STEVENS POINT AREA PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICT

#PointProud Schools 2040
Meeting 4 Outcomes – 7/15/2026

43 Task Force members in attendance (including 2 School Board members)

Planning/Facilitation consultants in attendance: Mark Roffers and Nick Johnson

District staff in attendance: Cory Hirsburnner, Superintendent; Chris Nyman, Assistant Superintendent/Director of Elementary Education; Michael Kurtz, Director of Business Services; Chris Budzinski, Facilities & Safety Manager; Nicole Baumann, Executive Assistant to the Superintendent; John Vollendorf, SPASH Principal; Sarah O'Donnell, Director of Communications; Jeff Mlsna, Director of Secondary Education Services

Large-Group Comments/Questions During Initial Consultant Presentation:

- C: Though the District's buildings are older, they have all been improved over the years.
- Q: Do any of our elementary schools have specialized programs? R: Yes, McKinley, Madison, and Roosevelt have programming and equipment for medically fragile students, which could be moved if needed.
- Q: When noting that a building is operating at less than 70% of capacity, is that 70% of their "optimal" capacity? R: Yes, just that we have used the term "working" capacity, which for elementary school buildings is 90% of their maximum capacity and for secondary buildings is 75% of their maximum capacity.
- Q: Where are 4K students in the alternative enrollment projections-to-capacity under a K-5, 6-8, 9-12 model? R: The assumption in the alternative K-5 projections table is that the District's new 4K program starting in September would continue.

Large Group Questions During and After SPASH Principal Presentation:

- Q: What is difference between open and closed campus? R: Cultural definition. SPASH is technically a closed campus today, with students expected to remain absent permission.
- Q: Why wasn't the 2013 recommendation to reconfigure to K-5, 6-8, 9-12 groups implemented? R: A community desire for consistency may be one reason. Also, the anticipated increase in elementary students did not transpire, and the anticipated decrease in high school students has not been as great as some other districts that have taken this step.
- Q: Is the District able to meet needs of 9th graders emotionally in SPASH? R: Yes. District has the right system in place for individual student support.
- Q: The 2013 study suggested an interest in keeping lower and upper classmen separate if 9th graders were added to SPASH. How could that work? R: Physically it may be difficult, but for classes, many core classes are organized by grade.
- Q: Do some SPASH students leave during the day for work apprenticeships and virtual learning? R: Yes. Virtual learning in this District is typically on the scale of 1-2 classes per student.
- Q: How many students at SPASH open-enrolled in from other districts? R: It was about 42 students in the 2024-25 academic year.
- Q: Between now and 2035, is there a timeframe when SPASH enrollment is anticipated to decrease more steeply? R: No, a fairly steady rate of decrease is anticipated.
- Q: What do we know about student achievement and well-being under a 9-12 model vs. the current 10-12 model? R: For student achievement, the best indicators may be that SPAPSD's comparable districts all have a 9-12 model and all demonstrate higher academic achievement at the high school level. Under the SPAPSD's current grouping, teachers and administrators have one fewer year to get to know students. Students also

currently have to transition once to high school-like classes and systems in 9th grade then another time to the actual high school building in 10th grade. 9th graders cannot, in the SPASPD, generally participate in social activities at SPASH (e.g., homecoming). Procedurally, having 9th graders at SPASH would streamline student records, grading, transcripts, etc.; at present, the District has three schools now serving high school level students.

- Q: Would potential capital improvements at SPASH (e.g., more classrooms, auxiliary gym) require a referendum? R: Yes, though its amount would depend on the level of improvements proposed.
- C: As a retired person, it may be difficult to get across to people the need to add on to SPASH for 9th graders, bring 6th graders up, and then close elementary buildings. I think it would be a hard sell.
- C: I disagree. The argument to standardize to the rest of State is strong.
- Q: From a financial perspective, hypothetically, could the money saved by closing an elementary school be redirected to expanding SPASH? R: Generally, these would be different pots of money. SPASH improvements would be capital, and most cost savings from closing an building would be operational.
- Q: Is there a market for closed school buildings? R: It depends on the building and its location. Wausau recently sold three buildings for a reasonable price, while outdated buildings that would have to be demolished take longer and sell for less.
- Q: How much in operational costs can be saved in closing one building? R: That information will be shared at the next meeting, but generally in the $600,000-$800,000 per year range.
- Q: Why is the DC Everest district bringing 9th graders to its high school building? R: To remove one transition, address an aging junior high building, and reflect declining enrollment.

Grade Group Alternatives – Preliminary Sorting: Following presentations on current and potential alternative grade groups, Task Force members were asked by show of hands which of the following six potential alternative grade groups warranted further evaluation at this evening's meeting, along with the current K-6, 7-9, 10-12 groupings. The alternatives that are <u>underlined</u> received sufficient support (10+ hands raised) for further evaluation:

- K-5, 6-9, 10-12 (6 hands raised)
- <u>K-5, 6-7, 8-9, 10-12 (11 hands raised-labeled as grouping "A" below)</u>
- K-2, 3-5, 6-8, 9-12 (0 hands raised)
- K-4, 5-8, 9-12 (3 hands raised)
- <u>K-6, 7-8, 9-12 (13 hands raised-also labeled as grouping "B" below)</u>
- <u>K-5, 6-8, 9-12 (nearly all hands raised-also labeled as grouping "C" below)</u>

Grade Group Alternatives – Individual Responses: Each Task Force member (excluding the two School Board members) then individually completed a worksheet evaluating the current grade groups and alternatives A, B, and C against the four facility option criteria and summarizing pros, cons, and other considerations. The following is the collection of all individual responses brought together in one place:

<u>For Retaining Current Grade Groups (K-6, 7-9, 10-12)</u>

Criterion 1 - Maintained or Enhanced Student Opportunities:

1. Maintenance
2. Good
3. Decrease disruption to current student and parent expectations
4. Does not optimize grade grouping
5. Status Quo
6. Maintain, but could be enhanced
7. Does not align w/ curr. stand
8. Maintained but not enhanced, not growing or evolving
9. 9th isolated

