

Week Added	Feedback
Updated 7/17	I do not agree with the recommendation for option one of having K-3 at one school and then going to another school for 3-5. We live right by West and there is no reason to bus kids all the way to South. My child also does ET at West so he would be bussed back there. My son loves West and the culture and teachers there. Please do not do this option.
Updated 7/17	I fully support option 1, grade level schools. I think this is a great way to equalize the amount of kids enrolled at schools while maintaining a sense of familiarity for current students. I think option 2 is a horrible idea. Separating kids based on program choice, when a large portion of those children are in this program because of their home language, is walking dangerously close to segregation. I understand different options must be presented, but I cannot see option 2 being conducive to a happy community.
Updated 7/17	After watching the video and reading the material given to me. I would like to give some feedback, I believe having partner schools where the grades are split will have huge mental health disadvantages for not only students but staff. I am an employee and a mother to a child on d47. I'm very confused why we can't just change the boundaries like we did in middle school. Either of the options for the elementary schools are going to have huge disruptions in student and staff.
Updated 7/17	This is absolutely not okay. For the 27-28 year, I will have a 1st grader and 4th grader. That means my youngest daughter will have gone to 4 schools in 4 years. Daycare, Preschool at glacier ridge, Kindergarten at Husmann, then 1st grade at North? Will open house, meet the teacher, school programs, book fair, Halloween parties and parades, all be staggered so I can do both of the schools? One of the best parts of having both of my kids at the same school finally is that I can do things for both of my kids at the same times. This is unacceptable.
Updated 7/17	I fully support option 1, grade level schools. I think this is a great way to equalize the amount of kids enrolled at schools while maintaining a sense of familiarity for current students. I think option 2 is a horrible idea. Separating kids based on program choice, when a large portion of those children are in this program because of their home language, is walking dangerously close to segregation. I understand different options must be presented, but I cannot see option 2 being conducive to a happy community.
Updated 7/17	I am concerned that siblings will be split between buildings if grade levels are split between buildings. When thinking about childcare, this may not be feasible for after school centers to pick up students at two different locations for one family. Keeping siblings together is incredibly important in being able to manage pick up and drop off. Same situation for parents who need to pick up their students after school. They can't possibly be in two places at once and often pick up takes quite a while to get through. I understand boundary changes may be necessary however this seems like logistically it won't be feasible for families to be able to get their students for dismissal or drop them for arrival. This is one area parents need more clarity around.
Updated 7/17	This is an absolutely ridiculous proposal- to expect families to navigate multiple schools, multiple modes of transportation routes and schedules and such is insane- on top of the amount of transitions for kids at such a young age- absolutely ridiculous!
Updated 7/17	My concerns are with the split grade level buildings model. Parents with students in extended time would have to pick up and drop off at multiple schools. Also, students with iep's and 504s would have more changes in the staff members working with them. These students need consistency with buildings and staff members working with them. I am also concerned with how this would affect the staff members. Many teachers would have to move buildings. This takes away from time they have to focus on instruction and what is best for students. Some teachers would have to work with different service providers than they are used to (speech, ot, resource teachers) as well as new administration. Many teachers have developed strong relationships with the other staff members in their building and this allows them to provide the best support for students. Teachers will have to build new relationships and students will be affected as teachers establish relationships.
Updated 7/17	Hello, I think the solutions are both creative and considerate. I was just thinking for solution #1 would it be possible to roll it out with students grandfathered into their schools. Since it affects the entire school zone equally, you could just have hybrid schools until this is complete. For example, in woods creek and glacier ridge: Year 1: Glacier ridge has all K classes Woods creek has all 3 classes 1,2,4,5 are split Year 2: GR has all K,1 classes WC has all 3,4 classes 2,5 are split Year 3: fully transitioned The reason I say this is it's a bit awkward to switch a child back and forth. For example a child might go to WC K-1 then GR in 2, then WC in 3-5. Having a gradual rollout will keep the experience consistent for those already partway through a break. While it wouldn't be a huge deal to move a 4th grader at GR to WC, I proposed leaving them in order to balance classroom populations. Whether you take this suggestion or not, it's a good plan which doesn't split friends.
Updated 7/17	I just received the new boundary update and I am appalled at the option to combine classes to move schools. Sending my kindergartner to one school for just a few years then having them switch is extremely disruptive. On top of having them in a different school than their siblings. You stated you would have to change start times to accommodate this change but then this would impact me taking and getting my eventual middle schoolers as they have an earlier start time that would now likely match the start time of my younger child. So if parents have kids in kindergarten, 3 and 6 all kids will have different start and end times? This option is surprising and absolutely disappointing and I, along with others I've already spoken to in no way support this option. Some teachers who have been at a school for years would also now be extremely impacted by this. I am truly hoping the district can put their heads together and think of something that makes way more sense than this.
Updated 7/17	Why do Indian Prairie families get K-5 stability while families with children in other schools face mandatory mid-elementary disruption? How does this support equity? How will TJA handle the cross-town busing bottlenecks for paired schools while separating dual-language students? Families should be provided with clear bus ride times before a decision is made, since splitting neighborhood kids across schools and a standalone multilingual building could increase time spent on buses. Why is the 3rd grade being split for West and South? How will the district ensure that curriculum delivery and teacher collaboration are the same when educators are physically divided between separate buildings? By concentrating the dual-language program into one building rather than integrating it across the neighborhood pairings, isn't the district creating a segregated environment that goes against its stated commitment to inclusivity and belonging?
Updated 7/17	Hello, I currently have a 3rd grade student and a Kindergarten student starting at Husmann in the fall of 2026. We have a 3rd child who will start Kindergarten in the fall of 2029. From a logistical standpoint, I am questioning why the Board would use North Elementary from K-2, then Husmann from 3-5, then Bernotas from 6-8. Logistically, wouldn't North as the 3-5 and Bernotas as 6-8 make much more logical sense? To flip back and forth between the North/Bernotas location, then to Husmann, then back to Bernotas seems poorly conceived. Having students attend K-2 at Husmann then transitioning them to North for 3-5 and then to Bernotas next door for 6-8 would make much more logical sense for parents with multiple students in the district. Additionally, a student starting Kindergarten in 2026 will attend Husmann for Kindergarten, then move over to North for 1-2, then go back to Husmann for 3-5, then go back to Bernotas for 6-8. Wouldn't keeping K-2 at Husmann make more sense?
Updated 7/17	I just reviewed the elementary boundary update. To be completely honest, I am not a fan of either option put forth in presentation. Are these the only two options (Grade Level Centers & Multilingual Language Academy)?
Updated 7/17	Is there an option to not do either of these changes? So, it could potentially be the grade level, the multilanguage academy, or keep things the way they are? or is it grade level schools vs. multilanguage academy and the board has to approve one of those?
Updated 7/17	Thank you
Updated 7/17	My son will start kindergarten when my daughter is in 4th grade at Husmann in 2027. We do not have bus transportation as we live .7 miles from Husmann. Please tell me what the time difference will be. I can't imagine walking .7 miles to Husmann, walking back, and having to walk an additional 1 mile to North and then repeating that in the afternoon. We moved to downtown CL so we can walk to the schools but this new plan would make it impossible. And I would be so sad if my children didn't get the chance to go to the same school at the same time. This would honestly make me consider homeschooling my children.
Updated 7/17	How does this affect the kids in/going to be in the aspire program at south? South is one out of a couple schools in the district with the resources and facility capacities for this program, so how do you plan to adjust? Also, start and end times would have to be staggered longer than 1 hour at minimum to give families time to get to two to three schools at a time; not to mention working parents who can't change their schedules because the district is changing start/end times. What about school functions being split? With having K-5 in one school, we only have to go to one school for school functions and eventually 2 when our eldest goes to middle school. With this plan, parents will have to go to two to three separate schools to attend these functions during a given week as the schools tend to host these close together such as open house, concerts, meet the teacher, etc. That's a lot of time/stress for families who work, who have multiple children and children with disabilities.
Updated 7/17	How does this affect the kids in/going to be in the aspire program at south? South is one out of a couple schools in the district with the resources and facility capacities for this program, so how do you plan to adjust? Also, start and end times would have to be staggered longer than 1 hour at minimum to give families time to get to two to three schools at a time; not to mention working parents who can't change their schedules because the district is changing start/end times. What about school functions being split? With having K-5 in one school, we only have to go to one school for school functions and eventually 2 when our eldest goes to middle school. With this plan, parents will have to go to two to three separate schools to attend these functions during a given week as the schools tend to host these close together such as open house, concerts, meet the teacher, etc. That's a lot of time/stress for families who work, who have multiple children and children with disabilities.
Updated 7/17	You can make more room in CL schools by removing Cary from the boundaries and allowing Cary to join Cary elementary schools. I'm not as concerned about highschool because it's a different district. My child as well as all other children, from Cary will have to travel To a farther school because of "boundary issues" instead of just going to the school that's in our community. As a Cary resident I would really want my child in the Cary elementary school because it's much closer than Canterbury or Coventry.
Updated 7/17	First, thank you for the communication throughout this process and for the significant work that has gone into developing these boundary recommendations. Questions I don't see how special education programs are addressed in either proposal. How would each scenario impact those services? How would busing costs change if more students attend schools outside of their neighborhoods? Was an option considered that simply redraws attendance boundaries based primarily on geographic proximity to each school? Many families intentionally purchased homes near specific schools so their children could walk or bike. How will that be taken into consideration? Concentrating bilingual programs at a single school seems contrary to the goal of creating diverse, integrated learning environments. Can you explain the rationale? Given the ongoing youth mental health challenges and the importance of community and belonging, how do additional school transitions and separating peers support students?
Updated 7/24	Based on my understanding of the proposed options, neither option keeps our current school community intact. One separates siblings who would be attending elementary school at the same time, while the other would move students who currently have a strong connection to the Husmann community. I hope the district can find a solution that minimizes disruption for families and prioritizes keeping siblings together whenever possible.
Updated 7/24	In either plan, will there be a focus on having self-contained programs as a whole in one building? For example, ASPIRE is now in both West and South. Is there a plan to have them under one roof? Families and staff can be better supported as one school community rather than two.
Updated 7/24	Hi I have the following questions that I wish to have answered. If it was in information previously sent or communicated, please point to that. 1. Can you provide building-by-building, grade-by-grade class size comparison: current 2026-27 counts at all schools versus projected 2027-28 counts under the new split. 2. Current capacity utilization percentage at all schools (enrolled students as a share of building capacity), and the target utilization the committee was optimizing toward. 3. The specific enrollment and housing development data used to project all the schools future population. Please provide the underlying numbers. 4. Historical class size trend at all schools going back five years, to see whether the imbalance driving this change is recent or long-standing. This form is not long enough for questions. It needs to be lengthened as I assume you will be receiving significant questions about this.

Updated 7/24	Hi I have the following questions that I wish to have answered. If it was in information previously sent or communicated, please point to that. 1. Can you provide building-by-building, grade-by-grade class size comparison: current 2026-27 counts at all schools versus projected 2027-28 counts under the new split. 2. Current capacity utilization percentage at all schools (enrolled students as a share of building capacity), and the target utilization the committee was optimizing toward. 3. The specific enrollment and housing development data used to project all the schools future population. Please provide the underlying numbers. 4. Historical class size trend at all schools going back five years, to see whether the imbalance driving this change is recent or long-standing. 5. In option 1, what is the proposed staggered start times? 6. In option 1, what consideration has been given to the fact that certain students will have three hard transitions (a student going into K this year at one school, then moving to a second school for 1-3 and back to a third school for 4-5.) 7. Are the budgets built to handle all the needs to make option 1 work. Annually we have issues of teachers going on strike for competitive pay, is the budget equipped to handle the inevitable strike as well as playground transitions, bathroom needs, transitioning of equipment or books, etc. Will this all be accomplishable during the one summer between the 26/27 and 27/28 school year. 8. Are the names of the schools changing? Seems ridiculous to have West and South instead of making them both one name similar to a high school that is fresh/soph and Jr/Sr. Ultimately requires purchasing additional "school spirit". 9. What consideration is given to after school activities? Will parents be forced to go to different schools for activities? For example, with open houses and a parent who has students in two separate schools, will they be held on the same day like you did this year with west and south? For fundraisers, which are constant, will parents be forced to watch one student in the APEX fun run at one school and then rush over to the school to watch that at the other? Its already incredibly difficult to find volunteers when everyone has "school spirit" at one school, now this will be split into two separate schools.
Updated 7/24	I would like to suggest a third option for the district to consider. Instead of having a single district-wide dual language school or relying solely on neighborhood assignments, consider dividing the district into three geographic zones based on the existing middle school feeder patterns. Within each zone, designate one elementary school as a dual language school, ensuring that families throughout the district have reasonable access while keeping transportation manageable. This model could also be used to strategically place specialized programs, such as self-contained special education classrooms and other districtwide services, so that every region of the district has access without concentrating all programs in one location. Thoughtful placement could improve staffing, transportation, resource sharing, and access for families while maintaining equitable opportunities across the district. While no option will satisfy everyone, this hybrid model prioritizes equity, operational efficiency
Updated 7/24	As parents of a dual language child my husband & I are strongly opposed to option b, consolidating all of the dual language students into one building. We feel this isn't fair to dual language students/families (or the Coventry students/families). Either keep things as they are (not possible) or all students/families should have to adjust (option a). One of the reasons we selected our home is that, in addition to the school offering the dual language program, it's also very close to our house. We're not unique. Option b would pluck these students out of their home school and place them at another school which is further away, considerably so for some. Additionally, option b limits the number of kindergarteners who can enroll in dual language, which seems counterintuitive. We understand that changes have to be made, & if students /families are going to be upended then it should be all students /families and not just dual language. We want to stay in our neighborhood too. Thank you.
Updated 7/24	I understand the need for changing boundaries however many of the families I know from our neighborhood, chose it because of Indian prairie. The new proposed boundaries means my kids would not only be split between two different schools, missing out on activities like reading to the younger grades, their younger siblings and cousins who moved from MN so they could all go to elementary school together. By taking away the k-5 options so many kids are missing out on those connections with younger siblings and friends not to mention the logistics of having multiple school pickups and drop offs to try and coordinate. If we can't stay with Indian prairie at least don't split up our kids and siblings.
Updated 7/24	It seems that the solutions provided are overcomplicating the issue. Option 1 seems to force a style of schooling that isn't necessary and will create more headache for families trying to get their kids to school for drop off and pick up. Option 2 is segregation. The most sensible solution is to redraw the district lines to keep neighborhoods together and better distribute the student populations to match the size of the school. My daughter attends North. We love its diversity, the amount of community events it offers to booster relationships among its students and families, and that they always look for ways to make school inclusive (through school spirit wear for every kid or free soccer nights), regardless of income or culture. Let's practice what we preach to our kids and show them the importance of community.
Updated 7/24	My questions center around the Multilingual Language Academy. 1. Will there be a decrease in the number of students able to enroll in Dual Language? 2. How will this change in programming impact those students who qualify for English Language support who are not admitted into the Academy? 3. How will Academy students transition to district Middle Schools? 4. Will the academy structure extend to Middle School as well? Thank you.
Updated 7/24	These options seem completely ridiculous and unnecessary. I would love to go into a much longer answer soon but for right now I'd just like my opinion on record that I am strongly against these plans. I wish this district would just go back to the basics, stop trying to make so many changes, and realize that sometimes the basics are the necessities.
Updated 7/24	In looking at current demographic information across all D47 schools, those schools with more diverse and socioeconomically disadvantaged families will be clustered together in option 1 while the schools with lower need populations appear to be grouped together (Glacier Ridge and Woods Creek) or not have a sister school at all (Indian Prairie). Does the redrawing of boundaries in option 2 account for this?
