staying together is more important. A grandfathered approach or gradual change (current MS students finishing where they are) might be needed.
	Create sustainable feeder patterns so that kids and families can feel confident that they will remain with their cohort.

	Some small spot redistricting to the middle schools may be needed to accomplish minimally affected students to high schools and also help prevent number of splits some middle schools have feeding into high schools, which would allow more students to stay together while moving through schools.
	There is wide disparities among the school buildings in terms of academics. This needs to be corrected. We have not comprehensively looked at boundaries + it shows. It is time to balance not just capacity, but opportunity as + academic performance. People wouldn't be upset about a potential move if all buildings were perceived as equal. One Dublin is a myth. Look at academic performance.
	The middle schools should absolutely be looked at. The high schools should be done correctly and then middle schools and elementary schools can be aligned to ensure the feeders flow correctly. A review should be completed to understand how Sells was impacted based on the last redistrict. Sells is now worse off academically and has lost sports teams.
	I think the middle school patterns caused a lot of issues with the previous redistricting process and absolutely need adjustments made.
	In order to make this work appropriately, all decisions and options should be on the table. Nothing will be perfect; middle schools won't yet reflect 1:1 to high school. But this should help create better cohorts of students through their academic career.
	Gives the district more flexibility to implement correct change.
	I don't believe I have the expertise to answer this question well but I am aware of odd feeder patterns (ie: students from Karrer MS are split strangely with a very small percentage going to JJerome and that's hard for students when they've attended ES + MS with the same students..going to a HS with completely new faces is tough.

	Feeder patterns should be a factor but should not override any other factors or considerations. For example, walkable areas to a school should be prioritized over feeder patterns.
	Keep kids together - kids need to keep their friends throughout K-12.
	Sooner the better people know where their kids will go to high school. It is easier to adapt to environment in middle school than in high school.
	The middle school (MS) feeder patterns should correspond to the high school boundaries, ideally an entire MS would go to one, HS or split 50/50. No MS should split 70/30. 50/50 or 60/40 is better for the students, and the relationships they have formed.
	The context is very important. We live here to have a high quality steady education. The current boundaries are not great for some elementary splits.
	The flow for long term enrollment makes sense to me vs. forcing middle school boundaries to stay.
	Feeder patterns for middle to high school is important to build students relationships/community and overall engagement.
	Again, if we're doing it, let's do it right for many years to come.
	We need kids to stay with peers when going to high school instead of splitting a middle school into 3 high schools.
	Academic success is focused on safety. Safety for freshman is a having a group of friends. Breaking up cohorts of kids is bad for them to have success.
	I think this only makes sense if we are redoing the entire district.
	It would be prudent to consider allowing MS kids to stay at current MS - especially if they have already moved - maybe this doesn't impact anyone?

	<p>You can't make logical high school pattern changes without affecting the middle schools. DCS needs to be better at keeping middle schools together for high school Grizzell & Karrer's splits (current) are poor & bad practice -> kids make friends & then these friends are split. Strive for (1:1) middle -> 1 high school.</p>
	<p>Option B in this question supports my prior choices of option B in question 1 and option A in question 3. Create equitable feeder patterns that do not disproportionately burden some students with separation + mental health impacts.</p>
	<p>PLEASE look at middle school boundaries when making high school changes! This was hugely problematic in limiting high school changes. There should absolutely be changes to the middle school level to align feeder patterns to high school.</p>
	<p>If we're going to do this, let's do this. Complete the full analysis, move what needs to be moved, and then let people have a period of time (7-10 years) where it doesn't come back again.</p>
	<p>In order for EQUITY, you have to look at redistricting both middle and elementary. It ALL has to be redone! The current middle schools are NOT equitable or balanced. In the last middle school redistricting it was very poorly done! NO consideration for SELLS whatsoever -> and the imbalanced continued!!</p>
	<p>Boundaries should be tweaked to make sense. Kids should flow with cohorts and go to closest if not second closest school.</p>
	<p>I think community open to looking at this where it makes sense. For Bristol Commons, we'd be willing to move back to Karrer within most of Bailey to keep kids going to Coffman which is within walking/driving distance. Then all of Karrer goes to Coffman.</p>