10. 3
11. Maintained if no change
12. Provide full and equal range. Maintain athletics ect.
13. Extra spaces
14. 9th grade losing out on opportunities
15. Maintain
16. We have maintained and harder for 9th grade
17. Maintaining
18. I'm not considering this option
19. Yes consistent
20. No
21. Everything stays same

Criterion 2 - Manageable Student and Family Impacts:

i. Maintenance
ii. Good
iii. No students are affected by change
iv. No change to neighborhoods
v. No change to busing
vi. Status Quo
vii. Maintain
viii. I strongly feel 9th grade should be in HS culturally/emotionally
ix. Families and students are familiar
x. Yes
xi. Definitely
xii. 3
xiii. Less impact but issues in long run
xiv. Maintain engagement etc. Minimize the affected students
xv. Longer elem connection. Even changes
xvi. Might need to redo boundaries
xvii. Same transitions. No change to impact
xviii. Maintaining
xix. No change, no disruption
xx. No change. Yes.
xxi. Yes
xxii. No changes

Criterion 3 – Fiscal Responsibility:

i. Depends on the building closing
ii. Potentially fair depending on consolidation
iii. Long-term maintenance costs do not decrease
iv. Not fiscally responsible. Landscape in 10 yrs too unpredictable
v. Needs to be addressed
vi. Managing the current system OK, but underutilization becomes a problem
vii. Need to realign the district
viii. Kicking can down the road
ix. Not working or we wouldn't be here
x. Not really – looking ahead
xi. 3
xii. Does not address enrollment decline

xiii. ?
xiv. Does not feel fiscally responsible
xv. Cost effective
xvi. Continue to burn cash in underutilized buildings
xvii. Continued deferred maint.
xviii. This is difficult because no one has enough money
xix. Not responsible
xx. Not sustainable w/ greater cuts each year
xxi. Consistency. Yes.
xxii. No
xxiii. No changes

Criterion 4 – Efficient Building Utilization:

i. Depends on the building closing
ii. Fair, depending on consolidation
iii. Disproportionation of building usage to the student population
iv. Stable, but decreasing
v. Needs to be addressed
vi. Problems with building underutilization: main reason we're here. Hard to balance.
vii. No
viii. Kennedy – building use low
ix. Would need to look at elem. schools
x. Minimal schools impacted or changes needed
xi. 3
xii. Not at all. Would need to close elem schools
xiii. Too much building available
xiv. Inefficient
xv. Severely underutilized space
xvi. Below closing elementary(s)
xvii. Currently the same
xviii. Capacity
xix. Inefficient
xx. Consistency. Yes.
xxi. No
xxii. No changes

Other pros, cons, & considerations:

i. Status quo, but with "doomsday"
ii. See you in another 10 yrs for Point 2050
iii. Need to redraw boundaries
iv. Pro – no change, people don't like change. Con – we must change
v. Allows for the transition of current spaces to fit newer education. space needs
vi. All as baseline "3" score
vii. Underuse of SPASH
viii. While "no decision" is a decision, it isn't probable in the district's best interest.
ix. Not working out
x. 6th grade out of elem.
xi. Consistency. Tradition.
xii. Culturally consistent
xiii. Not efficient unless we reconfigure elementary

For Alternative Grouping A (K-5, 6-7, 8-9, 10-12)

Criterion 1 - Maintained or Enhanced Student Opportunities:

i. Enhanced – equal building opportunities in middle grades
ii. We don't have info on this
iii. Gets 6th out of elementary
iv. Optimize grade grouping
v. HS status quo
vi. Enhances
vii. Maybe some grade-specific opportunities w/ smaller school?
viii. Improve the 6th-grade experience in middle school?
ix. Too many transitions
x. Elective opportunities remain intact
xi. Maintains elective options. Expand 6th grade options
xii. More standard aligned 9 still not in HS setting. Brings larger community.
xiii. Enhances 6th grade but not 9th
xiv. Fewer opportunities for older students to learn from each other
xv. Not sure split 6-7 8-9 opportunities, math
xvi. Could add 4k to all buildings. Maybe even more EC or daycare
xvii. Chance for smaller sizes in schools for k-5, 6-7, 8-9
xviii. 4
xix. Maintained
xx. Streamline learning. ↓ SPASH and co-curricular cuts. More team sports
xxi. Middle grade opportunities ↓
xxii. More space?
xxiii. About same as today but students. grouped by age
xxiv. Not sure
xxv. Extra opportunities for 6th grade athletics and academics higher
xxvi. Might be able to. Too much transition. Opportunity.
xxvii. Traveling staff or more staff. No.
xxviii. No
xxix. Social emotional **. Grade "teams" more feasible
xxx. Concerned this model maybe does not for co-curricular

Criterion 2 - Manageable Student and Family Impacts:

i. Too many transitions
ii. One family w/ 4 schools?
iii. Less fam. Engagement w/ brief time @ schools?
iv. More fams w/ mult. schools @ a time
v. Additional transitions
vi. It would be impactful to have an extra transition and transportation for parents
vii. Too many transitions – busing
viii. More students are affected by adding additional school transition
ix. Likely to have one close school move and one far?
x. Re-zoning is all but guaranteed
xi. Walkers <-> riders' parents impacted
xii. Manageable – needs to plan for
xiii. ↑ in transition
xiv. I think 6-7 and 8-9 is better than now, but not as good as 9-12
xv. Keep student grade grouping more age-related

xvi. More transitions. Potentially less accessible buildings (Ben/PJs)
xvii. Extra transition. Allow for more community connection w/ in grade
xviii. Bigger impacts for families w/ 4 different schools
xix. Extra transition
xx. Students in diff buildings same family 6-7, 8-9, transporting them bussing
xxi. Might lead to elem. School closure. Lots of transitions
xxii. 2
xxiii. Multiple transitions sucks. This would impact families with multiple children
xxiv. Potential for families to have kids in multiple schools which might be difficult
xxv. More transitions = pain points for families
xxvi. Too many changes. Dev appropriate
xxvii. Moderate impact due to facility swaps
xxviii. More transitions
xxix. Too many transitions a lot of different stops
xxx. Transition (4) □ transportation
xxxi. No. 2 transitions
xxxii. No
xxxiii. Multiple transitions. 4th building one fam. could be in
xxxiv. Family impacts: not great. Ex. Parent-teacher conferences. Students: possibly ok
xxxv. Individualized (elementary, 6-7, 8-9)