Updated 7/24	Under the grade-level centers plan, the incoming 2nd grade Aspire students at West will attend 3 elementary schools by 3rd grade. They were at Glacier Ridge for kindergarten and then moved to West for 1st grade. My son, an incoming 3rd grade Aspire student at South, will not be affected, but South is his second school as he also was in kindergarten Aspire at Glacier Ridge and then they were moved to South for 1st grade. Are there representatives from each program giving feedback on these plans? Splitting up a program like Aspire is detrimental to families, students, and staff. I was hoping with all this proposed shuffling that space would be created for the program to be in one building. When my son was in kindergarten at Glacier Ridge, his Aspire class was 10 students. We were not considered when school and community events were planned. We were invited. We got the same newsletter as everyone else, but when my family attended events, we were the only ones from his class. Inclusivity is not inviting people into what already exists, but rather creating an environment where everyone can thrive. This culture did not exist. My son's teacher was a first-year teacher. It was totally unfair to her to be at school without a mentor who was teaching the same population she was. She and the paraprofessionals in the room could have been better supported if they were part of a program rather than out on an island. My son's teacher was a first-year teacher. It was totally unfair to her to be at school without a mentor who was teaching the same population she was. She and the paraprofessionals in the room could have been better supported if they were part of a program rather than out on an island. Moving to South the following year, where the program was already established, made a difference. There was a culture. Of course, there are things that could be improved on, but there was a community. That year, the incoming kindergarteners were still sent to Glacier Ridge. Their first teacher quit, and their second was a first-year teacher as well. Again, these teachers could have been better supported. And maybe even retained. Those kindergartens were then sent to West for first grade rather than South, continuing to split the program and putting them in yet another school without program support. Our community is small. A lot of our kids attend private therapy together and participate in activities through NISRA together. There is a large number of our kids that have hybrid schedules and leave school early to go to private therapy during the school day because our children's needs cannot fully be met by the district. The district does not provide transportation to these therapy centers. Being at one school would allow for carpool opportunities. Overall, with a larger program, the culture would be more inclusive as well. Not one of my son's three teachers is still a teacher in the Aspire program. One moved to general ed, another quit during the school year and one has left the district. There have also been other teachers in the program who have quit during the school year. Supporting special education staff is the key to retaining them. These are all things that may be being overlooked from the outside. You have a population of students that struggle with change, and it seems to not even be a consideration. Just as it's a goal to keep neighborhood kids together for a K-12 experience, it should equally be important to keep our kids together as our community is in our program rather than our neighborhood.
Updated 7/24	How would this impact kids who go to before/after school programs? They won't be with their sibling if they move to a K-2,3-5 school and would be harder on working parents who will need to drop off kids at two separate before/after school programs. Two different schools would be very difficult on working parents who also try to coordinate bus pick up/drop off if they have two different school start times and end times. Would much prefer to keep K-5 and keep that community school environment. Splitting the elementary school into two schools would be a huge negative in my opinion. My son will be starting kindergarten in the 2027-2028 school year and his sister will follow 2 years after. I was looking forward to them being in elementary school for the majority of the time together, and not split up like my friends in Huntley are.
Updated 7/24	I don't see any benefit to the grade level centers....more importantly I see it creating a much greater need for transportation as some of these schools are more than 2 miles apart which requires more funds for busing and takes resources away from our teachers and students. Coupled with the fact that our district for some reason cannot/will not align the middle schools and elementary schools together in away that allows the student population to transition as a whole rather than splitting up, some consistency for these children and families would be appreciated. Moving to a new building is a big transition at this age. The language academy seems to make much more sense.

	I am deeply concerned about both options presented and would encourage the committee to "go back to the drawing board" and draw new boundary lines. I have outlined my concerns to the board of ed and Dr. Hinz in several emails. Neither solution solves the crowding problems on the north side, but more importantly, the Language Academy solution creates bigger problems than we already have with the division between mono and dual programs. I seem to wonder if the district is trying to get rid of the dual program? I am concerned that the dual academy idea is the path of least resistance between two terrible options and will create further isolation, segregation, and separation of the dual language students in our district. Furthermore, it will not solve our problem of retaining staff - in fact, many have heard the potential news and started looking outside of the district because they are horrified and were not consulted. I am speaking as a parent of 3 dual language students, a former staff member at a dual school, and a friend to many dual teachers who are vehemently against the language academy idea. Please read my emails for more information. All three of my children have gone through the dual language program thru North and Lundahl. My oldest is now a junior, my middle child is now a freshman, and my youngest is a 7th grader at Lundahl (time flies). I am very familiar with the program, the staffing challenges throughout the years, the loss of teachers on a constant basis to Spain and other districts (I have spoken at length about the Spain program and the problems that persist because of it....I have talked about this since my children entered the district back in 2015...) Furthermore, for the board's knowledge, I worked for the district for a number of years. So I am not speaking about this blindly, I come at it with some personal experience. The language academy will not solve any of the problems you list, it will simply isolate the dual program even more so than it already is. Let me explain why I am so concerned about this isolation/segregation... My children reported all throughout elementary school (at North) that there was not enough blending of the dual language and mono program - often reporting to me problems of racial slurs being stated to their Spanish-speaking peers and stating that the "mono and dual kids" don't play together and don't interact. That is a problem. (p.s. all of this I have gone to the district about over the years, offering support and education -I am a clinical social worker- that was turned down, I continually have been stating that we have a problem with the divide between dual and mono classrooms.) Then my children went to Lundahl, and that building staff worked very hard to help the dual students and mono students become one school population - We continued to hear reports of some problems of racial slurs, fewer though, that I continued to report - these incidents only occurred on the bus, so it seemed to be "getting better" at Lundahl. (I know Angie works very hard at maintaining a culture of inclusion for all students at Lundahl.) The set-up is designed so that my children have their dual language classes but also mix with mono kids for math, science, and encores, so they are truly "Lundahl kids" and not "dual" or "mono" kids like their experience at North. Furthermore, if you look at the make-up of my children's classes over the years - what was initially targeted to be 2/3 Spanish-speaking at home and 1/3 English only speaking at home as told to us was the design of the dual program at our "kindy meetings" -- the make up became less and less of a mixture and more and more that my children ended up being one of a small handful of kids that do not come from a Spanish speaking homes by middle school. There is a trend of students who "drop out" of the dual program before middle school - and they are typically the English-only speaking families. By 8th grade, my daughter was one of four kids in the dual class of 50 that were from an English-only speaking at home. I am VERY concerned that because the dual language program is the minority and the other option throws the district into complete chaos for everyone, that the dual language academy option is being presented as the "path of least resistance". Rest assured that just because it may be the path of least resistance, that does not equate to the best path or the most equitable path.... I am convinced now, after speaking with many dual language teachers this afternoon, that your staffing problems will actually INCREASE because many told me that if this pathway moves forward, that they will look for jobs elsewhere (because they told me that). And, as we know, they will find them. Dual teachers are not interested in being uprooted to a new academy. Please do not follow the path of the least resistance or least amount of people impacted - Please direct the boundary team to go back to the drawing board and draw new boundaries, just like they did with the middle school. It is the only reasonable way to solve this problem. Your comment at the Board meeting about bussing across route 14 was a very upsetting reason you listed as why you wouldn't want to consider re-drawing the boundaries - Here's why: 1. Many many children will need to cross Rt. 14 to get to your new language academy --- so now you are saying that crossing route 14 is only problematic for MONO-lingual students but those in dual crossing route 14 don't matter? We are a smaller group of parents, a less "loud" group of parents, but this group still matters. 2. My children have crossed rt. 14 to go to middle school every single year. That will continue for middle schools. There has never been a problem about that considered when talking about middle school. Given the scenarios, I think that Ms. Smith is right to say that the community would rather bus across rt. 14 rather than the solutions presented. It sounds like you, Dr. Hinz, have already made up your mind, but your board has some good questions that need consideration. Please send the committee back.
Updated 7/24	I am writing as a District 47 parent of two elementary students who will be entering 1st and 3rd grade this fall. I have followed the elementary boundary discussions closely and I watched the most recent Board meeting online. I appreciated the comments and questions raised by Emily Smith regarding the possibility of a third option (a complete boundary redraw). I also want to thank Board President Dr. Barton and Maria Krause for acknowledging and welcoming feedback from families and emphasizing collaboration throughout this process. I am concerned that neither of the two proposed options adequately serves our students or our community. It is particularly disappointing that the committee relied on 2023 enrollment data that does not appear to account for the district's significant recent growth, including numerous new residential developments. Given how important this decision is, I question why updated demographic data was not pursued earlier in the process when there would have been sufficient time to incorporate it before a final vote? I strongly urge the Board to reject Option 1. Like many families, we specifically chose Crystal Lake because of its neighborhood K-5 elementary school model. The overwhelming feedback I have seen from parents throughout the community reflects a strong preference to preserve that model rather than transition to grade-level attendance centers. Crystal Lake is not structured like neighboring districts with campus-style schools, and I believe this change would create unnecessary challenges for many families. Our family lives near Route 31 and the Pingree Road Metra station, an area that is frequently discussed during boundary reviews. Although Husmann Elementary is geographically closer, our neighborhood remains assigned to Coventry, requiring our children to be bused across town and across Route 14 resulting in longer travel times to and from school. Because our neighborhood is not part of the Coventry community, our children often lack the same neighborhood connections that many of their classmates enjoy. This existing inequity and this non-contiguous boundary further demonstrates why a comprehensive boundary redraw deserves serious consideration. I also want to acknowledge that I appreciate the work that District 47 parent Joe Keegan has done to analyze these proposals and engage the community. I hope the district and elementary boundary committee will work collaboratively with him and other stakeholders to develop a stronger and better solution before November. Before making a decision that will affect families for years to come, I respectfully ask the Board to direct the Elementary Boundary Committee to reconvene, carefully review the substantial feedback from parents and staff, and present a third option featuring a comprehensive boundary redraw. I also encourage the Board to push for transparent and timely communication throughout this process. Thank you for your time, your thoughtful consideration, and your commitment to making the best long-term decision for District 47 students and families. (Prior submission) I attended the board meeting tonight. There was a discussion about the need to get this done by the end of the year so the boundaries can change for next year, and an emphasis on planning for longevity. When asked about new subdivisions, there were no strong leads on how it will actually affect our schools. The last review was in 23-24 and didn't take into account any of the new development. One of the board members mentioned that these new developments will change the schools and boundaries within 3 years. If that's the case, don't rush to make a quick decision for next year. Get a new study done, wait for the results until December, and review for 28/29 instead. Two more thoughts, you mentioned concerns about staff. I worry about the impact on our support staff. Playground supervisors, paraprofessionals, and other staff members make a huge difference in our schools. Many chose these positions because they align with their children's school schedules and allow them to be part of their school community. These proposals could unintentionally make it harder. Lastly, you mentioned North schools being overburdened. North Elementary has had classroom sizes of about 15-20 students. Our school is built upon inclusion and making sure every student has a fair educational experience and community, regardless of income or cultural background. Part of North's dedication to building a community allowed it to earn the status of Exemplary as a top 10% school in the state. I'm concerned these changes will undercut that for future students.
Updated 7/24	I have concerns about the pairing of schools by grade levels because that does not solve the overcrowding of the schools on the North side of town. I do not understand how creating grade level centers helps solves the issue of needing to spread students out. There needs to be more of a balance made by moving the boundaries . I strongly suggest obtaining accurate demographics and numbers by contacting Dr. Kasandra or another researcher to gather useful data that can be used to formulate a plan. Why is there a September deadline set that must be reached to solidify a boundary plan? Getting the right numbers and demographics to make a better decision even if this goes past September seems to be most important.
Updated 7/24	I want to prioritize equitable class sizes across all schools as well as the ability to move self contained classrooms to spread them into additional buildings. When we have 3 or 4 grade level classrooms and many many students with IEPs we are unable to place them with gen ed peers due to the 70/30% law. Additionally I believe self contained/sped students being in all buildings is good for all kids.
Updated 7/24	Feedback on your current proposals: Proposal 1 is a logistical nightmare. As a family with multiple children, pickup times and drop off times to various school at various times would be a massive headache. Commute times will be even longer because pick up/drop offs will need to be varied. A family with kids spread across a k-2, 3-5, 6-8 schools could easily spend over an hour getting everyone to and from school each day. Middle school times are already different so families with children across K-8 could potentially be at 3 different schools with 3 different schedules to keep track of. Let alone 3 separate open houses or 3 separate schools to navigate conferences. This option may work ok for families with 1 or 2 kids, but larger families are really going to suffer. Proposal 2 is less inflammatory on our end. We are in the dual program and appreciate that our kids would get to stick with the peers and teachers they know, despite being at a different school. However, it feels like blatant segregation. Wouldn't this also really affect transport times for those coming from the more northern and southern sides also? It sounds like a big problem is the pre-K space and commutes. If there was a new space or other space currently outside of the current school buildings to place the pre-K, would that solve most of the problems? And would that potentially open up other spaces to help shift students around? Thank you for your time and consideration.
Updated 7/24	Thank you to the Boundary Committee for your work thus far on this initiative. I acknowledge the immense amount of time and effort you have put in — thank you. With that being said — the board meeting this evening made it clear that we do not have enough data to make this decision. The last boundary review was done in 23/24, which didn't take into account the many new housing developments. And even with an updated boundary review (which absolutely needs to happen before such an important decision is finalized), we still won't know the full effects of the new developments for three years. So far, there doesn't seem to be any information presented that supports rushing this decision and voting this November. Instead, I urge the board to take a more thoughtful approach. The boundaries clearly need to be updated, but rushing into a decision we may regret will have lasting impacts on our city, and most importantly, our children. Please take the time to get another boundary review done and consider waiting to see some of the impacts of the new developments before voting. Thank you for your consideration!
Updated 7/24	I have been kept in the loop with the idea to separate the elementary grades to accommodate class size concerns, bus routes, etc. I am not in favor of splitting up the grades to different schools. That is one more school our children needs to adapt too and separated from older/younger siblings. This adds one more layer to parents already busy lives with children at different schools. There has to be other options without splitting up our elementary schools.
Updated 7/24	Separating K–2 and 3–5 into different schools creates unnecessary challenges for families while offering questionable benefits. It will likely increase bus ride times as routes serve multiple schools, leaving younger children on buses longer. Parents with children in different grades may have to manage pickups, drop-offs, conferences, and events at two schools instead of one. Keeping elementary students together also allows younger children to learn from older siblings, strengthens school community, and makes family involvement easier. Please prioritize neighborhood K–5 schools. Please redraw boundaries to establish balance while minimizing shuffling kids to different schools, transitions can be hard on young kids.
Updated 7/24	I strongly oppose the proposal to separate K–2 and 3–5 students into different schools. This approach would likely increase bus ride times to pick up drop off kids at both schools, make transportation and school involvement more difficult for families with children in multiple grades, and reduce the benefits of siblings attending the same school. Of the options presented, option 2 - the dual-language academy proposal appears to be the better choice because it avoids many of these disruptions while still addressing the district's goals. I encourage the district to prioritize solutions that keep elementary families together whenever possible.
Updated 7/24	Option one seems expensive but no cost estimate was given. Option 1 honestly does not seem like a realistic option. The cost and work to transform playgrounds, bathrooms, move teachers, change school times, etc cannot be done well in a year and our schools were not set up that way, as they were in Huntley. It would create inconsistent and inequitable schools. I am disappointed that only these two options were given. Option two appears to have more benefits but the language center still does not seem to be taking long term changes into account.
Updated 7/24	To the school board, The proposed resolutions to the school boundary problem are not satisfactory. Making families split up kids to different schools is simply not a feasible answer in response to a handful of families not wanting to switch from being walkers to bus riders. With this proposal I would have 1 at west, 1 at south elem., and 1 at Bernotas. We have a population problem on the north side of town, we need to shift boundaries and that is the only solution. I also disagree with making Coventry a language academy and making everyone not in dual language who lives near there disperse to other schools. Just shift the boundaries and make this a sensible and logical solution.

Updated 7/24	Are boundary changes even considered? Are these the only two options? I feel both are a logistical nightmare. Splitting up families into two different schools and also splitting up a school community. I know change is inevitable, but we need to come up better options then these two. I would strongly advise at looking at boundary changes where there can still be a preschool at North or shifting some of Husman to North to make room for pre k. Moving everyone around is ridiculous, there has to be a better way and I ask that other options are looked at.
Updated 7/24	I completely agree. Consolidating the Dual Language program into one school feels incredibly isolating. As a parent in the program, it's important to me that my daughters continue learning Spanish while also building friendships with classmates outside of the program and maintaining connections with the kids they'll eventually attend middle school with. That balance has been a huge benefit of the current model. While I understand there may be operational advantages for the district, I don't believe this is what's best for our community or for families. The other proposed option is equally confusing. Splitting siblings between different schools based solely on grade level, with different bus schedules and pickup locations, creates unnecessary challenges for families. Are parents really expected to drive around town picking up children from multiple schools every day? It's hard to see how that makes life easier or better for anyone. In my opinion, both proposed options create more challenges than they solve and would have a negative impact on our community and the families they serve.