	<p>Small numbers of middle schoolers are sent to high schools that are different from the high school where the majority of their classmates go - if this can be addressed move them to a middle school where the majority of their high school peers will be that seems like a good idea.</p>
	<p>The flexibility allows for great efficiency in the allocation of future students and better organization for families if they know in advance.</p>

5. How should proximity to a school building be defined?:	
A. Radius drawn around a school building	B. Driving time to a school
I'm really not sure about this or how A is different than C. B is unclear-subjective. A seems to be the most "fair."	Drive time may be better because it is blind to distance.
Kids should go to school in close proximity of the community they live in.	Mileage or driving time both make the most sense to me
Radius - values community school so school is hub of neighborhoods & family connectivity, Also creates more social capital + peer to peer support for families *** so fabric of community within each HS feeder + at large as a collective	Driving time - families are bus! Should align/ish w/ proximity
Radius, keeps it more local & more accurate	The least amount of time to get to a school is ideal. If a student could drive to Jerome in 20 min or Scioto in 15 mins but lives closer to Jerome, I would prefer they attend Scioto.
Bussing seems to be the key/most important factor at this time.	To clarify, I'm assuming driving time means travel time. This is the best metric to use as it accounts for distance/mileage as well as traffic.
Easily understood	That factors into bussing, self driving, & prevents needing to drop-off or pick up
Radius is good but the consideration and constant comment about keeping housing developments together may not be as important as we think. For example: we talk about keeping Murfield together but **nney kids do not know Deer Run kids fams anyway.	Driving time to school..however, this is not the most important factor. It's all relative -- there are kids who have a long bus ride already and some do not. Ideally, less is better, but other factors matter more.
Radius is not something that can be argued. Drive time depends on so many other variables.	I think it just makes most sense from a bus/parent driver situation.
Radius, Distance + major roadways + landmarks. Safe travel to school for new drivers. *Look at data - what data is being collected for equity, race, free + reduced lunches.	I think it should be based on actual time to get to distance. OTHER: in this, I think traffic patterns need to be considered. For example, it's not feasible to transport children/students over the Glick Bridge, which traffic is already a disaster, unless there are steps taken by local government to fix those traffic pattern issues.
Proximity should be one of the main criteria! You shouldn't take away walking/biking option from kids and make everyone ride a car/bus! Proximity is also cost effective!	Because the bridges are not conveniently placed, distance isn't as much of a factor as drive time would be.

<p>Or C. If kids can walk/bike to school - they should go to that school - common sense redistricting! Shouldn't pass 1 school to go to another school farther away - makes no sense and is a safety issue! Especially for teenage drivers - should not have them driving all around the city - drive to the closest school! If a neighborhood can see a school, that's the school their kids should attend! Any other result is ridiculous.</p>	<p>Even if you are a certain amount of miles away from a school there might not be specific roads that take you to the school the fastest. The school that you can drive to fastest would make the most sense in terms of transportation.</p>
<p>A radius drawn around the school allows for all of these considerations; proximity for walkers, drive time and distance. It also allows for you to easily view feeder patterns for elem + middle school. It keeps friend groups closer, allows for easier access to after school sports and facilitates a sense of community.</p>	<p>Driving time to school/walking time is the most important. It's the most practical</p>
<p>Radius drawn around a school building seems best, but this is a tough one. Some students may live within the radius, but still cannot easily walk or ride a bike, and may have significant drive times. Others, depending on location, may not necessarily be within the radius but due to location may have an easier driving or taking the bus to school</p>	<p>Driving / travel time is what matters. However, you shouldn't have to go to the school you're closest to, clearly that does not work.</p>
<p>*Allows students closest to school to walk to school. *Most cost efficient for school transports since students closest can walk to school. *Does not create addition on school. *Most economically feasible & has worked for the past few years.</p>	<p>With the way the roads are laid out and possible congestion in more crowded areas, it makes this easier for everyone.</p>
<p>Kids should go to school where they live - which is why a 4th high school WILL be needed. but for now, kids that live around (aka close proximity) to the 3 schools should go to those schools - period. But you have to address the problem where it is - Jerome. If proximity is important, a 4th high school is the only option for kids who live in/by Eversole. If balancing enrollment is utmost importance, then Jerome -> Scioto. Coffman district is snear Coffman, no need to impact.</p>	<p>This feels most logical due to our roadways, as someone can be closer to one school in distance, but closer to another in actual driving time.</p>