Criterion 3 – Fiscal Responsibility:

i. No capital outlay
ii. Eliminates huge additions at SPASH, uses jr. high buildings to fuller potential
iii. Expensive transportation, teacher movement
iv. Busing expenses
v. Adds more bus routes?
vi. No decrease in building costs
vii. Financial stability of SPASH trumps all
viii. Will need a plan for
ix. Bussing needs would increase
x. Probably really good fiscally compared to other plans. Well, negative for transportation
xi. Less $. Increased bussing costs
xii. Adjust staffing
xiii. Kick cans down road. More bussing
xiv. Not sure how this helps the financial situation
xv. Lots of movement 6-9
xvi. Bussing for extra transition
xvii. 4
xviii. I mean sure, you're using buildings… but that would cost more
xix. No additional expenses to HS at this point
xx. ↑ bussing costs?
xxi. Less opportunity for closing building. Bussing costs ↑
xxii. Bussing?
xxiii. Best uses current facilities. Saves money. Staff similar.
xxiv. More bussing
xxv. Adds bussing costs potentially
xxvi. K-5↓ 6-7↑ 8-9↑ 10-12↓
xxvii. Community concern w/ cost. Bussing 2 jr highs
xxviii. Bussing

xxix. No. Too little students in buildings
xxx. No
xxxi. Less traveling teachers. Busing?
xxxii. This may be a better option fiscally speaking

Criterion 4 – Efficient Building Utilization:

i. yes
ii. We don't have info on this
iii. May be more effective use of buildings if consolidated
iv. Just shuffling the existing utilization impacted, but not condemning
v. Will need to develop a building plan
vi. Less students
vii. Probably the best balance of building utilization, though it tends toward underutilization
viii. Reduces elementary cap. More students in 6-7, 8-9? Better balanced enrollment 6-7, 8-9
ix. No
x. Maybe best for buildings?
xi. 4
xii. Doesn't sound super efficient
xiii. Capacity has the potential to be greater, and that's good
xiv. Yes
xv. Middle schools become underutilized
xvi. Less changes needed
xvii. May cost more for bussing
xviii. Close
xix. Small middle school
xx. Building capacity potential ↓
xxi. No. Students become too sparse or condensed.
xxii. No
xxiii. Keeps all elementary under capacity
xxiv. Probably not in further future

Other pros, cons, & considerations:

4. As a middle grade teacher, this addresses inequalities between Jr. High programs. The grading of 9th grade students is consolidated to one building
5. HS transcript concept does not improve
6. 9th grade experience does not improve
7. Elem does not improve
8. 6-7 is the only major educational adjustment from a peer-to-peer perspective
9. Plan for transitions. Retrain staff
10. Transition plan during SPASH upgrades?
11. Fewer students, fewer safety/security concerns
12. Change to a model that isn't efficient
13. How this affects K-5 parents – winners/losers close school
14. More busing what school holds 6-7, 8-9. More transitions
15. This is wacky. Why would people do it?
16. Tell me more about studies regarding more transitions
17. Excessive transitioning
18. If we move 6th grade, what does the district track and field days look like? Breaking up music groups would be a pain point for musical development.
19. NO – too many transitions for families and SE needs of students

20. Extra transportation
21. Capacity ↓. Transportation. Transition.
22. Worse than staying the same
23. 6th grade moved out of elem, less need of more space @ SPASH, 9th still not at SPASH
24. More transition, how does this help?
25. Busing/transp, nightmare

<u>For Alternative Grouping B (K-6, 7-8, 9-12)</u>

Criterion 1 - Maintained or Enhanced Student Opportunities:

i. Enhance 9th grade
ii. 6th curriculum is typically lumped in w/ 7-8
iii. Fewer options for 9th graders?
iv. Maybe fewer offerings @ SPASH due to 9th-grade accommodations
v. Doesn't solve any problems, makes more
vi. Freshman-JV Sports
vii. School-wide programs (drama, music)
viii. Enhances – Changes for 9th grade
ix. Benefits for 9th graders
x. Much better aligned with larger cultural/societal norms
xi. Elective opportunities may decline – not enough room in lab space
xii. Include ninth in high school activities. Fewer elective options
xiii. More standard aligned. Brings larger sense of community
xiv. Enhances 9th grade but not 6th
xv. More opportunities for 9th graders
xvi. 9 – student opportunities
xvii. All HS students in one building
xviii. 4
xix. Bring 9 up to SPASH – benefits discussed. Social dev optimized
xx. Maintained
xxi. Improve co-curriculars
xxii. Optimal athletes. Bussing. No extra buildings means fewer opp.
xxiii. Middle grade opps same
xxiv. 9-12 HS feelings. Unsure space/staffing
xxv. Better HS opportunities for 9th grade
xxvi. Balance w/ #3
xxvii. Elementaries maintained. 7-8 maintained. 9th enhanced
xxviii. More opportunity
xxix. One grade change
xxx. Athletics and classroom opportunities in high school. Yes.
xxxi. Yes
xxxii. 9th graders □ HS □ more electives
xxxiii. Could still be a good option for this all around

Criterion 2 - Manageable Student and Family Impacts:

4. No concern other than traffic
5. Zoning -> Almost no impact
6. Less than Grouping A – Boundary adjustments
7. 900 + students in 1 Jr high is a lot. Not sure if that is good or bad
8. This alignment is ok but no need to leave 6th in elementary when moving solves the issue
9. Fewer choices for students in electives, as there wont be enough room