Updated 7/24	Good morning, I would like to share my feedback regarding the two proposed options presented by the boundary committee. Both options are a complete restructuring of the district. These are not boundary changes. The boundary committee failed to actually address the "boundaries" of the district. Option 1 is horrifying from a logistics perspective. Children will be on the bus for even longer to account for the staggered schedule. The longer students are on the bus, the more likely unsavory behavior issues will surface due to boredom and lack of adult supervision (the driver can only do so much while driving safely). Parents will be in the car twice as long to pick up children. Imagine having a toddler in the car for two separate pick up lines -- yikes. Walking to/from school will no longer be a possibility due to the distance traveled, particularly having to double back to get to the next school. Separating K-2 and 3-5 will result in a drop in parent volunteers. Parents will likely only serve the K-2 setting and view the 3-5 setting as "older kids" who don't need help. How many parents will want to drive between schools to support 2 teachers versus walk down a hallway? This would be a nightmare for PTO involvement and volunteer support. Lastly, this option is in complete contradiction to the theme and focus of the middle school boundary decision making process. Lip service was given to keeping children with friends, but how on earth can the district stand behind that rationale when children from North and Husmann would be brought together only to be separated for middle school and high school? It's a slap in the face to everyone who was impacted by the recent change. Option 2 could be excellent in another lifetime, but I believe it's also riddled with problems. My boys are both in dual, and they said they'd love to go to one school with 5 classes at each grade level. Both of them have had problems with having a limited number of friends in the dual program. There are only so many ways they can mix the 2 dual classrooms to keep it balanced. More classrooms would allow for spreading out behavior challenges and personality conflicts. However -- you're essentially serving up the Latino community on a platter to ICE. Parents will not want to risk putting a spotlight on their children. Latino families who are citizens may have relatives who are not citizens, and ICE has no qualms with using children as bait (or not caring to do due diligence and taking the wrong people). The dual program will crumble because Spanish speaking families will not want to risk their children, and I certainly do not want to risk their children either. I do not trust this district to protect its students or families. So while I'd love for a multilingual academy in theory, I cannot support this practice. In summary, both options are unacceptable. The boundary committee needs to go back and reflect on BOUNDARIES, not restructuring the elementary schools.
Updated 7/24	Hello, I am the parent of three students who have either participated in or are currently enrolled in the Dual Language program. My youngest is moving into middle school this year, so these proposed changes will not directly affect my own children. However, after watching all three of my children go through the program, I feel it's important to share my perspective. The proposal to move all Dual Language students into one elementary school is, quite honestly, very concerning. One of the challenges with the current program is that it already creates a level of separation between Dual Language students and their grade-level peers. Because they spend so much of their school day together, their opportunities to build friendships and connections with classmates outside the program are already limited. I watched each of my children struggle to form relationships beyond the small group of students in Dual Language. Consolidating every Dual Language student into a single school would only deepen that separation. Rather than being part of their broader neighborhood school community, these students would become even more isolated from their peers. Elementary school is about much more than academics—it's where children build friendships, develop social skills, and become part of a larger school community. This proposal would reduce those opportunities and could have lasting social impacts on the students in the program. I respectfully ask the district to reconsider this proposed change and to carefully weigh not only the academic implications, but also the social and emotional impact it will have on these children.
Updated 7/24	The first option isn't my first choice as that then makes it harder for parents to be dropping off/picking up children. In addition this option would now put more kids on the bus for a longer time. Option two is the best option out of what was presented. This would cause less changes for more children. What about the special education students that are in gen ed classes that struggle with changes to environment and structure.
Updated 7/24	Although I feel this is all rather ridiculous and there should be a simpler answer. I am very opposed to having grade center schools (K-3 and 4&5). My primary reason for this opposition is the staggered start times. If my son started later than 8:30 I would not be able to make it to my job in time. Being a sub, not in d47, I wouldn't make enough money to pay for childcare to help with a later start time, therefore I would likely have to stop working just because of the staggered school times. With after school activities it could be near impossible for some children to make it to their sports or activities if the start time is later than it currently is. My son already gets off the bus and has only minutes to change before having to leave for baseball, karate, or whatever other activities he has. We are in Cary so his time home is already almost 4:10 (sometimes 4:20 since the bus is so often delayed). Will it be taken into consideration to have kids that are bussed from father places be on the earlier release time??? I would be angry if my son was released later than 3:30. Or would it just be acceptable to pull him early from school every day he has something (which is most days of the week) and then I now have to drive him home. All things in our life have been planned around a 8:30-3:30 time for school. To completely change that totally uproots our daily living. It is disruptive and not beneficial. I am more in support of a language learning center. At least then, start times could remain the same. Yes, some kids may be bussed farther and parents are claiming is segregation, but aren't the parents making the decision to put their kids into dual language? They aren't being forced to pit their kids into that program. It's like sending your kid to private school or some other school focused on a certain learning. That seems like the better option of the 2. Again, all of this seems rather ridiculous
Updated 7/24	I am very unhappy with the boundary change option that could potentially combine schools/grades. I live next door to south elementary school and the thought of my 4 daughters being split up between South and west is absolutely ridiculous. Having my youngest children potentially bused to a different school while my eldest is across the street makes no sense. Dividing grades between schools eliminates school traditions between younger and older kids. It's removes mentorship provided by the older students. It causes chaos and stress to parents on multiple levels. It's a potential that negatively impacts the vast majority of families in D47. I demand the boundary planning committee schedule additional meetings with more D47 ELEMENTARY parents involved. Approving this option would have a negative impact on students, their families and our trust in the board.
Updated 7/24	Please go with the second option for a single dual language school. As a parent of three, the thought of potentially having to have my children eventually at three different schools is extremely taxing both physically and emotionally. Children thrive with stability and familiarity. Breaking them up could cause emotional trauma which provides for a negative school experience. Also the logistics of having to drive and pick my children up from different schools does not make sense. Plus add in weather conditions, this makes it even harder on parents. Please do not split up the elementary schools into two different schools based on the grades and go with one dual language school.
Updated 7/24	I have two questions: One is around transportation. Below the answer states that you don't know how much longer it might take kids on the bus. Is there away to do an analysis to determine what the longest bus rides are now and then what they will be with these options. I imagine no matter the decision they are still going to kids on buses for a decent amount of time. This seems to be one of the biggest issues that people have. Realistically, we live in a large city, kids are going to be on the bus for a long time. It's not ideal but not bad. It sounds like it needs to be equalized. Can you do a more detailed dive into how the busing might change? Provide numbers? My second question is about PTOs. If we switch to grade level centers, we will likely lose all the work that PTOs have done. Have you considered the amount of volunteer time and money from fundraising that each school receives and what might happen to this if we make the change? PTOs build community in a school and are needed. What support would the district provide support schools if loss of this type of funding and volunteer work?
Updated 7/24	My husband and I are raising our children in district 47 and we both also attended district 47 for our schooling. We both firmly believe redrawing the boundary lines would be a better more beneficial options, rather than the two current options of 1) breaking the schools apart based on grade and 2) making one school a language academy. District 47 was built on the neighborhood schooling concept and most families have chose neighborhoods based on the schools they want their children to attend. Breaking up the schools and busing children out of their neighborhood makes no sense and will not only complicate things for families but also put emotional strain on the young children. Also, breaking up the grades and splitting siblings creates unnecessary conflict for parents when it comes to drop off/pick up, along with again emotional strain as younger grade children most times rely on having their older siblings in the same building as them to feel safe and comfortable. We strongly believe the best option is to redraw the boundaries. Thank you for your consideration.
Updated 7/24	The district's stated priorities don't appear to align with either of these options. My husband and I chose to move to this community years ago with three young children because of the neighborhood schools. We did not look at any homes in Huntley because we did not like the massive split grade schools. The other option to create a centralized dual language program creates an unnecessary separation of students from their neighborhoods, friends, and family. I would like to see a third option that would better meet the priorities of the district while keeping the community schools pk-5. New developments should include developer paid schools to accommodate the increased enrollment they will bring. Why don't we see this third option? In my opinion the plans presented are not appropriate for this community and further research is needed for a better fit.
Updated 7/24	As a parent of a dual language student, the idea of a dual language academy is incredibly disheartening to me. A huge benefit to the program is the chance to learn another language while still being immersed in a regular school setting with kids they will go to school with for years. The friendships between mono and dual kids matters immensely, and isolating them by sending them to a separate school is not the solution. I would guess enrollment in the dual program would drop significantly because of this change, and I know many other dual families would consider pulling their kids from the program if this were to occur. I think the first option is also not a great one, logistically, for families. Ultimately, I think a boundary redraw, taking into consideration the upcoming developments, would be the best option for everyone and would cause the least amount of stress and upheaval for d47 families.

	I am writing to express my opposition to the proposal to create a Language Academy to house the district's dual language program. Part 1 I have taught at Coventry since the dual language program began. During that time, our Building Leadership Team (BLT) and staff have worked intentionally to integrate dual language and monolingual classrooms. Our goal has always been to create one unified school community where every student feels a sense of belonging. We have made a conscious effort to ensure that students in the dual language program are not viewed as separate from the rest of the school, but instead as valued members of one school community. While I understand there may be perceived benefits to creating a Language Academy, I believe the potential disadvantages far outweigh those benefits. More importantly, the proposal appears to move away from many of the practices that decades of research have identified as making dual language programs successful. Research consistently shows that two-way dual language programs are most effective when they intentionally bring together native English speakers and native speakers of the partner language to learn alongside one another. The purpose of these programs extends beyond bilingualism; they are designed to promote high academic achievement, biliteracy, cross-cultural understanding, and meaningful relationships among students from diverse backgrounds. The integration of students is not simply a logistical decision—it is a foundational component of the model. One of the greatest strengths of our current model is that all students benefit from learning together. Monolingual students have daily opportunities to interact with classmates from different linguistic and cultural backgrounds, while dual language students become fully integrated members of the larger school community. Research has found that well-implemented dual language programs produce strong academic outcomes for both English-speaking students and multilingual learners while also fostering cross-cultural competence and positive peer relationships. Part 2 Creating a separate Language Academy risks unintentionally creating a form of segregation. Although this is certainly not the intent, separating students by program reduces the authentic daily interactions that help children develop empathy, appreciation for different cultures, and a sense of belonging within a diverse community. It also removes opportunities for students outside the program to experience the richness that bilingual and multicultural classmates bring to their school. I am also concerned about the long-term impact on students. Attending a separate elementary school could make the transition to middle school more challenging, as students would be entering an integrated setting without having developed relationships with many of their future classmates. Additionally, staff, students, and families in the district's neighborhood schools would have fewer opportunities to understand, support, and advocate for the dual language program if it were physically separated from the rest of the district. From a staff perspective, I worry that dual language teachers would have an even smaller voice in district decision-making. Even now, as a relatively small group within the district, it can be difficult to advocate for the unique instructional needs of dual language classrooms. Housing the program in a separate building could further reduce monolingual teachers from understanding and advocating for dual language classrooms on district committees, and make collaboration with colleagues across the district more limited. Part 3 There are also equity concerns. Depending on attendance, the Language Academy could have a disproportionately lower socioeconomic population, lower levels of parent involvement due to barriers beyond families' control, and potentially become the district's only Title I building. While these outcomes may be unintended, they deserve careful consideration because they could create inequities that do not currently exist. Another significant concern is family engagement in the boundary decision-making process. Many of our Spanish-speaking families work multiple jobs and have limited time to watch informational videos, attend board meetings, or fully understand the proposed changes. Some families may also be hesitant to speak publicly or advocate for their views because of language barriers or concerns about drawing attention to themselves in the current climate. As a result, the families most directly affected by this decision may not have an equal opportunity to share their perspectives. Finally, I worry about the long-term sustainability of the dual language program itself. A hallmark of successful two-way immersion programs is maintaining a balanced enrollment of native English speakers and native speakers of the partner language. This balance allows students to serve as language models for one another and is one of the reasons these programs have such strong academic outcomes. If the program is housed in a separate school, some English-speaking families may choose not to enroll or may withdraw because they do not want their children educated apart from the general student population. Over time, this could shift the demographic balance that makes the program successful. Instead of remaining a true two-way dual language program that equally serves both language groups, it could gradually evolve into a program that functions primarily as English Learner instruction delivered in two languages. That outcome would fundamentally change the purpose and effectiveness of the program. The district has spent years building an integrated dual language program that reflects both educational best practices and our community's commitment to inclusion. As someone who has seen this work since the program's inception, I believe we should continue strengthening that vision rather than separating it. I respectfully urge the Board to preserve the integrated model, which promotes equity, academic excellence, cultural understanding, and a true sense of belonging for all students.
Updated 7/24	
	I'm writing to share my feedback regarding the two options that were recently shared regarding the Elementary Boundary changes. I appreciate the work the committee has done over the last two years. We definitely knew this wouldn't be an easy task. With that said, I do have concerns with both options that were presented. The pairing/grade level centers seems like it could be a good idea IF District 47 was set up for something like that. However, our schools were not designed for this type of model. They were designed to be neighborhood schools. Trying to piecemeal schools together, reconstruct restrooms and playgrounds and reconfiguring classrooms/staff in all 8 of the 9 Elementary schools doesn't seem feasible to complete by next school year. It seems like we are just putting a bandaids on the problem in hopes that it will fix the problems we have. What happens when those schools run out of room for a specific grade level? Will they be moved back to another school? Not to mention the cost of doing all of that. This option would also be difficult for families that would have multiple students in different schools (staggered start/dismissal times, early release days, etc). This doesn't seem like the long term solution the District needs. The Language Academy seems like the "better" of the two options, but still not the answer to what the District is needing with these boundary changes. Cohorting all of the Dual Language classes in one building gives the vibe/impression that these students are being separated from all the mono-lingual classes. While the schools that currently house the dual language programs amongst mono-lingual classes offer great culture and diversity to the whole school population, not just the students in the dual language classes. Moving to a Language Academy will take all of that away. The whole mono-lingual classes population will also be moved away from their neighborhood school. In all honesty, I felt very blindsided by the two options that were presented. I've needed this past week to really digest what all of this means. I've stayed on top of all communication and filled out surveys and never once was an idea even mentioned about these type of options. I was under the impression that boundary lines would be shifted, just as with the middle school, not entire grade levels or programs. I strongly feel it's imperative that the boundary committee meet again soon to discuss other possible options that seem more feasible, equitable and financially responsible for the students and staff of District 47.
Updated 7/24	
	We do not support the dual language academy. Both my kids are in dual at Coventry and are already socially disadvantaged due to being in dual classes. They have 80% less peers than non dual students and putting them with only dual students will not encourage other social relationships. It will discourage them and show them that they are a separate group and "not like" other students.
Updated 7/24	
	To the Board of Education and Dr. Hinz, I am a D47 parent writing to oppose Recommendation 1, the grade-level center model. I ask the Board to weigh three specific problems before the November vote. 1. It separates siblings by design. Under this model, my sons would attend two different schools for multiple years — different buildings, different staff, different start times, different school communities. The district's own middle school boundary survey identified continuity, stability, and keeping siblings together as top priorities for families. This proposal does the opposite for nearly every multi-child family in the paired zones, permanently, as a structural feature rather than a one-time transition. 2. It fragments student support services. My children receive services such as OT and speech. In a K-5 building, one support team knows a child across six years and services are delivered under one roof. Grade-level centers force those resources to be duplicated or split across paired buildings — and the district's own materials acknowledge the plan "does not move enough students to southern schools, which keeps most special education programming concentrated in those buildings." A plan whose stated goal is equitable access should not make service delivery less consistent for the students who depend on it most. 3. The transportation rationale does not hold for families like mine. This change is justified largely by long bus rides. My children do not ride a bus — like many families, we walk or drive to our neighborhood school. Under grade-level centers, we go from one school with one schedule to two buildings with staggered start and end times. That means more car trips, more traffic at two sets of curbs, and more complexity — a new transportation burden created for families in order to solve a problem we are not part of. I have seen no route-level data showing this model actually reduces total ride time; the FAQ says bus routes will only be determined after the vote. The Board is being asked to approve a transportation fix without the transportation data. If enrollment balancing is necessary, targeted boundary-line adjustments and adding the second PreK site can address capacity without dismantling the K-5 neighborhood school model that families chose this district for. I urge the Board to reject Recommendation 1, or at minimum to require sibling-schedule and special-services delivery plans plus projected route data before any vote.
Updated 7/24	
	I'm opposed to consolidating the Dual Language Program into a single Multilingual Language Academy. As a parent of students in both dual and monolingual programs, I feel strongly that segregating the dual students to a single location would have a negative impact on the community. Both mono and dual students benefit immensely from being part of the same school and having the opportunity to socialize with classmates outside of their respective program. It goes both ways; mono students benefit from interacting with dual students and vice versa. Furthermore, if dual students are isolated to a single academy, they will not have the opportunities to socialize with other students they will eventually attend middle school with. Thank you for considering my feedback.