Students feel community at a school when it is close to their home neighborhoods & friends.	Driving time is how everyone plans their morning and time would be most accurate distance from school.
The building you live closest to is where you should	Fair driving time - Sawmill Rd. has delays/traffic.
It allows students to socialize with other students around the school.	Ultimately, let's look at longest commute today and try to maintain or reduce in most cases.
	Can you get to the HS in 15 min or less?
	Most people will use car or school bus for transport (though flying like a bird someday could be cool when the weather's nice :) - a reference to "As the bird flies")
	Tough question. I think students having the "easiest" fastest way to get to school, or get access to school - is important. Help with extracurricular/etc.
	Ease of getting to school - walking, biking, must be a priority. It is something that impacts the rest of community from travel/traffic patterns.
	Drive time makes most sense. That said, it may vary in order to have all of most middle schools feed off HS. Traffic studies, re: drive time across the river to school is important.
	This impacts bussing, kids driving to /from, and parents picking up kids after school + practices and attending all events. Drive time is biggest factor for sure. Also goes along with distance to bike or walk since they will likely take the same route as a car many times.
	Maybe not a lot of difference but many kids in HS drive to school, and as a parent, I drive to the school often for activities and drop offs. I hate to invoke the river boundary but it would be a nightmare to have kids drive over Glick bridge given current traffic.
	Because our district has natural boundaries (Scioto River, I-270) and has natural choke points (intersections and bridges), I think drive time makes the most sense. But in reality, two of the three HS are very close for many DCS residents.

	<p>Even though I selected Option B, it should be a combination of A&B. A circle of close proximity as well as drive time, are two criteria such that a particular neighborhood is in proximity when they are within a certain radius OR within a certain drive time. If they satisfy one of the two criteria, they should be considered proximate.</p>
	<p>NOT RADIUS - This is too difficult given the river and only a few bridges (eg: close by miles, but long to get to/across a bridge) AND these high schools are all close together so your radius ends up lopsided anyways</p>
	<p>Drive time + distance should be the main factors considered in this redistricting. For all schools. Radius is not great due to barriers to travel (ie: the river). A student should go to the first or second closest school to them (drive time or distance), but not the furthest away. Proximity/distance/drive time should control and be the leading factor over other factors.</p>
	<p>As a child I rode the bus 1 hour each way to and from school so this one is obviously personal to me. Minimizing time on the bus seems to be best for kids. If you are looking to reduce \$\$, then whichever choice does that.</p>
	<p>Driving time would be ideal as some distance/mileage vary more than drive time/ Proximity to all schools is not very far, especially when considering some of our surrounding districts.</p>
	<p>I think when most people (at least me) think of how far away a place is, they think of how long it would take to get there, i.e. walking/driving distance.</p>
	<p>We are a family who self transports to two separate buildings so drive time is the biggest factor for me personally. It is tricky to get everyone where they need to be and the traffic, route, can all make a difference.</p>

	<p>Schools are part of our community and ensuring that all students can arrive to school safely and in the shortest amount of time should be reasonable. With bridges, roundabouts and congestion/traffic, traffic studies must be done! And walkable/bikable options to school are what make Dublin unique and should be considered.</p>
	<p>Driving time should be equitable. School starts early enough and we do not need buses picking up students earlier. Student safety should play a role in this decision.</p>
	<p>Walkability needs to be considered - no one should see a school from their house/neighborhood and not go there. Beyond that, time to get to school should be considered. Ex: Crossing the bridge in Shawnee Hills will take considerable time and needs to be a factor.</p>
	<p>Overall transportation time (bus, car, walk).</p>
	<p>Travel time to the assigned school. Walkers should stay. With traffic, river concerns, travel time to school is important. Distance is irrelevant if you have to wait for a bridge.</p>
	<p>Because I am very close to one HS that my child could easily walk to if needed but under some maps would be going farther away and that seems ridiculous. To me this is the same as mileage.</p>
	<p>Based on traffic, round-a-bouts, lights, & bridges, longer distances (in the north) sometimes take less time to travel. It matters more how long it takes parents and students to drive/ride bikes/walk and safety of it.</p>
	<p>In looking at maps it seems some schools were clustered too close together. I think there will be times kids have to go to a school that may be further from them as long as drive time is reasonable, especially compared to other peers at school.</p>