10. Stronger connections at 9-12
11. Extra transition. Allow for more community connection w/ in grade
12. Yes
13. K-6 is a huge developmental range
14. Yes
15. 3
16. Seems manageable. Logical transitions.
17. Similar to current
18. ↑ belonging in 9th grade. ↓ # of students affected
19. More sites for families of more than 1 e.g. multiple sites
20. Classic config
21. More engagement for 9th-grade families. Changes are appropriate
22. Longer connections
23. Little impact on students and families
24. Minor
25. Same transitions. More developmentally appropriate time for 7-8, but it leaves out 6
26. Two school capacity ↓
27. Smallest change while standardizing grade groupings
28. Yes. Keeping elementary consistent.
29. No
30. No major changes
31. Family: probably ok. Could still be a headache. Student: probably ok

Criterion 3 – Fiscal Responsibility:

i. Capital cost @ SPASH
ii. Reno. Needed @ SPASH
iii. Expensive
iv. Poor fiscal responsibility for capital improvements needed to SPASH for 9th grade
v. Referendum no matter what
vi. Could close 1 jr. high
vii. Again SPASH ok, but the utilization of the middle schools is hard
viii. Staffing concerns
ix. Go to referendum. Need building improvements. ↑ capital costs.
x. Adjust staffing
xi. Cost to bring 9th
xii. 1-8 – low numbers
xiii. SPASH needs updates
xiv. 2
xv. Prob no more transp. changes than #3. But $ to update SPASH
xvi. Additional expenses to HS needed
xvii. Seems like little needs to be done
xviii. Allows for consolidation. Transportation at SPASH could be a challenge
xix. Unsure. Expansions still need to be done in Elem. And HS
xx. Inefficient for Jr highs and increases HS cost
xxi. #1
xxii. High potential ↑ in expansion
xxiii. I don't see how this covers costs
xxiv. Yes. Allows you to allocate a building.
xxv. No
xxvi. Potentially close a jr high? Major changes need @ SPASH

xxvii. Secondary would need that update

Criterion 4 – Efficient Building Utilization:

i. Underutilized jr. high
ii. Major underutilization of jr. high
iii. Plover Whiting is too full, others are underutilized, too much room at JR Highs SPASH is overcrowded
iv. K-6 – Balance, 7-8 – Not good usage, 9-12 – Logistics needed
v. Still needs to address elementary overcrowding
vi. Close 1 jr high too, but could result in longer bus rides
vii. How to balance the middle schools?
viii. Not enough space for special ed
ix. Need more room/space at SPASH. Less balance of enrollment at 9-12, more balance at junior high
x. Would underutilize Jr. high
xi. I don't think efficient
xii. Not fiscally responsible but could close building when mon up to SPASH
xiii. Lots of space at Ben/PJs or one full building/probably need border change at P.W.
xiv. 1
xv. If one middle school! Not efficient if 2.
xvi. HS enrollment likely to decrease even if higher initially
xvii. ↓ average bus usage
xviii. No
xix. No – unless consolidation and add-ons
xx. Con- JR highs not best used – HS stuffed
xxi. Close BF or PJJ
xxii. Potential capacity ↓. High school ↑.
xxiii. I don't see how this covers costs.
xxiv. Yes everything is in 9000 capacity
xxv. No – why have JH so small or overfilled if one closed?
xxvi. Turn one jr. high to alternative? Elementaries still off balance
xxvii. In elementary, likely better utilization w/ exception of P.W.. In secondary, could be tight

Other pros, cons, & considerations:

i. Expensive getting community support. We have talked of what the benefits of what this realignment are but what about drawbacks that aren't financial
ii. HS modernization?
iii. SPASH requires its own internal task force for sweeping changes
iv. No additional transitions. PP needs for 9th grade movement
v. SPASH # is too high. Would need to close middle school to see the cost savings benefit
vi. Feels like a half measure
vii. Difficult to manage 10-12th graders from leaving school
viii. Minimal change, but will need to make changes at elementary and high school
ix. 7-8 for high schools not fiscally or cram students
x. Two middle schools or one?
xi. I like this idea – keeping 7th and 8th grades segregated could work.
xii. Capacity – but it's a guess
xiii. Excessive transitioning
xiv. Elementary rotation
xv. Lower grade capacity ↓. High school ↑. Staffing ↑?
xvi. Only if trying to eliminate a Jr. high building
xvii. No. 6th grade out of elem.

xviii. Improvements to SPASH

For Alternative Grouping C (K-5, 6-8, 9-12)

Criterion 1 - Maintained or Enhanced Student Opportunities:

i. Enhanced 9th grade
ii. 6th grade curriculum usually lumped in with 7-8
iii. More opportunities for 6th grade students – perhaps fewer for 9th grade
iv. Maybe fewer offerings @ SPASH due to 9th-grade accommodations
v. More opportunities for all students
vi. Freshman-JV Sports
vii. School-wide programs
viii. Enhances, aligned with state
ix. Benefits for 9th and 6th grades; opportunity for 4k @ elems
x. Much better aligned with larger cultural/societal norms
xi. Include ninth grade in high school activities. Fewer elective options?
xii. Aligns w/ curr standards. Provides aligned extra-curricular. More socially acceptable peers
xiii. Enhanced for all grades
xiv. More opportunities for 9th graders
xv. 6-8 – good. 9-12 not sure
xvi. More consistent acceleration of students
xvii. All HS students in one building
xviii. 5
xix. Bring 9 up
xx. Maintained
xxi. Sports and co-curricular access improves
xxii. Optimal athletes. Bussing. No extra buildings means fewer opp.
xxiii. Gives more opps to 9th grade
xxiv. 9/12 HS. Less shifts
xxv. Pro – standard alignment to enhance learning
xxvi. #3
xxvii. Probable close one school, update facilities in other elementary schools. Update SPASH. Opportunity for 6th and 9th grades.
xxviii. 6-8? Transition
xxix. Typical w/ other districts for 9-12
xxx. Two grades changed, but standardized
xxxi. Athletics and classroom opportunities. Yes.
xxxii. Yes. Typical configuration HS credit in same building
xxxiii. 9th graders HS more electives. 6th graders more similar to 7/8 than K-5
xxxiv. Likely the best option for this. Would likely enhance.
xxxv. Individualized/enhanced opportunities