Updated 7/24	
	Please add a third option showing redrawn boundaries for balance. Add it to the existing two options for community review and feedback.
Updated 7/24	
	As a parent of an incoming Kindergartener I am very concerned that with both options presented, he will have to change schools after one year. And possibly change again for 3rd to 5th. In this plan he would attend Hussman for Kindergarten, North for 1st and 2nd, and back to Hussman for 3rd to 4th. Or move to North for 1st and stay. This is a lot of change for little ones to absorb. I say this as someone who had to change schools in 3rd grade and it was very challenging to leave my friends, support system, and safe space at a young age. I hope that an option can be developed that will avoid such a change for the little ones.
Updated 7/24	
	I'm the parent of a first grader in the district. While the administration frames the "same bus, staggered drop-off" policy as a solution, this plan still compromises student well-being, strains working families, and creates community disruption. Forcing elementary siblings onto a single bus with multiple drop-offs means our youngest learners could face significantly longer commutes. Instead of a direct neighborhood route, children will be on buses for extended periods of time while the bus navigates a multi-school drop-off loop. Furthermore, relying on a single bus to service multiple campuses creates a single point of failure. If a bus runs late due to traffic, weather, or mechanical issues, that delay directly cascades across two campuses, not one. Additionally, this plan fractures families who do not or cannot use the district's busing system. Forcing parents to drive back-to-back routes between two different schools could double the volume of local traffic. This would potentially create gridlock around our schools and could have a negative impact on our environment due to emissions. It also strips away the ability for neighborhood walkers/siblings to walk to school together, impacting a fundamental aspect of community identity and placing an added financial strain due to added fuel costs. Staggered dismissal times create a costly childcare issue. A gap between sibling dismissals forces working parents to cut their workdays shorter to wait in a second parking lot, or pay for after-school care programs just to bridge that scheduling gap. The same could be said about staggered morning start times. Parents of multiple children may find themselves unable to get to work on time due to having two drop-offs, thus possibly requiring before-school care programs. Lastly, retrofitting an older elementary building to handle exclusively preschool and kindergarten students requires massive structural outlays for things like age-appropriate playground equipment and low-height bathroom fixtures costs that often eat into any projected operational savings. No numbers have been shared with the community regarding what each proposed option would realistically look like in practice or cost. For a proposal that would impact our children and community so significantly, it's imperative that the District provide concrete numbers regarding staggered start times, bus ride durations, and school filled seats versus capacity projections for either of the recommended options. This is the only way to make a fully informed decision and provide true transparency to the community. Thank you for your time.
Updated 7/24	
	I think its a great solution with changing grade levels. Its fair and it solves the class size. Like everything it takes time to adjust but its a great long term solution. Downers Grove has that in place and it has been working by helping the students engage in small class sizes and improvement in grades and test scores.
Updated 7/24	
	A "NO" vote on the proposed school restructuring is the most responsible choice for our community right now. While change is sometimes necessary, this current plan introduces significant developmental and academic risks for our children. The boundary committee needs to return to the drawing board and return with a more thoughtful, better-aligned solution based on the following key concerns: Key Reasons to Vote "NO" 1. Loss of Mentorship and Leadership In a traditional K–5 configuration, 4th and 5th graders naturally step into leadership roles as school role models. This environment builds essential self-confidence and emotional maturity. Shifting to a K–3 system strips these students of those key growth years, abruptly thrusting them into a new intermediate or middle school setting where they instantly become the youngest, least experienced cohort all over again. 2. Critical Developmental Mismatch The period between 3rd and 5th grade represents a pivotal cognitive shift from "learning to read" to "reading to learn." Forcing a school transition right in the middle of this developmental window breaks the continuity of critical teacher-student relationships and disrupts established instructional methods at a time when stability matters most. 3. Curriculum and Instructional Disconnect K–3 programs are heavily tailored toward foundational literacy and numeracy. Without a seamless K–5 pipeline, 4th and 5th-grade educators at receiving schools face a major hurdle aligning their expectations and teaching strategies with the specific curricula students brought from their previous schools, leading to potential learning gaps. Bottom Line: The current proposal prioritizes logistical shuffling over student development and curriculum continuity. The boundary committee must re-evaluate and present a strategy that preserves student stability. Given these concerns, what specific alternative models—such as redrawing boundary lines while keeping the K–5 structure. For example south is a packed school and having the boundary past Haligus makes zero sense. Those kids are riding in buses for a very long time. If that truly is the concern the committee should meet again re draw the boundary's. They are saying this solves two things bus time and transportation. If we were to do the new structure based on distance within the boundaries it would cause MORE bus time and MORE busses needed due to the staggered start. What is the alternative solution?
Updated 7/24	

Updated 7/24	Our children attend South Elementary. The idea of kids being split up into different schools due to grade level would pose a logistical issue. The stress on parents attempting to navigate bus or car travel with multiple children at separate schools does not seem like an ideal situation. You would also deal with cross traffic, boundary bus issues, a lack in PTA volunteering and board member availability if one household enrolls in multiple elementary schools. Additionally, our children will be attending Bernotas years from now but I feel they should qualify for Lundahl boundaries due to its close proximity to the Gates neighborhood. Kids in our area can safely ride their bikes (transportation would be easier) versus traveling over McHenry Avenue.
Updated 7/24	I strongly oppose any proposal that splits elementary grade levels between schools or requires students to change elementary schools midway through their elementary years. From a parent's perspective, these options seem to prioritize logistics over the well-being of children. Under one proposal, my son would attend kindergarten at the same school as his older sister, transfer to a different elementary school for first and second grade, and then return to the original school for third through fifth grade. That means three separate transitions during elementary school, all before middle school. It is difficult to understand how this could be considered in the best interest of children. I am equally concerned about any option/boundary change result that would move some students/households to a different school in the middle of their elementary career. (created by option #2). Children have established friendships, know their teachers and staff, and are preparing together for the transition to middle school. Removing children from that environment to possibly a different school is unnecessarily disruptive and asks them to sacrifice relationships and stability for an administrative solution. Schools are communities, not just buildings with available seats. The relationships children build with classmates, teachers, and families over six years matter. Any proposal that requires students to bounce between schools or lose their elementary community just before middle school should be removed from consideration. I urge the Board to prioritize continuity and stability for students, even if doing so requires more creative solutions to enrollment challenges. Let's not "solve" a problem by creating another.
Updated 7/24	I am not really a fan of either of these options. My child is currently a student at Coventry and both options would drastically effect us. If a language academy is established, he will be removed from the school that he loves so much as he is not in the dual language program. Additionally, our neighbor, who he is good friends with, child will be and that program and 2 good friends and neighbors would not be able to attend school together (they are a year apart in age). This would then cause my child to have to cross McHenry Ave to attend South Elementary, where the majority of the students will be attending middle school at either Lunhal or Bernotis where my child will be going to Hannah. This will effect the friends he makes and the high schools they go to as he will be attending South High School. The grade level housing would effect us and make things challenging because depending if Coventry or Cantabery have Pre K program, my child and his younger sibling will not be in the same school, assuming the school is Pre-K thru 2nd and then 3rd -5th. As my oldest will be in 3rd when their sibling starts in K. Also, the logistics of picking up 2 kids, kinder and 3rd grader or even 1st and 4th from 2 different schools would not be easy as I would not the only parent doing so and this would cause a lot of congestion in the neighborhood for both schools. I think the option Joe advised at the school board meeting needs to be looked at and considered fully. Why was a option to just redraw boundaries not brought to the table for family to see and review. I hope you will really take the concerns laid out here, along with other community feedback into consideration to provide the best schooling options possible. Thank you for your time.
Updated 7/24	Hi, I'm concerned about the school pairings that would greatly affect how how school day goes. Right now, I have 1 child going in to his last year of preschool, 1 going into 1st and 1 going into 2nd. We don't get bus service e since we live close enough to South, so kids walk/ride bikes. If this option were to pass, that means next fall, I'd have 1 at West and 2 at South and the staggered pick up times/double drop off and pick up, would eat in to our day greatly. My walkers would now be forced on to buses. My kids would be separated from their siblings. My middle had a tough start to kindy and it was so nice that his sisters classroom was next door and they could grab her to comfort him the first day. That wouldn't be possible for my youngest if he is separated from his older sister with the school pairings. They wouldn't be able to use their saber cash to read/visit each others classrooms. These are small but special things that make south so great and I'm afraid it will be lost with this change. Among other concerns. There has to be a way to make the boundaries make more sense without forcing these kids to change schools every few years.
Updated 7/24	Among the many concerns I have with the current suggestions, the statements below are a few that are very concerning. -School start and end times would need to shift slightly between paired schools due to transportation needs. Staggered schedules would still allow siblings to be picked up and dropped off in their neighborhoods at the same time. -New bus routes will be determined after a decision is approved by the Board of Education. The bussing proposal under the grade level center model MUST be described in actuality to the community PRIOR to the decision being made. In the video sent, it was mentioned several times that one concern being addressed was the amount of times students are spending on the bus. If the proposed plan is for both grade level center populations to board the bus at the same time in the morning, the kids who have the later start are then spending more time on the bus in the morning, and vice versa for the other group on the afternoon. This does not make sense for students. Imagine a family with a 1st grader and a 4th grader. Let's say, hypothetically, that the K-2 building adopts a 8:20-3:00 schedule, and the 4-5 building runs a 8:50-3:30 school day. Is a 30 minute stagger even enough? Any longer just means MORE time spent on a bus. In McHenry, which is a referenced district that operates on this model, they are staggered a whole 50 minutes apart for start and end times. If these 2 students are picked up at the same time, that means the 4th grade student starting school at 8:50 is being picked up as if they need to be somewhere by 8:20 (because other K-2 riders in the route do) and so they are acting as if their day begins at, let's say, 7:50 when they get picked up by the bus. Boarding a bus an hour (maybe even more for some kids?) prior to a school day so that they can make 2 stops to drop off some students and then have to wait on the bus and continue to their building is too much time on a bus. This is the amount of time mentioned on the webpage that states that extended time on a bus can cause students to become dis regulated and therefore impact their learning. We have just added that much additional time that EVERY bussed student. In the afternoon, a 6 year old first grader who is done with school at 3:00 now has to get on a bus and wait another 30 minutes for the other school to dismiss and board to begin their trip home? If the is significant of an amount of time is being added to all students days on a BUS, that is unacceptable. If we are inadvertently increasing the amount of time a child is away from home during they day, one would think the priority would be to increase their instructional time, not they time they spend on a bus, in an often chaotic and overstimulating environment. The proposal sends kids to school on the earlier schedule, and has their arrival home as based off of the later schedule. This is not what is right for students. This information must be clear and presented prior to vote.
Updated 7/24	I strongly oppose the proposal to move to grade-level elementary schools in Crystal Lake District 47. I have three daughters, each two years apart, and one of the biggest benefits of our current neighborhood school is that they can all attend the same elementary school together. Keeping siblings together is important for our family. It creates consistency, strengthens their sense of community, and makes school life much easier to manage. From a practical standpoint, this proposal would create significant challenges for our family. We plan to walk to school from our home whenever possible. If my daughters had to attend different schools based on grade level, it would be impossible to walk them both to school and manage pickups and drop-offs at separate locations. Instead of encouraging walking and neighborhood connections, this change would force many families like ours to drive between schools, increasing traffic, time, and stress. The current neighborhood school model allows families to build lasting relationships with teachers, staff, and other families over many years. Splitting siblings across different schools takes away those connections and creates unnecessary logistical burdens. Please reconsider this proposal and keep elementary schools organized so that siblings can attend the same school together. I believe this better supports families, strengthens our neighborhoods, and makes daily life more manageable for parents and students alike.
Updated 7/24	The building pairings will make it very hard for working parents who rely on their kids to have the same time schedule and for older siblings to help with younger siblings. I am also concerned for kids who start at Woodscreek then go to glacier ridge and then go back to Woodscreek that is a lot of transitions for young kids. Also how would it work with staff? Would the teachers get to choose where they want to be or would they just be assigned by grade level?
Updated 7/24	I am seriously concerned with the two options that were presented for the "boundary changes." These two options do not address the issues with the large group of kids coming from the steeple run/wyndwood neighborhood. Our kids are already on the bus for an hour and cross northwest highway. The amount of time on the afternoon bus causes them to miss some practices and activities as it is. I thought a huge concern with the "boundary changes" would be addressing bus time and crossing major roads? These changes keep our children on the bus for even longer and are still crossing a major highway. There were no actual boundary changes introduced to the "boundary change" proposals. This does a serious disservice to every kid in our neighborhood who were not even considered in these choices.
Updated 7/24	I have concerns with both of the proposed options for boundary changes. The first option, grade-level centers, poses logistical issues. For families with more than one child in the district, especially working families, the differing arrival/dismissal times are going to be challenging and inconvenient. There is also something to be said about having children in the same building from K-5. It creates a sense of community that will be difficult to recreate when children are so often switching buildings. The second option, multilingual language academy, is also not a great solution. It is purposefully creating segregation. This small number of students will only have exposure to each other all the way until middle school. Meanwhile the students that are actually in Coventry's boundaries will be bussed further away to other schools. Dual language should be offered at all schools so that each student can attend their "home" school. It has been addressed that Route 14 is a natural separation, but that separation doesn't seem to be working anymore. Children that need to cross this road should be bussed and boundaries should be drawn to accommodate new developments and current and future projections of student population in each building. Thank you for your time!
Updated 7/24	I am writing as a Crystal Lake resident who has been following the elementary boundary discussions closely. While I do not currently have children attending District 47, I care deeply about the long-term success of our schools and our community. I have watched the recent Board meetings, reviewed the information that has been shared on the district's website, and have been paying close attention to the conversations taking place throughout the community. First, I would like to thank the Board for listening to public input and encouraging community participation. I especially appreciated the discussion at the most recent meeting regarding the possibility of requesting a third option from the Elementary Boundary Committee. I believe that suggestion of a boundary redraw deserves serious consideration before a final decision is made in November. Based on everything I have read and learned, I strongly oppose Option 1. Transitioning to grade-level attendance centers would fundamentally change the elementary school experience in Crystal Lake. One of the strengths of our community is its neighborhood elementary schools, and I believe preserving that model should remain a priority whenever possible. The proposed change would impact not only students but also families, neighborhoods, transportation, and the sense of community that develops around local schools. As someone who lives on the north side of Crystal Lake, I also understand the importance of ensuring that attendance boundaries make geographic sense and reflect the way our community has grown. With significant residential development occurring in recent years and many new developments in the works, I believe this is the right opportunity to complete a comprehensive boundary redraw rather than implementing a solution that many residents feel does not address the underlying issues. I recognize that boundary changes are never easy and that no plan will satisfy everyone. However, the amount of community feedback expressing concern with the 2 current proposals suggests there is value in taking additional time to explore another alternative. A full boundary redraw would allow the district to evaluate all attendance areas comprehensively rather than making more limited adjustments that may require additional revisions in the near future. I respectfully encourage the Board to vote against Option 1 and direct the Elementary Boundary Committee to reconvene and develop a third proposal that includes a comprehensive boundary redraw. Providing the community with a third option would demonstrate a commitment to transparency, thoughtful planning, and collaboration before making a decision that will affect District 47 for many years.
Updated 7/31	The new boundary options are not ideal for families. A big reason why we moved to our current home was to be close the elementary school so my three children could bike or I would have a 3 minute drive to their school. Splitting schools would make the daily commute much more difficult and we would loose the community/neighborhood feel. Please reconsider.
Updated 7/31	I am writing on objection to both options proposed. If you go through with option 1, every kid going into 1st grade this year will go to a different school for one year then have to go back to the school they were originally at. It's disruptive. Splitting up young siblings like this option will do for many families is also inconvenient and undesirable for parents. I cannot imagine the bus schedule and seasoned teachers will want to have to switch schools either. Overall, this option is one I did not expect and for multiple reasons do not support. The 2nd option, is completely inconvenient to dual language families and has legal implications. I am asking the board to actually sit down and do a boundary review like we were told was happening the past few years. I get something needs to be done, but both options proposed have a negative impact on way more students and families than some tweaking of boundaries will do.
Updated 7/31	As both a parent and teacher in D47, I feel very strongly that option 2, the Multilingual Language Academy is not the way to go in order to address boundary concerns. It seems to go against the inclusive environment we strive for in our district by segregating all Dual students into one location. A concern of the district and community is to keep kids at their neighborhood schools, but this would do the opposite for those students in dual language. Would this not be detrimental to the program as a whole, as well? I thought one key aspect of the dual language program was for both mono and dual students to co-mingle, therefore creating a more immersive environment. This would also devastate many Coventry families and teachers, a close-knit community that has worked hard to achieve such an amazing climate and culture.