	<p>It's not just about going to school, but activities & sports which is also a strain on families because there is not transportation to those (buses). I am very worried about buses & young drivers having to use the very dangerous round about during rush hour. So safety is a HUGE concern.</p>
	<p>Travel time to school seems most important - if you can see the school building from your home I also feel very strongly that your home should attend that building. Community schools have always been a legacy of DCS and I (and many) value it because of this..</p>
	<p>Driving time should be the definition for proximity because it impacts students schedule/day to day activities/time. However, kids that are within a walkable distance to a high school should absolutely attend the high school within walking distance. This makes the most sense. Regardless of any of the other factors & considerations.</p>
	<p>Driving time to school or commute time is the most important factor in terms of proximity as kids in high school are independent enough to commute on their own, but still need to be close by for off hours, extracurricular activities and using libraries and sports facility.</p>
	<p>Walkers should stay to their current school. There needs to be a balance between drive time and distance, but drive time should be considered more. Send kids to 1st or 2nd closest school. Many neighborhoods that go to Jerome are the same drive time (within 1-2 minutes) to Jerome & Scioto or to all three schools. Look at Muirfield Place, Shawnee Hills, Din Eidyn area, The Reserve. Muirfield Village can and should be split up. They have separate neighborhoods within the village.</p>
	<p>Suburban districts people have cars to get kids there</p>
	<p>Impacts, realistically, the greatest number of students/parents in the way they will most often travel to the school building.</p>

	<p>If a student lives close/somewhat close to a river and needs to cross it to attend a school this becomes very important in considering. Having to walk or bike across a bridge over water, in the winter if sidewalks aren't plowed or become crowded w/ students walking can become dangerous. Bus drivers are at a shortage and we need to consider being able to walk to school without dangerous conditions. Issue sin't if one HS is better or worse, travel across a river is limited and should be highly considered.</p>
	<p>Drive time, and in particular, traffic adjusted drive time feels like the correct analytical data point. With whatever changes are planned, a detailed and transparent traffic pattern study should be done. I'm worried about traffic choke points on Emerald Parkway in particular.</p>
	<p>Kids should be going to school closest drive time to them. Our neighborhood has been drawn in maps to Scioto which is furthest away from radius, drive time, and distance. Again if large ammounts of kids need to be moved, it's the same to take from growth areas. They are same distance from Jerome as they are Scioto.</p>
	<p>I think because of the daily routine, it should be with time.</p>
C. Distance/mileage to a school	D. Other
<p>Seems the most logical.</p>	<p>If you would feel comfortable walking to and from a school or say to a football game, you should be attending that school. If you would have to drive or bus to the school, then use drive time/convenience. Some areas farther out can be more flexible because they would have to drive/bus anyway.</p>
<p>This is a definitive parameter</p>	<p>All should be taken into account but access to major roads for busing should be taken into account. Walkers should be looked at. Consider what is best for district as a whole, for each school, and not what is visually pleasing on a map plan. We have one oppportunity to get this right for the longterm growth/success of the district.</p>