Criterion 2 - Manageable Student and Family Impacts:

i. This would be positive alignment to standards
ii. Easier for 9th graders to transition
iii. Zoning -> some impact (Elem)
iv. Reframing @ junior high 9th grade shift
v. Keep jr highs smaller
vi. I strongly believe this is the best grade/student age alignment
vii. Stronger connections at 9-12
viii. Extra transition. Allow for more community connection w/ in grade

ix. Minimal impact
x. Done everywhere else. Would need to consider redrawing elementary lines
xi. Don't think change that much
xii. 3
xiii. More change
xiv. Similar to current
xv. Classic config
xvi. More engagement for 9th grade families. Changes are appropriate.
xvii. More grade-appropriate
xviii. Significant impacts due to class/school swaps
xix. Minor other than elementary changes
xx. Same transitions. Gets more academic rigor for 6th. Adds more parental involvement.
xxi. 9-12 capacity and staffing? Transition.
xxii. All SPASH students belong @ SPASH
xxiii. Yes. Allows family integrations.
xxiv. Consolidation/changes
xxv. No major changes
xxvi. Family: probably better. Student: also prob. Better
xxvii. Individualized (elementary) 6-8

Criterion 3 – Fiscal Responsibility:

i. capital cost @ SPASH
ii. Close an elem?
iii. Reno. Needed @ SPASH
iv. Expensive?
v. Poor fiscal responsibility for the capital improvements needed to SPASH for 9th grade
vi. More money and 4k
vii. Facilities improvements are more substantial
viii. A lot of cost to improve SPASH
ix. I feel like SPASH could absorb 9th grade w/o too much fiscal issues; keeps other buildings at ok/good capacity (closing ½ elementary schools)
x. Will need more admin support
xi. Go to referendum. Need building improvements. ↑ capital and operational costs 9-12.
xii. Adjust staffing. Need additional facilities
xiii. This makes all schools more efficient
xiv. Cost to bring 9th
xv. Depends on adding to SPASH
xvi. SPASH needs updates but less bussing for sports
xvii. 4
xviii. Would need to close …2? Elem schools
xix. Additional expenses to HS needed
xx. Yes long term
xxi. Allows for consolidation. Transportation at SPASH could be a challenge.
xxii. Cost of change? Staffing?
xxiii. Better long term fiscal benefits with fewer facilities. Short term high cost
xxiv. #1
xxv. Staffing mostly in place. Probably lose an elementary school.
xxvi. Cost ↑ high school?
xxvii. Community concerns w/ cost
xxviii. Potentially close one school recovering ≈ $800,00/yr

xxix. Potentially close a building. Maybe.
xxx. Yes – closing/reconf. Schools
xxxi. Major changes needed @ SPASH
xxxii. Likely a tougher option fiscally
xxxiii. Improvements that are necessary at high school level

Criterion 4 – Efficient Building Utilization:

i. Close an elem to rebalance?
ii. SPASH overcrowded
iii. 6-8 □ perfect, K-5 □ good but needs balance, 9-12 □ logistics needed
iv. Helps K-5 significantly. Addition @ SPASH
v. SPASH # is too high for 2027
vi. Continues to balance building capacity well; allows continuing to keep middle and high school buildings full, close ½ elementary
vii. Need more room/space at SPASH
viii. Yes
ix. Free up elementary and increase building utilization
x. When – key – to move up to SPASH
xi. SPASH is quite full locker space?
xii. 4
xiii. Capacity under and is this a problem?
xiv. Yes w/ re-drawing maps
xv. Opportunity for consolidation. SPASH spaces could be tight and would need adjustment
xvi. Consolidation needed
xvii. HS with RENO will be more efficient. Closure of elementary can save $$
xviii. Potentially closer to ideal #s
xix. Some buildings around 50%
xx. Balance overall. Potential ↑ high school
xxi. Long term yes. Elem. Attendance
xxii. Would need improvement to SPASH
xxiii. It can become optimized as you go. Yes.
xxiv. Yes – elimination of schools
xxv. Fixes over population @ PW
xxvi. Elemen. = not as much. Secondary = could be tighter
xxvii. More space for needs (elementary 6)

Other pros, cons, & considerations:

4. HS modernization?
5. SPASH requires its own internal task force for sweeping changes
6. Less students in each elementary could mean closing 1 (or 2) buildings
7. Bringing in another grade, and how do you manage that with 32 doors
8. Model is more widespread
9. How this affects k-5 parents winners/losers
10. Can teachers get onboard w/ no classroom, etc? Harder to return to that for staff
11. It's normal. The traditional config here is odd.
12. Tell me more about social/emotional alignment concerns.
13. W/ re-drawing no need to close school!
14. Is there space in arts (music)? not just athletics
15. Track meet?
16. Balance. Transitions. Con ↑ high school transitions?

17. DO THIS
18. Similar to other school districts
19. Standard model. Consideration for emotional/social increase. Improvement that is needed at high school

Grade Group Alternatives – Small Group Discussion Results: After completing individual responses, each of the eight small groups were asked to respond the following two questions for each of the District's current grade grouping and alternatives A, B, and C:

i. How well does the grade group option perform against the criteria?
ii. What are its other pros, cons, and considerations?

Each group recorded its responses on flip-chart pages, as follows:

Group A flip-chart comments:

Retain Current K-6, 7-9, 10-12 Groups:

4. Maintains
5. Not fiscally responsible

Alternative Grouping A (K-5, 6-7, 8-9, 10-12):

4. More middle grade opportunities
5. 9th not a HS still
6. Families would have harder transitions
7. Transportation costs
8. Still underutilized buildings
9. How to adjust MS buildings
    e. Close 1?
10. Still need ↑$ for HS

Alternative Grouping B (K-6, 7-8, 9-12):

1. HS opportunity for 9th
2. Less impact on families as it is 1 grade

Alternative Grouping C: (K-5, 6-8, 9-12):

i. Standard alignment w/ state
ii. Transportation issues for pick up/drop off
iii. $ for HS changes
iv. Comradery
v. Closing elementary school

Group B flip-chart comments:

Retain Current K-6, 7-9, 10-12 Groups:

i. Maintains, does not enhance

Alternative Grouping A (K-5, 6-7, 8-9, 10-12):

ii. Maintains current elective opportunities for SPASH while expanding for 6th grade
iii. Increases number of transitions and the number of families split between multiple buildings. Preferable grade grouping for 6th graders
iv. More fiscally possible without referendum; concerns about increased costs of bussing needs
v. Less students in SPASH = potential safety increases
vi. More turnover with more traveling teachers
    a. Could be a "stepping stone/phasing" option as we move towards 2035

Alternative Grouping B (K-6, 7-8, 9-12):

i. Benefits for 9th grades, but decrease in electives
ii. Alignment w/ traditional cultural experience of American high school
iii. 900+ students is way over 75% ideal capacity, but w/ out consolidating schools 450 is way under capacity
    a. Could result in fewer opportunities for 7/8 students
iv. 9-12 will require more admin, security, ect.
v. Less balance @ 9-12
vi. SPASH #s are too high to move this in 2027

Alternative Grouping C (K-5, 6-8, 9-12):

i. Much better aligned curriculum standards & alignment w/ the rest of the state & standard high school experience for 9th graders
ii. Keeps middle schools smaller, but better balanced than option B
iii. Could add a lot of costs for SPASH (both in capital needs and operational needs)
    a. Would allow for a better utilization of middle schools and potential shutting of elementary
iv. May be very hard to sell to community

Group C flip-chart comments:

Retain Current K-6, 7-9, 10-12 Groups:

i. Maintains current systems, prolong inevitable fiscally.
ii. Not efficient.
iii. People don't like change, but we must change.

Alternative Grouping A (K-5, 6-7 ,8-9, 10-12):

i. NO – too many transitions, changes to a model that isn't efficient

Alternative Grouping B (K-6, 7-8, 9-12):

i. Creates more problems without solving current problems
ii. Not an efficient use of space

Alternative Grouping C: (K-5, 6-8, 9-12):

i. Enhances for all grades, minimal transition, standardized model, fiscally could provide an opportunity for suitability for modern learning

Group D flip-chart comments:

Retain Current K-6, 7-9, 10-12 Groups:

i. Poor for criteria 3&4
ii. Larger population schools may have more trouble with a sense of belonging?

Alternative Grouping A (K-5, 6-7, 8-9, 10-12):

i. Strong for 3, harder for 2
ii. Multiple transitions are difficult

Alternative Grouping B (K-6, 7-8, 9-12):

i. Poor for criteria 1,3, & 4
ii. Our group doesn't like this model

Alternative Grouping C (K-5, 6-8, 9-12):

i. Our group disagrees about criterion 1

Group E flip-chart comments:

Retain Current K-6, 7-9, 10-12 Groups:

i. NO
ii. Not fiscally responsible

iii. Not efficient building use
iv. Minimize impact to students/fam.

Alternative Grouping A (K-5, 6-7, 8-9, 10-12):

i. Probably not
ii. Difficult for families w/ multiple kids
iii. Logistically tough for student athletics
iv. Open up academic opportunities
v. No need to change SPASH
vi. Research shows that multiple transitions more difficult

Alternative Grouping B (K-6, 7-8, 9-12):

i. OK
ii. Issues with space use at middle school (or just 1)
iii. 9th @ SPASH – benefits already discussed
iv. Classic configuration
v. $ to update SPASH

Alternative Grouping C (K-5, 6-8, 9-12):

i. OK
ii. 9th @ SPASH – benefits already discussed
iii. Classic configuration
iv. Least impact to families
v. Academic achievement/mindset shifts
vi. Social/emotional benefits: Could separate out 6th graders in bldg

Group F flip-chart comments:

Retain Current K-6, 7-9, 10-12 Groups:

i. Criteria 1 & 2 not changing
ii. Criteria 3 & 4 building usage not efficient (necessarily)
    a. Means $ = efficient = not fiscally responsibility
iii. Pros:
    a. Community hates change
    b. Opportunities for elementary space
iv. Cons: Doesn't change the identified problems
v. Considerations: Sports have already shifted

Alternative Grouping A (K-5, 6-7, 8-9, 10-12):

4. Criteria 1
    d. Social–emotional needs met extremely well
    e. 6th graders ready
    f. Grade teams
    g. Math students?
5. Criteria 2: Extra transition
6. Criteria 3: Less traveling teachers
7. Criteria 4:
    d. Busing?
    e. No elementary
    f. Over capacity
8. Pros:
    d. Social-emotional positive groups

e. Each grade/course would be consistent due to no “cross buildings”

9. Cons: Extra transition
10. Considerations: Advanced math/other subjects

Alternative Grouping B (K-6, 7-8, 9-12):

i. Cons severely outweigh pros

Alternative Grouping C (K-5, 6-8, 9-12):

i. Pros: 9th graders feel like HS
ii. Cons:
    a. Major building changes @ SPASH
    b. 9th and 12th together is not entirely appropriate (?)
iii. Considerations:
    a. Would likely need referendum what if we make a huge plan and the community says no?
    b. Staff impacts sharing classrooms
    c. A phased approach could be beneficial

Group G flip-chart comments:

Retain Current K-6, 7-9, 10-12 Groups:

i. How does it perform against the criteria:
    a. Could be enhanced
    b. No change
    c. Long term maint. cost
    d. Some buildings not used to capacity
ii. Pros/Cons/Considerations:
    i. Need to redraw boundaries
    ii. 9th grade experience stays stagnant (con)

Alternative Grouping A (K-5, 6-7, 8-9, 10-12): (No response recorded)

Alternative Grouping B (K-6, 7-8, 9-12):

4. How does it perform against the criteria:
    1. Enhances opportunities for 9th graders and other co-curriculars
    2. Does not address family developmental considerations of K-6
    3. Cost
    4. Does not address elementary school building utilization
5. Other considerations: Zoning changes

Alternative Grouping C (K-5, 6-8, 9-12):

i. How does it perform against the criteria:
    1) Enhances across all grade levels
    2) Same # of moves but only at other grade levels
    3) Facility improvements are extensive

Group H flip-chart comments:

Retain Current K-6, 7-9, 10-12 Groups:

i. Not sustainable for the long term (15 years)
ii. Pros: Transitional in community
iii. Cons: 6th grade needs to be a part of middle school

Alternative Grouping A (K-5, 6-7, 8-9, 10-12):

i. Community viewed benefits for fiscal responsibility although does not align with other criteria
ii. Pros: 6th grade a part of middle school
iii. Cons:
    a. High schoolers are not with 9th grade
    b. More transition
    c. Transportation challenge – bus routes

Alternative Grouping B (K-6, 7-8, 9-12):

i. Enhances student opportunity for 9th graders with significant improvement to SPASH
ii. Pros: Used during a phasing period could make this successful
iii. Cons:
    a. Over or under filled Jr. high
    b. Still have Plover-Whiting issue and 9th grade problem

Alternative Grouping C (K-5, 6-8, 9-12):

i. Aligns well with criteria, although requires a significant upfront investment
ii. Pros: Standardizes across the state (most data)
iii. Cons: Staffing and space

Individual member written meeting evaluation responses (at end meeting):

1. Please provide your preliminary rank the grade grouping options discussed today. (1 = my most preferred; highest number = my least preferred)

   The table below shows the number of members ranking each option 1, 2, 3, and 4. For example, Option C was ranked as the #1 option by 32 Task Force members.

Rank	Current Grade Groupings	Option A: K-5, 6-7, 8-9, 10-12	Option B: K-6, 7-8, 9-12	Option C: K-5, 6-8, 9-12
1	4	3	1	32
2	10	14	9	5
3	14	9	12	2
4	10	11	15	0
Total	38	37	37	39
Average Rank	**2.8**	**2.7**	**3.1**	**1.2**

Task Force Member Comments on Options:

a. I think Option C is the only option
b. Option C standardizes with the state/country. Option A does not improve the student experience for anyone but sixth graders. Closing schools and moving enrollments will send families into an uproar.
c. Option B should not be considered. It solves virtually zero problems, but it creates them.
d. Dependent on $.
e. Getting to Option C is going to take phasing to win the community over so we can work towards it for 2035.
f. I feel pretty strongly about moving 9th up to high school. I think there needs to be contraction for both student and facility/budget reasons.

g. I don't believe the community is ready to support another referendum, especially to increase the footprint of SPASH with declining enrollment. I'm not saying I don't support it and it makes sense, but I don't think the general public will understand and support this option.
h. I think there may need to be a transition of Group B.
i. Great concern of putting all our eggs I one basket as Option C will require community support. I would like to discuss Option A more. I know there are large concerns, but I like giving students in 6-9 a similar experience in 2 buildings.
j. I'm fully against moving 9th to SPASH until massive capital improvement isn't as necessary to maintain offerings.
k. I think the community would struggle to close a building and add on to others.
l. What happens to elementary? Closures. Not ready to make a decision, looking further at K-5.
m. Why aren't we talking about moving boundaries?
n. Would like to discuss how SPASH actually works with 9–12 for cost. I think it is important to look at a 4K building site/EC learning center.
o. My ranking is based on redrawing map, so students and current growing neighborhood (for elementary) are moved to schools with projected less capacity. In other words, pre-distributing students to even out school populations.
p. The schools in this community hold importance culturally. Closing more than one would cause community upset if not outrage.
q. Still worried about the fiscal cost of adding ninth to high school
r. 9–12 cohesiveness and learning opportunities/6th with 7–8 would benefit too!
s. Sixth grade needs to move out of the elementary schools. Ninth grade should be part of capital SPASH if we can fiscally manage it.
t. If we make a change, and need to close the school, we need to consider the waves will be creating an order to pass a referendum to add to SPASH or the work will be null and void.
u. Option C, standardize with state, only issue is fiscally how much? Staffing issue? How will closing one school impact the rebalance of students which school potentially?
v. I am not considering any option but K-5, 6–8, 9–12.
w. I feel Option C also fills personal expectations of what grade grouping should be but I look forward to challenging my rankings over the next month to reflect on other opportunities and challenges with each option.
x. Just need to ensure adjustments were made to allow SPASH students to not lose opportunities.
y. We have to do something with the sixth graders.
z. Even though for Option C, there may be a big fiscal component, I think Option A could have just as much, if not more, of a fiscal impact when you factor in the transportation mess. I like Option A best though, for things like criterion one and two and feel social/emotionally. This may be a better fit.

2. What went well at this meeting? What could have gone better? How?

a. More time is needed for discussion. All interesting.
b. I think people had many strong feelings, and we needed smaller group discussions a little earlier on to trade ideas. Even more discussion was planned for this meeting, and I think it's good we didn't get to it because this topic needed more time for questions, discussion, and consideration.
c. It was helpful to hear from Mr. Vollendorf re: SPASH details. We were asked to analyze models in an insufficient amount of time. (Both individual reflection and group discussion.)
d. Good discussions
e. Very informational. Many topics were resolved.
f. Great meeting. Thank you for the group letters on sign-in sheet!
g. Could we offer an optional pre-meeting tour of secondary facilities for those of us who are not as familiar with SPASH and the two middle schools?