Updated 7/31	We have many concerns about school parings option. - How will families decide on which school to help the PTO? Families shouldn't have to pick and choose which school their time and funds go towards. - There is great benefits of having a school with multiple ages. The proposed option you will lose the older kids helping the younger kids. The 'classroom' helpers benefits all kids. - transportation/drop off and picks will be a nightmare. Are we changing the start time of one of the schools? How am I suppose to be in two places/schools at once? - sense of community ? Completely down the drain. - Will we know have to attend multiple school events (meet the teacher, choir, multicultural night, bingo etc) Thinking of my kids at two different schools is an absolute disappointment.
Updated 7/31	I also wanted to note my concerns about school start and end times if option one is seriously being considered by the school board. I currently drive and pick up my kids. I have a big concern about having to choose between what child to pick up and what children to take the bus if they are separated by school at such young ages. In my opinion, a 4th grader is too young to walk home alone from bus drop off and that is what would have to happen if I am stuck in line picking up my younger child from North Elementary which for me, is an entire mile and a half farther away than where they are now at Husmann. If the start and end times are too close together, this is a huge inconvenience and liability for me as a parent and something I am very uncomfortable with. I would have to consider bussing all of my kids to avoid that and I don't think it's fair to have my kids take the bus when I am willing and wanting to drive them to and from school. Driving them is what I am most comfortable with while they are younger. I have major concerns on the implication of this as a parent and felt the most recent proposal and update should have included more information on start and end times being considered.
Updated 7/31	I think that the school boundaries need to be redrawn so the children all attend one k-5 school.
Updated 8/14	If Coventry can only house 5 dual language classes per grade, what happens when we outgrow that? Will we eventually need to lower the number of English speaking students admitted into the program? If that happens, the ratio of English to Spanish speakers would be off and the dual language model would move from a two-way dual language model (English and Spanish speakers combined and learning from each other) to a one-way dual language model (only Spanish students learning both language with no immersion of English speaking peers). Another unintended consequence of that would be that we end up with one primarily Hispanic school, rather than diversity across the community. This could also happen just from English speaking families opting out of the program because they want to be with their neighbors and aren't interested in attending a separate dual language academy. In either scenario, there is a risk of creating a greater racial and cultural separation between schools. I'd love to hear more on the districts plans to address this.
Updated 8/14	To whom this may concern, I am writing this as a parent of a student in D47 as well as an employee. This recent proposed boundary changes in fact do not feel like boundaries as much as it feels like breaking apart a community. The "language center" that has been proposed not only feels like a segregation issue but a human right issue. From the most recent information available the program serves more than 1,000 students which includes one third native English speakers and two thirds native Spanish speakers. Many of the parents of English speaking students said they will pull their children from the program. That leaves many Spanish speaking children that do not have that option to be pulled out. In light of our current state of our country that feels very unsettling. In our employee portal there is information on what to do if ICE is to come into our schools and tries to take a child. The fact that the board even thought this was an option is truly unsettling and not the crystal lake community I have always loved. The split school proposal would effect every single student currently enrolled in D47 elementary as well as a large amount of staff. In the most recent poll of parents concerns with boundary changes on our employee portal 81% were parents or guardians. The primary concern from that poll was the emotional and social well being, particularly regarding maintaining friendships and familiar environment. This split school option goes against both of those. The concerns that were brought up about long bus rides and students safely crossing route 14 is effecting some students but this would effect every student. Many families buy homes so they can walk to school, this option would eliminate that for half of their elementary school experience. With this option in place the children would have to get use to yet another school the emotional impact that will take on the students will be huge. The benefit of having K-5 while having older kids in the building able to mentor and support younger students is truly something wonderful, I see it everyday at work. The staff impact of this is also huge, many staff including myself wanted to stay at the school I am currently working at for many years to come, if this in place that is no longer possible. The emotional and mental health impact this is going to take on staff will be truly heartbreaking to watch. Especially following the 2024 events of the district not treating their employees properly, this just adds to the feeling. I work at North, to say that school is something special is an under statement. Michelle Barrett has worked so hard to make North feel like a family not only to the staff but also the students. We were named an exceptional school for a reason. The thought that the school board wants to break that apart and destroy all the hard work and heart that has gone into that school is heartbreaking. The students and staff deserve more than that.
Updated 8/14	Please consider a boundary review instead of the current options that have been proposed. The disruption that the new outcomes could cause is hefty and not in the spirit of heling our kids develop.
Updated 8/14	I don't agree with these options for our community. One option sends families running from one school to another to drop off various kids at too many locations, causing fragmented communication systems and does not solve our overcrowding on the northside. The community feeling we all have for our neighborhood schools will be gone and there will be many more logistical and support staff inconsistencies. The Dual Language Academy option for us is a much more dangerous option that would take our city and divide it up based on your home language. English speaking families will likely be less inclined to enroll their students in a building where their children are isolated from their monolingual peers and neighborhood community. It would weaken the dual language program, would not solve any of the problems that the dual language program has maintaining staff, and lower the diversity across the non-dual language schools. This is plain and simple segregation on the part of the district. At the last board meeting, board members asked several questions about these options, and at least one board member requested that they look at a third option. Also at the last board meeting, only one person stood up to talk about their concerns about the options. We request you look at another option to solve the problem, without causing more issues noted above.
Updated 8/14	It seems like the main issue is the need for a Pre K on the North side of town. Was there an effort to secure a location to fill that need so as to not have to effect all the schools? Recommendation #1 is an unacceptable option for our family.
Updated 8/14	As a North parent, I support Recommendation 2, the Multilingual Language Academy. I understand this would mean Dual Language students leaving North, including some of my children's friends, and I know the impact on Coventry families would be much greater. I don't take that disruption lightly. Looking at both options, Recommendation 2 feels like the better long-term choice for the district. The grade-level center option would disrupt so many families by moving kids between schools during their elementary years, separating siblings, and changing the K-5 neighborhood school experience. The Language Academy addresses more of the district's larger issues while allowing most students to stay in K-5 schools. It also creates an opportunity to strengthen the Dual Language program by bringing students, teachers, and resources together in one building. Neither option is perfect, but Recommendation 2 offers the better long-term solution for D47.
Updated 8/14	I work in a school district which went to grade level schools 2 years ago. We are now moving back to the traditional K-5 model (neighborhood schools) because we did not see any benefits. We saw that the transportation budget grew immensely because buses are going around town rather then neighborhoods to pick up kids. We saw a majority of families express they were strongly against this model. Siblings were split up and went to different schools. Siblings had drastically different bus pickup times and drop off times. Parents struggled to attend events such as conferences and open house because of the distance between schools and similar timing of events. We also saw teacher moral drop as established teams and partnerships were broken apart as teachers were sent to new buildings. In addition, schools needed to be modified to accommodate the different ages. This included playgrounds, bathrooms, and the classrooms themselves. These changes all came at a cost that did not need to be paid because the K-5 model already had those accommodations in place. Additionally, the option which creates a language academy has multiple drawbacks. Many of these are the same as listed above, but taking a specific group of students (multi-lingual/dual language students) and isolating them away from their peers in a different school is a bandaoid solution that does not actually address the problem of retaining quality staff members and gaining access to resources. Moving teachers to one building does not address these concerns and it limits the ability of the program to grow. As a parent and as a teacher who saw this happen, I strongly urge District 47 to look at a boundary modification or a different 3rd option rather than grade level centers or a language center. The monetary cost to the district and impact this will have on students, teachers, and families will be detrimental to the success of all our children. It is also concerning that the "boundary committee" came up with two solutions that do not address the concern of the boundaries. If your team is assembled based on their expertise with boundaries...then work on the boundaries. Do not come up ideas which isolate students, increase spending, and separate successful teacher teams.
Updated 8/14	The Multilingual Language Academy appears least disruptive to the most amount of families. It looks like more districts have taken the approach of creating a language academy likely because it creates a stronger language program and more camaraderie amongst students and staff within the program, while being the least disruptive to the most amount of families within the district.
Updated 8/14	I live in cambria subdivision and currently zoned for Canterbury. I have 3 kids and having 2 elementary schools sounds absolutely ridiculous whe it comes to transportation. We are currently part of the cary park district. I feel like we should be rezoned for cary district. the elementary school is bike-able and their busses already come into our neighborhood due to 1 street being zoned for cary. Right now my kids participate in park district activities but never get to meet kids they are/will be in school with because of the outrageous boundaries. This would solve the overcrowding at canebury and free us some of the buses.
Updated 8/14	Please provide the research, data and plans that that support the statements made about the enrollment imbalances, transportation and financial efficiency. Please provide the information that has led to the dismissal of all other options of boundary changes.
Updated 8/14	I am a former teacher and parent of five children in Crystal Lake. One graduated from D155 this year, another is at CLC, and I have three in D47 (8th, 5th, and 3rd grade). All of our children have been through the dual language program with D47. I want to start out by saying how wonderfully supported, challenged, and encouraged all of our children have been in their years as dual language students with D47. We are also a bilingual household and all of our children have been raised bilingually in Spanish and English since birth. I am a former teacher for 13 years, a National Board Certified teacher, and an experienced dual language teacher. I have worked as an elementary and middle school teacher in Honduras and Miami, as well as for D47 as a dual language teacher, ELL coordinator and bilingual parent liaison. I have strong feelings against the Multilingual language academy proposal for several reasons. First of all, the naming of this building is entirely inaccurate. Multilingual means "many languages"; However, the only language other than English that will be taught there is Spanish. It is a bilingual program and the dual language program works because it promotes diversity and inclusion within the existing buildings, with all students in the community. There are some key reasons moving the dual language students from their existing elementary schools to one language academy would be detrimental to the students and the foundation of the program. Sheltered instruction enhances isolation, it does not promote community. These dual language students will be entirely with ONLY dual language peers for 6 years. It will not be until students begin middle school that they begin to mix in socially with non-dual language peers. This will lead to more isolation and segregation upon entering middle school. The creation of a language academy will remove the diversity out of our existing elementary buildings. Hispanic families will be encouraged (as they are now) to enroll their students in the dual language program and an exclusive dual language building. It is stated on the D47 website that this language academy would be the biggest benefit to the teachers; however, the dual language academy would not solve any problems the district is having maintaining staff. However, after speaking with many dual language teachers at all their buildings, these very same teachers do not want this move. Most dual language teachers leave for higher pay in other districts, not because they are looking for an all bilingual building with staff that is also 100% bilingual. English speaking families will likely be less inclined to enroll their children in a building where their students are isolated from their monolingual peers and neighborhood community. Currently, the wide majority of the English-speaking families enrolled in the program have Coventry, Canterbury, and North already as their home schools. Very few English speaking parents CHOOSE for their
Updated 8/19	1. The BPAC I mentioned is a group required by law to be in existence. Bilingual parent advisory council. I have FOIA'ed information about it and would encourage board members to also look into this and whether or not they were consulted. 2. It is seeming to me and many others that several board members and Dr Hinz are pushing for a language academy. Why has this information like the power point not been disseminated in Spanish? I am aware that the website can be translated, it does not translate well (I am bilingual) and the power points can not be automatically translated. Furthermore, while I know you can't possibly translate into all of the languages that parent speak across this district, it would be reasonable to ask that something that will fundamentally alter the dual Language program specifically for Spanish speakers be translated into Spanish. When I spoke with my Spanish-only speaking friends, NONE of them knew about the boundary change possibilities. A few questions: 1. My children attended both the dual program and the EC program. Will EC be available at the language academy in the same manner it is now? How about special education services? 2. If dual language students only make up 50% of the ELL population, What is the percentage of ELL non-dual language students that identify as Hispanic / Latinx? (I'm still not convinced that this option is not segregation of a specific ethnic group.) 3. Would you be willing to make public your conversations with ISBE around the legality of the language academy because our collaborative conversation went very differently and it was clear that ISBE felt that this model was not legal. 4. Would the board be willing to have an anonymous survey for dual language teachers to get their honest feedback? I do not agree with Ms Stanton's comment that simply stating that they liked having targeted PD together is an indicator that they are enthusiastic about this option. I have heard quite the opposite. 5. Will you be editing the list of mentioned schools / districts that supposedly have language academies to reflect a more accurate list of comparisons so as not to misinform the public?

Updated 8/27	How about a third option??? Option 1 would create more bus routes or longer bus rides. Also instead of having the feeling of a school community, the children are being shuffled from one school to another. What about working parents having to do staggered drop offs at different schools? What about school functions? Parents night? Volunteering? All of these would be difficult to manage in multiple schools. Option 2 sounds like segregation, plain and simple. This option would make many parents pull their kids from the dual language program. Parents were assured that even if their children were in dual language, they would still be socialized with both dual and monolingual students.
Updated 8/27	Did individuals who created these proposals consider the impact of the segregation for the proposed "academy"? The community optics of having dual language completely separate? I would like an explanation of how having a separate "academy" creates a more cohesive community for Crystal Lake.
Updated 8/27	The recent strategic plan implemented by D47 calls for equity and to consider each and every student's experience. As you move through the elementary school boundary decision, I implore you to please keep special education students in mind and not simply dismiss them as a separate category. They deserve the privileges of attending school with their siblings, with their neighbors and in community. The experience we've had with my daughter with Down syndrome has not allowed these privileges. Let me give you an example: Our daughter spent grades 2-5 at Glacier Ridge (GR)in Adjusted Learning. We lived on the northeast side of town, which made GR the farthest school geographically for us. She knew no one going in: No neighbors, no siblings. Can you imagine how your child would feel in this situation? Dr Gruper & staff did their best to help integrate her and build friendships while at Glacier Ridge, which we were thankful for. However, this did not come close to the benefits she would have had going to school with her neighborhood community and familiar faces. Our daughter is now in middle school. With the current location of the special education programs, she is placed at Bernotas. Close to 100% of the Glacier Ridge students she integrated with and has connections with go to Lundahl, so she once again was put into a school of unfamiliar peers. When she pushes in to Gen Ed classes now at Bernotas, those students don't know her because they didn't go to elementary school with her and she doesn't know them. This makes her experience that much more difficult to start over in building new connections. It is a much more challenging age the middle school level. Plus, if you are not familiar with Bernotas, the special programs "wing" of the building is about as segregated as could be from the Gen Ed population. For a district who wants to espouse the values of equity, inclusion and community, why does our district seem to exclude the most marginalized students in our district with these values? Again, I implore you to not dismiss special education students in planning. They deserve the same privileges as their typical peers. Please act on the values of equity and inclusion for each and every student. Thank you for your time,
Updated 8/27	Please add Joe Keegan's boundary redraw as a third option.
Updated 8/27	Please consider a boundary redraw, like the ones Joe Keegan presented, instead of these 2 options!! Splitting the grades between schools would make it impossible for families to be at events, volunteer, do drop off and pick up, with multiple children. The dual language academy is segregating those families and children. Redrawing the boundaries is a much better option! It keeps neighborhoods together and families together in schools.
Updated 8/27	I don't think either option is a working solution for our district. I believe re-drawing the boundaries would be the best option. I'm not sure how either one of the options currently presented would truly help w busing and really feels like it can become more difficult for family with multiple kids in different grade levels.
Updated 8/27	Will you please consider a third option of redrawing boundary lines for the elementary schools?
Updated 8/27	Will the district survey dual families to see how this decision will impact current enrollment in the dual program? Given that dual-language success relies on a strict 50/50 balance of native English and native Spanish speakers, If native English-speaking enrollment drops due to longer commutes, how will the district prevent the program from devolving into a traditional, segregated ESL model? How does the district plan to mitigate the risk of bilingual teacher turnover caused by uprooting established educators from their preferred neighborhood schools?
Updated 8/27	I am not a fan of both options being presented. We have concerns similar to many Crystal lake families. There is a third option of redrawing the boundaries in a traditional way. I do ask to please consider smaller neighborhoods when redrawing these lines. We live in the Indian hill trail subdivision and have seen parent map drafts cutting our neighborhood into two schools. First, it doesn't fit the model of the district wanting to keep transportation costs and times down. But secondly and most importantly completely cuts a small cohesive neighborhood into two schools. The impact on the children would be significant as they are all very close. The parents all rely on one another for school activities and support. The idea of cutting this small neighborhood in half should not be considered. Thank you
Updated 8/27	I strongly oppose grade level centers. Having a wide variety of ages allows students to act as leaders. It also allows students to develop six year relationships with building staff, especially Encore teachers, admin, and non-certified staff. Also, losing neighborhood schools would be a downside. Not to mention the logistical nightmare for families with multiple children. Surely, there is a better solution.