<p>I think proximity to school plays a role for neighborhoods with direct access to the school (next door, across the street) but after that I think other considerations should be prioritized.</p>	<p>You need to consider rivers, 270, when looking at driving to school. The question options don't give an adequate background data. Keep neighborhoods together.</p>
<p>In a concrete value, regardless of speed and traffic issues.</p>	<p>Consideration -1-5 one I</p>
<p>Kids near Coffman can bike to practice now. We are just as close if not closer to Jerome than most of Jerome yet we are targeted. Our kids can bike to Jerome & Coffman while other Jerome kids can't yet they get favored. Se someone 4 miles or 3 miles from Jerone & 3 or 4 to Scioto should move befor someone who is 2 miles to their current school. People who have homes where kids bike& walk bought there b/c they can't leave work or drive them. Moving them to the one school that is twice as far away penalizes them & creates a hardship that didn't exist before.</p>	<p>Natural boundaries should also be considered, but just common sense too. We live in an amazing district and kids getting to any of our 3 high schools is completely doable. "Neighborhoods" should be given a similar size range. If the average neighborhood is 150, then split large neighborhoods into smaller sub-neighborhoods to even out groups.</p>
<p>HS - more than 1 mile</p>	<p>I think its a combo: A. Radius first, C. Then mileage to a school, D. Effectiveness of population mixture - resources to provide equitable school experience AND consider whether a school might be overladed w/ need (socioeconomic)</p>
<p>This makes the most sense to me, logically. It seems that driving to the closest HS to my house is my "home" school. However, I am not opposed to having my student drive/ be bussed further if it's needed in order to spread the students more evenly.</p>	<p>I don't have a good answer for this one.</p>
<p>The distance can be a problem with driving to and from school and after school sports or clubs and having to account for time to pick up or drop off.</p>	<p>Choice A, radius to building makes the most sense. However, a hybrid of this and natural boundaries (neighborhoods), or feeder patterns should be included instead of -just- radius.</p>
<p>This stays static over time..Option B will fluctuate & may require more adjustments.</p>	<p>I personally feel proximity shuld be a low priority. If every thing South of Brand/Hyland Croiy needs to go Coffman (Westbury, etc..) then tht's what should happen regardless of the fact that they're across the street from Jeroome. Beyond that, it's for transportation to figure out.</p>

<p>Distance and mileage always factors into district tra</p>	<p>Contiguous Zones using natural boundaries & major roads. *Should not have to cross river. *Should cross fewest amount of major roads. These will help preserve th ability to keep traffic at a minimum and help students more safely transport themsleves <> school if necessary in many cases. *Ensuring middle & HS are close to reduce the impact on transport for a parent from one school to another.</p>
<p>This takes into account the potential for walkability</p>	<p>Walkability should be the MOST important consideration. Bussing is not required for the high school, and there is historic precedent in the district to eliminate HS bussing if levies are not passed. Giving the highest percentage of students access to safely walk to school should be paramount.</p>
<p>This option seems the most objective way to make</p>	<p>Radius, drive time, & distance, all feel like you will get the same result when you try to draw a boundary line. I'm not sure there is another way to define it, but rather needs to be determined if it is a priority consideration.</p>
<p>It feels logical that students should attend the HS closest (in mileage) to home. Most HS students can drive or bike and this matters to families and kids in extracurriculars, families where both parents work and/or have multiple school aged children.</p>	<p>I really struggle with this one. Natural boundaries/busy intersections, etc. I would strive for walkable safe commutes wherever possible. I don't find proximity to be very important.</p>
<p>We are only a 5 minute drive to Coffman. It is does not make sense to move to a high school that is 15-20 minutes away. Especially when you consider new drivers having to make the commute on rainy + icy days. Coffman is bikeable for us. We are much closer, distance wise to Coffman than Scioto.</p>	<p>Due to location circumstances (ie: rivers, bridges), a radius likely misses critical data points when it comes to proximity. Driving time is likely the best option of the three choices listed. I also think biking/walking, when thought about with a clear "actually doing that" lens is valuable. For example, last proccess, lots were claiming their kids could bike. Are neighborhoods south of 161 really biking to Coffman? Other neighborhoods cherry picked in the Bailey area are within 1 mile, internal roads only to Coffman.</p>
<p>Not sure of the context this will be used. However, most people would want/expect to go to their neighborhood school.</p>	<p>Adjacent neighborhoods should be kept together as much as possible to promote lasting friendships. The primary focus should be on the well being of the kids - not ease of transport.</p>