h. I liked the individual worksheets to fill out before and during small groups. I think they were obviously a little space-limited, though. I wish the presentations had been significantly shorter, and we had much more small/large group discussion. We're in that second, more discussion-based phase, so let us chat/discuss.
i. The process of discussion is way too rushed.
j. People that don't work in schools have loud voices, but have no idea how it works.
k. Presentation by principal at SPASH. The study used however, was old and an updated study would be more helpful since enrollment has declined even more in the 12 years since the study was done.
l. The evaluation of Grade Group Options worksheet w/ 4 criterion helped to break things down, see pros and cons, which plans are similar and which vary greatly.
m. It is hard to hear in small group table talk. It is nice to have time to independently process, but we need more time to small group talk. Thank you for having the slides available for note-taking.
n. Having options to discuss gave us an idea where we all stand at that time. Speaker from principal give good info about capital SPASH space.
o. Great information from Mr. Vollendorf. Good group discussion.
p. I'm glad we are moving forward. The small group discussion was rushed, and it was difficult to make a clear opinion/decision.
q. We made actual progress in decision-making, rather than copious information gathering. Could have used more time on worksheets and table discussions I didn't finish.
r. We were rushed to complete comparison. There could have been a standard ranking. Score for us to use to compare all options if one is the best and four is the worst. We could rank each criterion, then have an avenue across all members that is comparable.
s. Talk too long in the beginning. More time and small groups to really discuss- not rushed.
t. Less summary and more time to talking groups (expect people to know what we've already covered).
u. A lot of information shared, mainly on how the high school runs and how it would be able to handle more students.
v. Less time on reviewing previous info. More process time and discussion.
w. Presentation of info is always solid. I am concerned about making changes based on outdated opinions/knowledge about how schools function, what the school culture/climate is like.
x. Good conversation in small group. Appreciated the presentation from John.
y. Thanks for the table assignment on the sign-up sheet. I enjoyed the trivia question last month. I left with a smile on my face, and I learned something. I don't concur with the complaint who said to release those who wanted to be done and didn't want to spend 90 seconds having a laugh.
z. Good discussion, appreciate the information shared. I would like more information on 4K/EC sites and how capital SPASH would work with ninth grade.
aa. Small group discussion was very productive. Sharing out loud a disclosure of what will be expected to present so there isn't a scramble at presentation time of what the expectation is.
bb. High school presentation was neutral and informative. Not enough discussion time when we are supposed to be coming forth with an idea.
cc. Finally moving forward on initial decisions. Good process keep going.
dd. Felt productive! More than previous sessions.
ee. This went well. I didn't have enough time to process this sheet.
ff. What went well with details/grade grouping?
gg. I know my going forward thought and they haven't changed. I want everyone else to get the info they need.
hh. More Q&A time and discussion time. Or perhaps during small group share out have each group share a question they have. John's presentation and information were very valuable.
ii. I like the paper copies of all slides.
jj. Good small group discussion. Great at introducing models for us to look at.

kk. John did a great job of explaining and fielding the questions. Good shared info and then good group discussion.

ll. Would have liked info portion to go shorter and more time for table discussion of the pros and cons

mm. I don't know if it was just my placement in the room today, though I think likely not, during small group discussion, I had a really hard time hearing my group members. I think there was a lot of passionate discussion tonight and I anticipate future meetings to be similar. It would be helpful if I could hear and feel like I could actually contribute to the conversation. Additionally, I felt the small group discussion was more limited on time.

3. What information do you feel you need to complete the tasks ahead?

a. We need to consider what consolidation if any should take place alongside or independent of grade group reshuffling.

b. I would appreciate a more detailed agenda (ahead of time) that would allow for thought before the meeting.

c. Good review and clear plan, but not enough time to discuss and share thoughts as a large group

d. Biggest concern is $

e. Which decision will be prioritized

f. Does the consolidation/closing of any of our 3 Title 1 schools cause any budgetary concerns due to a potential loss of Title 1 funds? Does this need to inform which schools are considered for closing beyond just capacity?

g. I think drilling down on two financial questions: how much $ to bring 9th to high school
Specifically, look at a scale/a few different points: (1) $ min go include 9th grade, like bare minimum; (2) $ to bring 9th in with all the bells and whistles; (3) a $ point (or 2) in the middle.

h. How much $ to be gained by closing various buildings, especially the elementary.

i. Please take people on a field trip to SPASH, Ben, and PJ's. Can we hold our next meeting at those schools so people who have never been in them can see?

j. A meeting at SPASH so people can get a feeling for the building and illustrate the needs since this is a critical part of the plan.

k. Look at individual elementary and junior building needs assessments, which buildings need more/less improvement

l. It is hard to hear in small group table talk. It is nice to have time to independently process, but we need more time to small group talk. Thank you for having the slides available for notetaking.

m. Suggesting building adjustments; physically seeing the buildings would be helpful.

n. 4K Opening how it may impact daycare. Current information of the standard model/research that will help support that transition 9 to SPASH. Closing a school money saved? A cost to add on to SPASH?

o. If we did nothing but change school boundaries, what does that do? Not advocating for this, but a question voters might want.

p. More elementary impact information. 4K – 6 is a huge developmental range…

q. True, real world "dollars" benefit of closing a school. This is serious community impact and needs to be ironclad "worth it".

r. If sixth grade moves up, then what happens to K-5 closures? When implement 9 to 12? 2030, 2035, sooner?

s. I think how we would handle the extra space in the elementary schools if sixth graders leave is the biggest factor for me between the current and option C. It would be nice to know more about what those options are is full day 4K in all buildings realistic? Can we use a building as a daycare instead of closing and make some money? How out of the box can we be?

t. Criteria for shutting down schools? Which schools?

u. Does the grade alignment decision come first then we look at building consolidation?

v. How do boundary shifts change enrollments? What if we repurpose an elementary building to be a 4K center? Why aren't we talking about VSIPs/reduction of faculty lives?
w. I am open.
x. How are decisions affect staffing, what opportunities change if ninth grade goes to SPASH.
y. Is creating a 4K site an option?
z. What financial support/puzzle pieces are needed to move ninth grade up? Is it able to be achieved?
aa. Were any draft high school changes drawn out for ninth grade being there? Floor plan/additional building space? Could we meet at SPASH to walk through potential facility changes needed to bring ninth on board there?
bb. More information (cost for each option?)
cc. All of the potential closure information.
dd. Cost to adjust SPASH for grade 9. How does school closings fiscally benefit closing/operational cost versus transportation?
ee. 1 consideration that I hope is brought to the table is the option of switching from only an alternative high school to also an alternative junior high. If we can identify these students and give them more specialized resources from a younger grade, then it would be more proactive rather than our current reactive. The current structure is a disservice to students and staff alike – learning opportunities are being severely reduced due to the lack of resources and space and time.
ff. Likely what will be presented. In order to make a more formal recommendation and feel like I could really stand behind that, I would need to look at and compare numbers. So for example, if the district were to do Option A, what factors (i.e. transportation, building updates) would increase physically, as well as decrease (i.e., selling buildings) first Option C.