Updated 8/27	My child will enter the D47 school district next year and I am very concerned to hear about the approach the school board is taking to address population growth in the elementary schools. It seems that not all options are being considered fully and that the impact has not been assessed from all angles. Other schools who've adopted this approach successfully have multiple school buildings on the same campus... nowhere is this the case for Crystal Lake. As a parent, I demand that the school board expand the options they're considering before voting in November. We will be watching, we will be taking notes, and we will be voting in school board elections.
Updated 8/27	Hello, I listened into the board meeting tonight and I continue to have concerns and questions. It was stated that if option one was chosen then the committee would work with CLETA on start and stop times. How can a parent have a true opinion on this option without knowing what start and stop times will be? I would have kids at one school one mile from me and another child at another school a mile and a half farther if this option is chosen. No one has answered me yet on if I should have any concerns on start and end times being so close together! I won't be able to pick up and drop off all of my young children. This is a huge point of stress for me as a parent and I would appreciate more transparency on what options are even being thought about regarding that. I would also just like to write in again on how disruptive option one is to parents who will have young children in both schools. I would appreciate a response at least acknowledging my concerns on the start and stop times and how the option one plan would allow for children to be picked up and dropped off. Even if there is not a concrete start and stop time being considered, I would like more information on how it will look. Thank you.
Updated 8/27	PLEASE PLEASE PLEASE DON'T BREAK UP INDIAN HILL TRAIL NEIGHBORHOOD!! Our neighborhood is small enough to keep in one school! It's ridiculous to separate a neighborhood this size. These kids have grown together from day one. It affects daily life as well! This entire neighborhood works as support system for one another with coordinating car pooling, school activities and to school events together because they are in the same school. To separate would be a bigger disruption to families past just changing school boundaries. Zoom out, and look at the bigger effect of what it would do for busy working families that rely on their established local "village/support system" around them that helps raising kids in a growing and busy lifestyle in today's society.
Updated 8/27	I am interested in re-drawing the boundary lines instead of switching to k-2 and 3-5. I also am NOT in favor of the dual language program being moved to one school. We just moved into the district, and its a little disheartening to hear all of the uproar this is causing the town. I dont see why simply redrawing the boundary is not a preferred option? We currently will have to drive across town for both elementary and middle school options were assigned to. We pass a closer elementary school and middle school on our way to where we're currently assigned. Doesn't make sense.
Updated 8/27	My husband and I would like a boundary re-draw to be an actual option. Currently it is not an option. Thank you
Updated 8/27	I have a few more questions/comments after tonight's board meeting. 1. You quoted \$7,500 to add a bathroom for prek. Where did you receive these quotes? Is this the a single bathroom addition? Or to add multiple stalls or bathrooms for prek? 2. What is the budget for moving resources? It will cost money to move split resources, such as books, to make sure they are grade appropriate for the schools. I remember the library quoted \$1 million to move their books to a new location. Although our school libraries are smaller, you'll be moving books to multiple locations to accommodate the grade changes. 3. Have you taken into the account of loss of staff, such as playground supervisors or paras, who would not be able to switch schools and pick their kids up in time? These are already positions tough to fill. 4. Only 2% of respondents to your survey about the boundary changes in the spring were Spanish. The results are biased and discriminatory. 5. What happens to the PTO funded resources? 6. Will paired schools reduce volunteers? Parents will be forced to split their time between their kids schools. 7. What happens to the staff at North who aren't certified as pre-k? 8. How are the encore teachers divided among paired schools? One more question. Have you taken into account the types of subdivisions? You listed 11 new developments. There's at least 2 that are 55+ communities. Are those part of the 11?
Updated 8/27	Both of these options presented seem too extreme, especially for North to be torn apart & for Coventry to be gutted for a language academy. Is it possible to find a building to rent, like the old Health Bridge, for a more centrally located preschool? This would alleviate a lot of issues & not tear apart our North school family or gut another school. It'd make more sense to use Coventry or Canterbury as a central location for the preschool/Wehde area and then redraw the boundaries from there!
Updated 8/27	We feel the boundary map redraw would best address these issues, for all families to ensure parents could be able to drop off and pick up their children from the same elementary school. Some families would have to be at 3 different schools at once, and this is just not possible or logical. Splitting up grade schools is not only more complicated for families but it also would cause more undue stress.
Updated 8/27	This is terrible change to the elementary school! My kids/friends/buddies that live across the street will no longer be able to walk to school together, be classroom buddies or see them in the hallways. That is one thing they look forward to, is seeing their friends that live on the same street. Not to mention we help echother if something comes up and we cant get our kids. District is not only disrupting friendships but family support systems! You will have a very angry community. And being at the school with my kids is the only think thats keeping me in Crystal lake and not moving! You dont realize how important friendship/community is when it comes to our children. We put moving somewhere else to keep our kids in their schools!
Updated 8/27	I believe neither of the proposed options are beneficial to the district as a whole. It seems that the Howard doesn't even really believe that these are good ideas. It's like putting lipstick on a pig. I have no desire to have my elementary aged children and 2 different school and I'd venture to guess no one else does either. This options do not seems to be a long term solution. Redraw the boundaries and actually make a change that will stand the test of time. Don't split up siblings, inconvenience parents by doing 2 picks ups or waiting for 2 busses and bussing kids out of their neighborhood all together. Please, please listen to the community and what they want. But what is bring proposed is NOT it! Redraw the boundaries and keep most of the kids in their neighborhood schools!
Updated 8/27	To whom it may concern, I have a daughter at North Elementary and am strongly opposed to the grade center proposal (#1). The language academy proposal (#2) or adjustments to existing boundaries are preferable. I do not understand why a boundary adjustment proposal has not been presented in addition to the radical changes of Recommendations 1 and 2 — I know of other districts with comparable or bigger road boundaries than Route 14 that bus students across them. At the minimum, a boundary adjustment proposal should be presented so that the district can demonstrate that it would not solve enrollment challenges to an acceptable degree. There will be significant disruption in creating grade centers, including the relocation of teachers' classrooms and materials, such as library collections, and playground reconstruction, only for the grades at each center to potentially require adjustment in a few years with further demographic changes. Teacher morale would be degraded, with the effects passed on to the students. I expect the average student transportation time to increase since grade centers will typically be outside local neighborhoods. Parents of students in different centers will have to make tedious trips to multiple schools, and it will be harder for parents to coordinate their children's education with teachers at different centers. North Elementary is currently the only state-designated School of Excellence in the district and should be a beacon to the other schools. There is no guarantee that North will retain its status after being merged with Husmann, an embarrassing loss for the district. I have talked to other parents who share my concerns, and will oppose Recommendation 1 through all available channels

Updated 8/27	Both solutions are completely ridiculous and have severe problems. Creating a language center where you send all the kids who are in dual language honestly just sounds like segregation and is a disgusting option. Not to mention having to bus kids from all different areas to one school seems like it would be problematic for families whose kids live far from the dual language school. The second option of splitting grade levels is just ridiculous. No parent wants to have two drop offs for their kids who are siblings and have to go to different elementary schools, not to mention have an elementary school child have to switch schools after only a few years seems like too much change for someone that young. Honestly to even offer either of these solutions when the obvious solution is to just redraw the maps. Like you have already redrawn the map yearly so just continue to do that. Nobody likes these ideas and nobody supports it. You are going to have a lot of people leaving Crystal Lake if you do this. I, and my sisters who also live here, have all discussed places we would like to move to if this does go into effect. We do not want to leave Crystal Lake because we love it here but we chose this area for the schools as one of the top reasons. And if the school district is going to just go ahead with plans that no parent wants, then I guess they aren't as good of a school district as I thought. Not to mention, long term none of these options will last or help with the problem long term. The school district needs to realize funds or something to create more schools due to the amount of developments being made. However, for now, redraw the map until you can put in plan for a new school. Glacier ridge class size is a lot smaller than the other schools and u can send more kids that way. Easiest solution without all the hassle and construction that is currently proposed. Saved the construction for new schools.
Updated 8/27	The two options that you have laid out for us are not great options. They will cause a lot of students who walk to school now to be driven or bussed to school. More buses and further commute would occur, and siblings would be split up in elementary school not to mention the elementary school aged kids shouldn't be changing schools that often. School is a big adjustment as it is and then halfway through elementary school they r just supposed to switch again? And the dual language center is just racist and a fancy version of segregation. You can expect a lawsuit from parents for that option. I have seen videos by Joe Keegan with a fabulous option of just redrawing the boundaries which seems to make a lot more sense, and is less damage to parents and students. He is saying you don't even want to weigh that option and that you are withholding info from him which highly unethical. If the parents want a third option then you should allow the third option, the school funding is paid through our tax dollars and right now it is an abuse of our tax dollars.
Updated 8/27	Hello, We have lived in Crystal Lake for 6 years. We have two sons, ages 8 and 5. They both are attending Glacier Ridge this year, in 3rd grade and Kindergarten, respectively. For many years we have looked forward to the day where they would be going to the same school. This is because ever since our 2nd son was born, dropoffs have been difficult to manage as two working parents. Add that to the fact that I am now required to take the train into the city 4 days a week, and my wife 3 days a week, so maintaining our work schedules wouldn't even be possible without the excellent services of Extended Time (ET) which is offered at Glacier Ridge. We do not have family in the area to help. It gave me tremendous peace of mind knowing it would get easier this year, with dropoffs finally at the same school for both kids. I am dismayed by the concept that our sons could again go to different schools next year, if the option to split up elementary schools based on grades proceeds. I am not sure how we would manage that or what that would mean for our family, who currently relies upon ET at Glacier Ridge for both kids. We barely made it work before, when my youngest was going to daycare, and would have to seriously consider moving to another district if we don't have an option like this that works for our schedules. Please do not proceed with splitting up Glacier Ridge. It is a perfectly fine K-5 school and it would be absolutely disruptive to our family to split it up.
Updated 8/27	Why not consider a third option? Both of the current options seem to be quite disruptive. I live directly next to Coventry school with my daughter going into first grade this year. Both options will have us walking to Canterbury and that seems really silly. We love Coventry school. I went to Coventry, my mom even went to Coventry. I was so happy to have my daughter go there as well and these 2 options will change that. Please add a third option to keep kids at their current schools with their neighbors!
Updated 8/27	Hello, In following along with the boundary change options and updates, I have significant concerns with the options. I currently have a 1st grader and a 3rd grader who absolutely love going to school together. In pairing and splitting the elementary schools (K-2/3-5), they would be split next year and would be devastated not to go to school together, be picked up together, and see each other in the hallways. I asked my third grader what she was most looking forward to and she told me it was to be the big buddy this year. Having buddies/mentoring is such a fun thing for the kids and they enjoy seeing their buddies in the hallways. Also, seeing the confidence in my third grader going to school today and knowing exactly where everything is and who the teachers/paras/helpers are is amazing. If option 1 is chosen, none of these things can happen. Also, from the parent stand point, this will be difficult with multiple drop offs/pick ups (even with staggered times, the kids will have to be in the car waiting for the other kid which is difficult after a long day of school). Volunteering and attending parent nights, etc will become even more difficult. I also did have a question about option 1- it doesn't seem to accomplish one of the main goals of evening out class sizes amongst the district as the north schools will still have higher class sizes, right? It also seems that these north end schools are at risk of being affected by the new developments, so won't we be back at square 1 in a few years and have to find a new solution again? I would love to see a third option of changing the boundaries which includes looking at the new developments in the boundary redraw. I understand how difficult figuring all this out can be and appreciate all the time and energy that is going into this. Thank you!
Updated 8/27	In the other Illinois districts that currently have multilingual language academy's, do the students do as well as the students in the other district schools? Is there a disadvantage academically to a language academy? The introduction of a language academy seems to be the least disruptive to families, and if it also benefits the bilingual students, we are strongly in favor of this option.
Updated 8/27	I don't have a question. My children have always been in D47 and attend Coventry. Your plan with the multi language building? It's blatantly racist. Like, plain as day racist. As educators when asked to draw up a plan your best work was to segregate dual language kids all together in one building? Are you serious? You do realize those kids need socialization in both English and Spanish to succeed, right? I know that and I'm not a teacher. I truly hope this boils over enough that this plan is never brought to light minimum and hopefully enough action will be taken to remove members of this school board. How shameful.
Updated 8/27	Both of these options are moronic. In one scenario, because my son isn't dual language, he'll be kicked out of the only school he's ever known even though when I had to move earlier this year I specifically moved within the same school boundaries to keep him there. In another, he'll be kicked out because he had the misfortune of moving onto 4th grade. So then has has to go to a different school for two years before he moves onto junior high and hell by then, one of those middle schools might be a language center too right? And are you seriously comparing D47 to Chicago Public Schools as an example? It's insane to think that one of the options is proposed segregation based on family upbringing and language. Make sure you label all the water fountains in the building. Good thing you're making sure these kids that have friends of different ethnicity don't have that "problem" any more since they won't see them at school again. It seems like the school board never accounted for the fact that yes, more homes will be built, and yes, that means that more children will move into the school district. That's just the future's problem right? Except the future is now. I think anyone with half a brain in these positions could have predicted an "enrollment imbalance" years ago. Do better.
Updated 8/27	I have a question about the boundaries. Before changing attendance boundaries and moving large numbers of students, why isn't the district evaluating whether two under-enrolled elementary schools could be combined into a shared K-5 school community using both existing buildings, or operated as grade-level centers? Could this approach balance enrollment while minimizing the number of students who have to leave their current school, friendships and neighborhood?" Also, would you be able to provide and quantify the number of students being disrupted under each option.
Updated 8/27	The bussing proposal under the grade level center model MUST be described in actuality to the community PRIOR to the decision being made. One concern being addressed was the amount of times students are spending on the bus. If the proposed plan is for both grade level center populations to board the bus at the same time in the morning, the kids who have the later start are then spending more time on the bus in the morning, and vice versa for the other group on the afternoon. This does not make sense for students. Imagine a family with a 1st grader and a 4th grader. Let's say, hypothetically, that the K-2 building adopts a 8:20-3:00 schedule, and the 4-5 building runs a 8:50-3:30 school day. Is a 30 minute stagger even enough? Any longer just means MORE time spent on a bus. In McHenry, which is a referenced district that operates on this model, three school are staggered a whole 50 minutes apart for start and end times. If these 2 students are picked up at the same time, that means the 4th grade student starting school at 8:50 is being picked up as if they need to be somewhere by 8:20 (because other riders in the route do) and so they are acting as if their day begins at, let's say, 7:50 when they get picked up by the bus. Boarding a bus an hour (maybe even more for some kids?) prior to a school day so that they can make 2 stops to drop off some students and then have to wait on the bus and continue to their building should be considered too much time on a bus. This is the amount of time mentioned on the webpage that states that extended time on a bus can cause students to become dis regulated and therefore impact their learning. We have just added that much additional time that EVERY bussed student is away from their family and in the supervision of the district. In the afternoon, a 6 year old first grader who is done with school at 3:00 now has to get on a bus and wait another 30 minutes for the other school to dismiss and board to begin their trip home? If the is significant of an amount of time is being added to all students days on a BUS, that is unacceptable. If we are inadvertently increasing the amount of time a child is away from home during their day, one would think the priority would be to increase their instructional time, not they time they spend on a bus, in an often chaotic and overstimulating environment. Huntley, a second referenced district that operates on this model, can do so because their school were built with the grade levels centers on the SAME CAMPUS. Our buildings were not designed with that intention, and students should not have to make 2 stops on a bus daily. Families should be horrified to loose that time with their children during the weekdays. These logistic needs to be presented in detail BEFORE a vote.
Updated 8/27	Has BPAC been consulted with the proposed multilingual school idea? Who are the members who were consulted and are they parents, who should be on the BPAC?
Updated 8/27	I'm writing to express my concern about the proposed changes to the elementary school populations that are based on demographic information rather than boundary considerations. It is understandable that districts need to make adjustments as attendance rates change across neighborhoods and the schools that they attend, however the current suggestion to move the dual language and ELL programming to one school in the district is a method of segregation that infringes on the rights of multilingual learners to be in the least restrictive learning environment as their same grade English speaking peers. Additionally this proposal seeks to segregate Spanish speaking educators to one school which will only create a silo effect and impact the collaboration and consultation efforts of educators across the district. Separating students into one school not only removes them from their neighborhood community, it alienates them and impedes the progress on language acquisition.