<p>More feasible opportunities for walk/bike/drive.</p>	<p>Proximity is too complex for A/B/C. For each A/B/C a value should be determined so that "minimum radius" X will violate some "maximum distance" Y or "maximum time to drive" Z. The X,Y,Z of this equation should be deterministic and data driven for all households w/in the DCS district.</p>
<p>I would have said A but in the meeting they explained option C would mean that if student could walk to "X" school he would not be redistricted and be bussed to "Y" school. I was thinking option A would cover that but C covered that.</p>	<p>Students ability to walk, bike, and the ability to not have to drive, walk, bike through major intersectins & across multilane lanes of traffic should be at the school especially if it is the school closest to them. Students that have the ability to use bike paths to schools & avoid major intersections safely & easily, should not be moved to a high school further away that doesn't allow them to do that. Keep students at the closest (distance) to a school especially if they can easily bike. The city of Dublin wants these paths around schools - we should focus on that.</p>
<p>Because it is the most comprehensive.</p>	<p>A combination of B+C, with other considerations. Option A doesn't make sense to me because of where Scioto is located & the proximity of Coffman to Scioto. I would consider driving time & mileage, but also geenral number of potential students closest to each school. Keep the average down.</p>
<p>Keeping kids that can walk at that school makes mo</p>	<p>I think you need to consider the accesibility of a school via a bike path, so students without cause can travel to school on a safe route. And you only need to consider for those who do not have reliable transportation NOT for weathly kids w/ cars. That may mean generalizing certain populations based on need.</p>
<p>Distance is the least subjective. Driving times vary greatly based on many factors. However, traffic patterns and how many dangerous / high travelled intersections need crossed shoould be weighted heavily (downtown Dublin is incredibly hard to get through, roundabout accidents, etc.).</p>	<p>Some students will have to travel farthers and for longer commutes no matter what. Safety should be a strong consideration not only to and from school, but also after school sports/extracurricular. Round-about and major/congested intersections & accident-prone areas should be considered greatly.</p>

<p>I believe distance and driving time are very much the same and should be priority. Within 2 miles, kids can ride bikes and walk if necessary and have a safe path. Kids should not be going to the high school furthest way for example there are 2 HS closer and they are sent to the 3rd furthest. Taking away walkability and bike transportation should be not allowed during redistricting. You also should not drive by closest school to go to another school.</p>	<p>There are different routes that can be taken to school, so A-C aren't necessarily fair. Dangerous intersections, such as the Dublin round a bout, should be considered. A radius should only apply to elementary + possibly MS, but not high school.</p>
<p>If something happens, we need to be able to reach the school quickly by car, so a short distance is very important for us. Since students travel to school every day, it is best for them if the school is as close as possible.</p>	<p>Walkers should walk to the nearest school. That should be the first decision. Then travel time should be considered at different times of day. Last, safety should be considered the traffic reports did not include accidents/safety.</p>
	<p>Re-define neighborhoods. I can't explain how important this is, that a neighborhood planning block should be no larger than on ES. Now, for proximity, if residential falls under the 1 mile radius, your entire "neighborhood" should get to the school. However, after this radius, traffic safety patterns should be studied to make sure the safest channels should be used for bus transport. In addition to this, the DCS should take into account municipality plans, such as the Dublin Envision Plan.</p>
	<p>Combination of driving time, distance, and traffic patterns. Example: a commute with less left turns improves traffic flow (the UPS delivery model).</p>
	<p>B+C this should include walking and biking. This needs to take into account major obstacles (bridges) and paths. Some roads are not safe to cross on bikes or walking. Easy access for students for after hours activities.</p>
	<p>Keep neighborhoods together!</p>
	<p>I think various factors but #1 being the "community" of the high school - can kids walk or bike for afterschool events? Many students do not have parents who can transport to school for practice, etc. Our HSs should be accessible to all even when not school hours.</p>

	<p>Neighborhoods should be kept together! The split of Riviera between Bishop & Deer Run is a great example of what not to do. After neighborhood, then radius is fine as a secondary consideration.</p>
	<p>The number one consideration is SAFETY! Must look at travel studies/accident reports & get accurate data! High school students will be driving - must look at safest routes: consider traffic & high traffic times. Consider walkability and bikeability as well (distance/mileage) still absolutely should be considered, but safety is #1.</p>