Updated 9/4	Hello, I am asking for further clarification regarding the District's position that a traditional boundary change option is not viable for elementary schools. The District recently explained that a traditional elementary boundary-only solution was not developed in large part because Illinois Route 14 presents a significant transportation barrier and because the District wants to avoid non-contiguous attendance areas. I understand that there are important considerations regarding Route 14; however, those concerns appear inconsistent with the middle-school boundaries that were just proposed and approved through this same boundary process and committee. Specifically, the newly approved middle-school boundaries for 2026-27 include the following large areas from which students cross Illinois Route 14 to attend their assigned middle school: 1) The entire area western half for Bernotas west of Route 14 2) The entire southeastern portion south of Route 14 for Bernotas. 3) The entire non-contiguous area for Hannah Beardsley between Bernotas boundaries to the east and Lundahl boundaries to the west. 4) The southern half of the non-contiguous area for Hannah Beardsley located east of Route 31 and south of Route 14. The same committee that recently proposed those boundaries containing these multiple Route 14 crossings and non-contiguous areas is now recommending elementary boundary solutions in which those same characteristics are being cited as significant obstacles and refusing to provide an option showing a map largely because of the Route 14 issue. If crossing Route 14 is a transportation barrier that prevents the District from developing and evaluating a boundary-only elementary option, why was the same committee able to approve middle-school boundaries that require a large number of students to cross Route 14? Similarly, if non-contiguous attendance areas are considered so problematic, why did the same committee propose non-contiguous middle-school attendance areas? With the middle school boundary process, the District has already shown that crossing Illinois Route 14 and creating non-contiguous boundaries can be balanced against other District objectives. If the same factors were considered workable when establishing the new middle-school boundaries, what has changed that makes them so prohibitive that even providing an elementary boundary-only option is off the table? Before the Board and the community is asked to choose between two major structural changes to elementary education, I believe the District should further explain why the same boundary principles applied by the same committee for middle schools cannot also be applied when developing and evaluating a 3rd option for elementary schools. And, I implore the Board to demand to see what a redrawn district would look like and to make their own assessment as to the pros and cons of that option. The District and Boundary Committee should not be the sole arbiter of the options available.

Updated 9/4	Hello, First off, thank you for always thinking of the students' best interests. I do have a combination of suggestion and question. Please pardon me, as I'm not too familiar with state funding or county boundary/property laws, but I'd like to raise this question thinking outside the box. Have you looked into the other districts if they're having the same issues with enrollment, boundary issues, and unbalanced class sizes? Can district 47 partner up with District 26 in Cary and District 300 in Algonquin to balance enrollment and class sizes? For example, we live in Cary, but we go to a Crystal Lake school. We love D47, don't get me wrong, but as the district mentioned, one of the reasons listed in the boundary review proposal is that students should be with their home school. The closest elementary schools to us is Three Oaks Elementary School in Cary and Briargate Elementary School in Cary, yet we go outside of our town, to Crystal Lake —Canterbury Elementary School. Similarly, some of the Lake In The Hills students also attend Crystal Lake schools where they could be going to their home school in D300 (Lincoln Prairie, Neubert, or LITH Elementary School). Thanks for having this section of the website for us to provide feedback. Sending you all my best during this tough decision-making tasks.
Updated 9/4	Hi, I am not currently a D47 parent, but will be next year when my son enters Kindergarten with the new boundaries (whatever they are) in place. With the option to have "buddy" schools, I saw that South and West are intended to be paired together. Since I live right by South High School my child will likely attend school for at least 2 years at the very furthest away elementary school from my house. I know that we have a higher concentration of elementary schools at the south end of the city, but transportation costs won't necessarily be lower if some kids are now being bussed further away and kids from the same household mean that busses are making multiple stops as South and West are the furthest apart buddy pairing proposed. Surely there is a way to adjust boundaries to have more kids from the crowded North and Hussman schools attend West and South with a permanent boundary change that would redirect students that already live close to most of the south schools to one of them. I have other concerns about both available options, but it seems that a traditional boundary change isn't even being considered with no real transparency as to why or what the different costs might be with each option.
Updated 9/4	This is not a question, but my feedback as an involved parent with both of my children now attending South. I am very concerned about having 2 different locations of schools and having my kids split up next year. This is a huge inconvenience for drop offs/pick ups. This will also be very difficult for working parents like myself who still like to volunteer at the school. I would not be able to fit visiting two schools into my schedule to volunteer in my kids' classrooms. I imagine I am not the only parent this would impact. I am also concerned about already sending my third grader to a new school again next year. This is going to impact culture of the students, families, and the staff. Please reconsider this change. It will leave a lot of South families very unhappy and will likely resort to families considering sending their kids to private schools. Thank you for your time in reading this feedback.
Updated 9/4	Changing schools away from K-5 and now making them go to numerous schools before middle school is ridiculous and places undue burden on families with more than one child. Shuffling from one school to another while both are in K-5 seems unproductive, inefficient, and inconsiderate of families and children. Change school boundaries, fine, but keep the school so children and families have one learning environment throughout K-5.
Updated 9/4	A third option should be considered for the boundary changes. I'm not sure why the board wants to rush into a decision when there was various ways to explore a different option. These changes will affect many, specially families that have students in various grade levels. Also putting dual language students in just one school would be inequitable. Please consider the voices of the public, as this will affect us all!
Updated 9/4	We DO NOT want boundaries changed to certain grade level schools, k-2 and 3 - 5. I have 4 young kids, 2 in Elementary and 1 in Preschool as of now. I already have to rush to 2 different schools in the morning. And will have to already go to 3 different schools when my youngest is in preschool and my oldest is in middle school. To add a 4th school to my family by splitting them up by grade, is terrible. I moved here with schools being top priority. We chose our location with intention. We have been paying taxes here for over 7 years and I believe our community has a say in a huge decision like this. You want to split up families and make it harder on the parents as well as the kids. These kids love to go to school with their siblings. Some kids feel so much safer with their siblings around. Students get to know the teachers and their school so well that being at school is comforting for them. With mental health problems on the rise, it doesn't seem right to add a stressor to families and students. Every parent I have talked to is extremely upset that it is even an option. We don't want our families split up. My daughter was crying when she overheard that it is possible to be separated from her sister. It is not why I moved here. Parents becoming comfortable with admin and staff of your school also matters and having to switch and start all over again halfway through, is awful to do to us. We DO NOT want this as a boundary option. I hope the district we chose hears their community and makes the right decision. Please don't do this to our families.
Updated 9/4	The proposed boundary change is concerning to me as a mother. When our family chose where to live, the school was an important part of that decision. We intentionally chose this neighborhood knowing our daughter would attend this school and become part of its community. A school is more than a place of learning. It is where children build friendships, develop relationships with teachers, and gain a sense of belonging, confidence, and security. For young children, especially kindergarteners, consistency and familiarity are incredibly important. Repeatedly changing schools requires children to adjust to new teachers, classmates, routines, and environments and can disrupt the stability they need to thrive. It is difficult to feel that families who intentionally chose a neighborhood, purchased a home, and became part of an established school community should now lose that school placement because of new development. We understand that growth requires planning, but we believe that planning should also consider the families and children who are already part of the community. One of the things we value most is being able to walk to school. Those walks are more than a convenience, they are special time for our family to connect with our daughter, talk about her day, and spend meaningful time together. For her, walking to school means seeing familiar faces, connecting with neighbors, and feeling that her school is truly part of the community where she lives. A boundary change would take that experience away. I respectfully ask the district to reconsider the proposed boundary change and create a new boundary map that accommodates the new development without unnecessarily disrupting existing families. Our daughter deserves the opportunity to remain connected to the school and community we intentionally chose as our home, where she can continue to grow, learn, and feel that she belongs.
Updated 9/4	I am writing to express my concerns and disappointment regarding the boundary options currently being presented to District 47 families. I understand that boundary changes are complex and that the district is attempting to address enrollment, growth, and the needs of our schools. However, I am concerned that the current options presented do not appear to adequately address the practical, safety, financial, and community impacts they may create for families. It is particularly discouraging that a third option—one that takes additional time to thoughtfully reconsider and redraw the boundaries—does not appear to be receiving meaningful consideration. I understand that there may not be a perfect solution, but I believe our community deserves a process that thoroughly explores all reasonable alternatives before making a decision that will affect families for many years. Transportation and Safety Concerns The proposed boundaries raise significant concerns regarding how students will safely travel between schools and how families will manage transportation. Even with staggered start and dismissal times, traveling from one school to another could present challenges. For example, within the Coventry neighborhood, the schools may be relatively close together, but there are limited parking options immediately surrounding the schools. Expanding those transportation demands into areas such as Canterbury and the surrounding neighborhoods could create additional congestion and logistical challenges. The distance between Hussman and North Elementary also raises concerns. These schools are more than a mile apart, and I question how transportation would work for families whose children attend different schools. Could one child be considered a walker while another child in the same family is assigned to a bus? If so, how would that work for families managing multiple schedules? Most importantly, student safety must remain a priority. I am especially concerned about boundaries that could require children to cross McHenry Avenue. There does not appear to be a safe and reasonable way for students to cross that road on their own. If the proposed boundaries require students to cross a hazardous roadway, will transportation be provided to ensure their safety? These are not simply logistical concerns. They directly affect whether the proposed boundaries are practical and safe for children and families. Concerns Regarding the Language Program and Community Cohesion I also have serious concerns about the potential impact of Option 2 on our community. I worry that the proposed boundaries could unintentionally create a separation between students based on participation in the dual-language program. Why should two children who live in the same neighborhood and are best friends potentially attend different elementary schools simply because one child participates in
Updated 9/4	Hi! My recommendation would be to do some additional research with current dual families (and teachers!) on the language academy option. The pulse I am getting from dual families I know is that many will pull out of the dual program. Not sure how true that is for others, but for us, we have already made the decision to pull out if this is the path it goes. I don't agree with segregating the dual group, and for my kids in particular, I don't like putting them in a school where the transition out of dual would be hard, if we needed to take that path. Thank you for reading feedback.
Updated 9/4	First of all, I want to thank the Boundary Committee and the Board for what I know is an incredibly difficult job. There will never be a solution that makes everyone happy, so just know that your time, efforts, and considerations of all needs are appreciated. I am a dual language parent of a second grader and fourth grader at Coventry. I am also a sub in the district and have taught multiple long-term positions at Coventry as well. My background is as a dual language teacher, with eight years in Wauconda before coming to Crystal Lake. I have a master's degree in Bilingual and Multicultural Education. I give this background just to say that I have experience with different language learning models and school districts, as well as a vested interest in the success of D47's program going forward. When I first heard the two proposed options, I was shocked that neither was a traditional boundary redraw. The move to grade level centers is not one that I would like to have at all, as it separates families further into multiple buildings. Elementary school is the time when you can feel safe and secure in building relationships with administration, teachers, staff, and fellow families for the most extended stretch of time of any schooling level. To divide this into grade level centers would break up this cohesion and complicate life for families. The language academy option is also not one that I would recommend. Part of the value of dual language programs is that all students get to learn together in a diverse community. Yes, there are students of all backgrounds in our dual program, but to put all the dual language classes at Coventry would be to deprive the other buildings in the district of the beauty that comes from learning that our world is bigger than what we see within our own homes or neighborhoods. I know my children would continue to benefit from this, since they are in dual, but it would be taken away from the monolingual classmates who get to see and hear Spanish throughout their buildings. Also, I know that the numbers for dual admission would have to decrease in the future. It is already sought-after to get one of the lottery slots for native English speakers, so to reduce the number of admissions further would be a detriment to our district. At least one teacher at each dual grade level would also be out of a job, since there are currently six teachers at each grade level across the district and only five would be needed at the language academy. The committee referred to this as a good way to combat the teacher retention problem that our district has with dual language teachers, but let me be blunt for a moment. I say this because I love our district and want it to succeed, but sometimes you have to hear something the hard way. We don't have teacher-retention problem because there aren't enough good dual language teachers out there; we have a teacher-retention problem because we don't pay our teachers well enough. That's the needed change
Updated 9/4	I strongly oppose the proposed grade-level center model. My biggest concern is the loss of the traditional K–5 school community. There is real value in children spending their elementary years in one school, building relationships with teachers, staff, other students, and families. Requiring children to change schools midway through elementary school adds another transition during years when consistency, routine, relationships, and belonging matter tremendously. This would also be extremely difficult for families with multiple children. Similar pickup times do not solve having elementary-aged siblings in separate schools. Families could be managing multiple principals, PTOs, conferences, curriculum nights, concerts, activities, communications, and school events. Siblings would also lose the experience of sharing the same elementary school community. I am also concerned that this proposal does not even create one consistent model throughout the district. Some schools would be PreK–2/3–5, others K–3/4–5, while another remains K–5. That seems contradictory if consistency and efficiency are part of the goal. Special education is another major concern. The proposal acknowledges that much of the district's special education programming would remain concentrated in certain buildings. Students with disabilities deserve meaningful access to the same peers, activities, opportunities, and school communities as everyone else. The district should clearly explain how this model supports inclusion and Least Restrictive Environment rather than unintentionally creating greater separation. I also question whether the educational benefits are strong enough to justify such a major disruption. Teacher collaboration, professional development, appropriate class sizes, and strong instruction are important, but I do not believe dismantling the K–5 model is necessary to accomplish those goals. I would strongly encourage the district to continue exploring less disruptive options such as boundary adjustments, enrollment balancing, targeted program changes, and better use of existing space. Our elementary schools are more than buildings operating at capacity. They are communities, and I do not believe we should give that up unless there is overwhelming evidence that this change is truly better for students.
Updated 9/4	Hello, Our family fully supports the new boundary proposals. Easing overcrowding in our school is essential, and we are confident these changes will create a better educational experience for everyone Thank you!

Updated 9/4	Please do not go forward with the suggested changes to our schools. We have been part of d47 and Glacier Ridge Elementary since 2014. Our youngest is now in 1st grade. I can't imagine how he will feel changing schools in 3rd grade. His school is Glacier Ridge. He will also be separated from his friends that are in other grades. This is his community. He has friends in all k-5 grades and interacts with them daily. Splitting up a school is not a good idea for a number of reasons. Different teachers, different principles and changing up the kids' routines. I would not feel comfortable with him walking or riding his bike to Woods creek. It is too far. We walk to Glacier Ridge and always have. Also, I can't imagine having to go to two different schools for pick up and drop off. That isn't not helpful for any parent and takes more time out from a workday. I really think you need to rework the boundary lines to even out the students that go to all of the schools. There are homes that back up the Glacier that go to Woods creek. That makes zero sense. Start there. Move the lines to even out. Make room at North Elementary for another preschool and split the kids so it isn't so far for some students. This just makes better sense than completely disrupting the D47 families. I hope you will consider this alternative and keep our communities together from K-5.
Updated 9/4	I believe neither of the options presented have been fully, independently researched (nor has any research been thoroughly presented), and the decision is being rushed. These are major, costly changes that will impact many families and the community as a whole. Not only that, but these options don't even adequately solve the capacity problem that started this redistricting to begin with. There is no need to vote so quickly. The board is also broadly ignoring the educators that would be impacted and the public, which has expressed a lot of negative feedback for both options, in general. There is a strong call for a third option. Answer that call. I urge the board to push back the vote and consider other options that provide more benefit to the community without such massive cost.
Updated 9/8	I do not feel either of the options presented are a good fit for our community. I am completely understanding and sympathetic to the need for new boundaries to accommodate our growing community but both options presented are not conducive for our town. I would like a third option presented that is a change and expansion of our current neighborhoods to schools. I do not agree that bus route changes would be any different in a third option accommodating this as opposed to the options presented by the district in which bus routes will also be greatly impacted. Please investigate and add a new option to the suggested plans.
Updated 9/8	The grade level centers would make things very difficult for those of us with multiple children around the same age. Navigating, planning and modifying work schedules is already challenging enough. We would like our children to remain in their neighborhood schools and attend with their siblings.
Updated 9/8	No to any change and leave students at current schools, also no need to move kids. Again no to any change and don't approve of the possible change.
Updated 9/8	The grade level centers is a terrible idea. My family moved out of Chicago and into Crystal Lake so that schooling would be simple. We chose a home down the street from my daughter's school where she just started kindergarten. It was hard enough starting full time at a new school. To think of her forcing her to change schools again in 1st grade, then again in 4th grade. Then again in 6th and 9th grades! She and many others would no longer be able to walk to school during their primary years, and no consistency for young children. Once they establish a connection to a school they are forced to switch. There is a lot of research on this topic showing that children have the hardest time when they switch schools, which the new proposal makes them do. Keep things as is. Let parents who move to that area be allowed to build their life around that school as intended. Let children have consistency and be little kids rather than worrying about when they need to leave their school again.
Updated 9/8	Putting all dual language kids in one school is modern day segregation. The option of splitting schools k-2 and 3-5 will cause undue stress on families with multiple kids at multiple schools. The district doesn't even have enough busses nor drivers as it is, so you're going to add more drop off and pickup points? Both options are terrible. While I understand that changes need to be made, I wish the district would try a little harder to listen to other options that were proposed by community members.
Updated 9/8	I am extremely concerned and frustrated by the possibility of these elementary boundary and programming changes. Our family lives just three blocks from our current elementary school. This is truly our neighborhood school. The ability for our child to attend a school within walking distance is something we have valued tremendously, and it is one of the reasons our current school feels like an extension of our community. The thought that my son could be forced to leave his school halfway through his elementary school experience is incredibly upsetting. He should not have to leave behind his friends, teachers, staff, routines, and sense of belonging because of a boundary or programming decision made after he has already established himself in his school community. Even more concerning is the possibility that our neighborhood school could become dual-language only, essentially eliminating it as an option for families who live directly around it. I understand that school districts have to make difficult decisions regarding enrollment, facilities, and programming. However, those decisions should not come at the expense of stability for the children who are already attending these schools. The proposed school is farther from our home. It is close enough that we would still be expected to manage transportation ourselves, but far enough away that the simple convenience of walking to our neighborhood school disappears. What may look like a small geographic change on a map becomes a daily burden for families—twice a day, every school day, for years. I strongly urge the district to consider grandfathering students who are already enrolled in their current elementary schools. If a child is already established in a school, they should have the opportunity to remain there through elementary school rather than being forced to change schools because of a boundary or programming change. I also strongly urge the district to consider the message this sends to families about what it means to live in a neighborhood and attend a neighborhood school. We should be building strong school communities and creating stability for children—not disrupting students who are already settled and thriving. I recognize that there may be valid reasons behind these proposals, but I believe the impact on currently enrolled students and their families needs to carry significantly more weight in the decision. Our children are not numbers on an enrollment spreadsheet. They are students with relationships, routines, friendships, and a sense of belonging that matter. Please prioritize the stability and well-being of the students who are already in these schools and find a solution that does not force them to start over simply because the district's plans have changed.
Updated 9/8	Inclusion is a problem with this change. It is going to cause separation and further divide from lack of exposure to cultural differences and languages spoken around our mono language children. By separating the dual language program kids from mono language, you are separating a large portion of cultural differences which I WANT my kids to be exposed and accept other cultures. When you don't grow up with it being your "norm", it absolutely has an effect for later on in life. INCLUSION is huge for kids!!! (And adults). It is also so stressful to be uprooted from schools and your comforts. These children have a lot of stress and pressure with what they are learning as it is. To have to acclimate to a new setting is not something that needs to be added to the mix currently. Your argument to rebut that could be, "kids are moved all the time and are fine", but have we ever asked those kids how they are really doing???? It can effect long term causation of anxiety, stress, lack of confidence, the list can go on... it does not have a benefit to our community to separate children into a single school. You need to have more diversity throughout the community. Keeping dual mixed in with mono language is extremely valuable for all the children. Separation is not going to benefit the children. My kids needed the ability to intermix with mono language during the day as there is still a big gap of language when they are young. They are having to learn how to intermingle and adapt to cultural change and learning to create their own new culture of acceptance and inclusion. It teaches Mono language students this as well! Without exposure to differences, you don't have an opportunity for growth. Yes, they all have to learn to accept we have differences in all aspects and need to embrace and share so we can adapt to change.
Updated 9/8	Common sense does not warrant splitting up families that could be attending the same k-5 elementary school. There is a reason grade level centers and language academies have not been implemented in other districts and why some reversed course later on. I find it especially reaching to list language academies state wide compared to local in order to obtain a list to present and support this proposal. Let's not make change for the sake of change. Vote no on this.
Updated 9/8	I'm finding it very difficult to take your examples of local school districts with grade level centers seriously. Glevview is in Cook County, only 15 miles from downtown Chicago. Huntley School District 158 isn't in McHenry county either. There are a total of 9 k-8 school districts in McHenry County and 9 school districts serving Kane County so really only 2 of 18 total district have grade level centers. Not a good percentage in my opinion that you are not being transparent about. I also find it interesting you are not sharing the number of districts who changed to grade level centers and then changed back within 5 years. You didn't even bother to list any "local" school districts with dual language/ multilingual school...because there aren't any. In my opinion these are reasons to look into other options.
Updated 9/8	1. My children attended both the dual program and the EC program. Will EC be available at the language academy in the same manner it is now? How about special education services? 2. Will translation services (headsets - which have been rented for D47 events in the past) be made available at the September 21 board meeting? There are significant changes presented to the board that directly impact Spanish-speaking families in D47, and the board is making it very difficult for Spanish speakers to feel welcome at these meetings if translation is not available. 3. If dual language students only make up 50% of the ELL population, what is the percentage of ELL non-dual language students that identify as Hispanic / Latinx? (I'm still not convinced that this option is not segregation of a specific ethnic group.) 4. Would you be willing to make public your conversations with ISBE around the legality of the language academy? Our collaborative conversation went very differently, and it was clear that ISBE felt that this model was not legal. 5. Was a segregation survey done in 2025 in relation to the proposed change of the Language Academy? Can we please see the results of this survey in the September 21 Board Meeting? 6. Would the board be willing to have an anonymous survey for dual language teachers to get their honest feedback? I do not agree with Ms Stanton's comment that simply stating that they liked having targeted PD together is an indicator that they are enthusiastic about this option. I have heard quite the opposite for all of the Dual Language teachers. In fact, there has not been a single meeting for Dual Language teachers specifically district-wide in over two years. 7. Will you be editing the list of mentioned schools/districts that supposedly have language academies to reflect a more accurate list of comparisons so as not to misinform the public? Chicago Magnet Schools, Maywood, and Rockford Public School communities look nothing like Crystal Lake. The demographics of the communities are significantly different. 8. Can the District also provide LINKS to "Option 1" of the boundary proposal online? There are links for "Option 2", but no links for Option 1. The way the entire presentation reads clearly demonstrates some favoritism by the district to lean towards supporting Option 2. This is not presenting the information equally. 9. WHY was one dual language section and North closed early for the past two years, when clearly there are families that could have filled this section of dual language? This needs to be questioned and exposed. It appears this is the district's intentional way to limit the growth and development of this program, as well as create only 5 sections of dual language that would fit very nicely into Coventry's school setting - the proposed Dual Language Academy. This seems to be a deliberate decision coming down the pipeline for two years now and is not best practice for student learning.
Updated 9/18	Why are you, as a Board, so insistent on continuing to spend valuable time and taxpayer resources on plans that have the potential to negatively impact our schools and our community? At this point, how can either of these proposals be considered worthwhile? Scrap both plans and go back to the drawing board. One of the biggest questions is how you can confidently make decisions about classroom capacity based on assumptions about future enrollment. How do you know that all of these new rental developments will actually result in large numbers of school-aged children entering our district? Are we making expensive, long-term decisions based on data—or speculation? And then there is the proposal to turn a school into a "Language Academy." How exactly is that supposed to benefit our district and our students? More importantly, how is separating students from one another the answer? A dual-language school is not the same thing as a "Language Academy," and labeling it differently does not change the reality that you are creating a separate educational environment for a specific group of students. If the goal were truly to establish a language academy, wouldn't it make sense to offer a broader range of languages rather than essentially focusing on one additional language? Parents deserve to understand the actual educational benefit, the financial justification, and the long-term impact of these proposals—not simply be presented with plans that appear to solve problems that may not even exist at the scale being projected. Last year, we watched the Board handle contract negotiations in a way that left many in the community questioning its transparency and judgment, including the decision to hire substitute teachers at rates significantly higher than what our own teachers were being paid. That situation was frustrating, expensive, and damaging to trust. Now, this year, it seems the answer is to find yet another way to spend more of our money on expensive plans that are questionable at best and potentially harmful to our schools and community at worst. At what point does the Board stop and ask whether these decisions are actually in the best interest of our students, teachers, families, and taxpayers? You owe this community better. We deserve thoughtful, evidence-based decisions—not costly proposals created simply because the Board feels compelled to do something. Scrap these plans. Go back to the drawing board. Listen to the community. Look at the actual data. And come back with solutions that genuinely improve our schools rather than creating new problems in the process.

Updated 9/18	We will be beyond disappointed with this school district if they split up grade levels. I have 4 kids that I am putting through your district and moved here for Woods Creek. I would never have imagined my kids having to be split up. That is cruel to do to the families that support your community. There is not a single parent that I have talked to that wants this to happen. I hope you are listening and do the right thing. This will be yet another reason people will home school. My kids are so excited to be together and you want to take that away. Not to mention having to get kids to different schools. We don't bus and that is not an option due to bad situations that have happened on the bus. I will have to 4 different schools in one morning when my youngest is in Preschool. That's ridiculous. Your students get comfortable with staff and the school. My one daughter with anxiety will have a very hard time with this. Being the 5th grader and helping the little ones is something that they look forward to and is so good for them. I could go on and on. Please do not do this to us.
Updated 9/18	The boundary survey has an error. The survey requires the choice of option 1 or 2, with no option for other/none. This is a forced-choice response and creates a measurement error. The responses will not (and cannot) accurately reflect the parents' or community's decision. This survey is not being sent in good faith. Please fix it.
Updated 9/18	I have not seen a history of all proposals, but I do not remember seeing a boundary redraw on the list. Has that option been seriously explored? I have not seen maps proposed for a simple redraw. Has an option of combining with district 46 been explored? In the fall of 2030, I will have a 5th grader, 1st grader, and kindergartner in district 47. I do not see our family being able to attend family nights at multiple schools, so I think you will lose the community feel that you are working towards at each school. As someone who also cares about students, I believe that the language academies would create lengthy bus riders for those attending.
Updated 9/18	I'm pretty disappointed by the recent survey that was just sent out about the boundary changes. It was very biased, and the where wasn't really anywhere to oppose any of the options presented, instead the survey forces the community to choose one. The board isn't listening to the community in wanting another option which would include a boundary changes instead of these two options. Information has been presented at previous board meetings about how boundary changes can work and still fix the current issues the district is having. I think the board needs to really take a look at this option, and oppose both these options until they have time to examine this option. I feel like "forcing" these two options isn't right and when the survey only presents these two options it skews the integrity of the survey in showing this is what the community wants. I feel this is being rushed through without looking at the long term effects of this decision.
Updated 9/18	Good evening, My son currently attends Indian Prairie Elementary and neither of the options would adversely affect him or his education. However, I still decided to read through the two options presented and voice my opinion against Option #2 the Multi language Academy. I understand how it would be beneficial, but I am also aware that this could be seen as segregation, or potentially discrimination. Separating those who are currently using school to better their English from their native tongue not only teaches other students that differences do actually matter, even though we as parents fight diligently to say otherwise, but it also takes away the experiences of those within the multi language programs from utilizing their new found skills amongst their friends in the real world settings with their friends. Thank you for Listening.
Updated 9/18	I was curious if it's been discussed to add and/or move an elementary school to accommodate for the influx of children from these new developments in the crowded areas. Another idea could be to combine preschools with elementary in some areas to maximize resources. It seems sensible to consider these options, focusing on where the crowding actually is rather than having to disrupt all schools. Making ALL kids adjust to another learning environment, separating families and busing or driving when they could otherwise walk across the street to their neighborhood school.
Updated 9/18	Hello, I'd like to raise a concern about the justification given for limiting boundary adjustment options to the two proposed recommendations (Grade-Level Centers or Multilingual Academy), specifically the explanation involving Route 14 as a barrier. The stated rationale is that Route 14 prevents students from walking across it, and therefore northern/eastern growth can't be balanced against under-capacity southern schools through conventional boundary redraws. However, this reasoning conflates two separate issues: Walkability — Route 14 being unsafe to cross on foot is a valid concern for walk-zone assignments. Capacity balancing — Redistributing enrollment via bused attendance boundaries does not require students to walk across the highway at all. A conventional boundary adjustment could still reassign non-walk-zone neighborhoods on the north/east side to under-capacity southern schools via bus transportation, without requiring any student to cross Route 14 on foot. Additionally, it's unclear how many (if any) current or potential school attendance boundaries actually border Route 14 closely enough that walking across it would even be a realistic concern in the first place. If this affects only one boundary line, or possibly none in a meaningful way, citing it as the primary justification for two large-scale structural changes affecting the entire elementary district seems disproportionate to the actual scope of the problem. I would ask the district to: Clarify exactly which school boundaries are impacted by the Route 14 walkability concern, and how many students this actually affects. Share whether a traditional boundary redraw scenario (using adjusted busing rather than walk zones) was modeled and evaluated alongside these two more disruptive options. If that simpler scenario was ruled out, explain the specific data or constraints behind that decision. Transparency on these points would help build trust in the recommendation process, especially for families trying to weigh the tradeoffs of the two current proposals against a scenario that hasn't been fully explained or ruled out with supporting data.
Updated 9/18	The school district needs to work closer and have a larger voice when some of these multi-family developments are considered. They become kid condos for the early years and then the people move and cause misallocation of resources for the middle / older grade schools. Impact fees and additional developer requirements need to be emphasised to reduce the already high burden on existing taxpayers and businesses. It is obvious that another large taxpayer referendum in coming down the pipeline to rehab or repurpose the schools. I think the idea of a home school and balanced class sizes between mono and dual language programs need to be emphasised. Good luck as you are not going to please everyone.
Updated 9/18	First, your feedback survey REQUIRING that we pick one of your two options shows that you're not listening. Second, your most recent presentation that brushed off the idea of a boundary redrawing and simply stated why your ideas are the best shows that you're not listening. You have clearly already made up your mind to go ahead with one of the two undesirable plans so nothing us actual parents of actual students say will matter to you. But both of the proposed ideas leave much to be desired. The proposal of paired schools separates siblings, moves kids around more times than necessary, and creates potential scheduling nightmares for those of us with multiple students in elementary school. As someone who moved to three different schools in K-5 I can attest to how uncomfortable it feels to a child to keep being uprooted and thrown in a new environment during that time. Your second proposal of a "language academy" is straight segregation. Dress it up however you want, that's all it is. And you shouldn't even be considering it. Present some sort of evidence other than "because our idea is better" as to why redrawing the boundaries won't work. Until you take it seriously and actually listen to the parents, you will have zero support for these two current proposals.
Updated 9/18	I support the balancing enrollment measure to keep class sizes manageable. I oppose the Multilingual Academy as it seems to segregate Spanish speakers in a different school and I think learning Spanish and English words can benefit all our students. It is good to have friends from different backgrounds at school, as you will later, as an adult at work. Thank you for seeking feedback on these issues.
Updated 9/18	Both of the proposed options contradict some of the impacts that are claimed to be what you are trying to fix with these options. It is stated that with non-contiguous boundaries, it can fragment students from having a K-12 experience with their peers - this will happen from elementary school to middle school if the multilingual academy option takes place anyway. Kids from South Elementary will mostly go to Lundahl, while some will end up at Hannah Beardsley with mostly new kids. They then get split up again going to high school so fragmentation will be the same if not more with the multilingual option versus keeping or adding some non-contiguous boundaries. For the longer bus routes, most of these new developments are less than 10 minutes from all of the schools that it is stating are in need of additional kids. You also have a lot of the new developments grouped in the same area, with one or two outliers, which could combine into the same bus route. The majority of these new developments can't be walkers to any of the schools so they will need to be bussed either way; add them to a route to one of the schools that needs additional enrollment. You are already changing some of the "natural" boundaries, boundaries that you had claimed to not want to change, with the multilingual academy option so why can't it be done without adding the multilingual academy? It was mentioned that these boundary changes are trying to keep kids that live extremely close to a school at that particular school, or their "home school." We live less than half a mile from our neighborhood school and had chosen to stay in this neighborhood because of this particular school and being so close. With this multilingual academy option, you are now requiring kids that currently can easily walk to a school without major traffic to now cross a busy road (McHenry Ave) since they still won't qualify for busing. Pre-K is not mandatory and each program is chosen by the parents/guardians. The D47 Pre-K program offers only two different 2.5 hour long timeframes, meaning these kids have parents/guardians at home throughout the day that can get them to and from the program. They are also fully aware of the location of the Pre-K program when signing up amongst all of the other options in the area they can choose from for their child. If we remove the busses for the pre-K program and require they have their own transportation, this will eliminate long bus rides of the younger kids and less bus wear and tear. The grade-level centers require kids, and parents alike, to learn a new administration, staff and new school every 2-3 years. While policies and procedures may align between schools, administration and staff changes can greatly impact kids. It also can make parents and kids alike lose a sense of community. We love going to our current school's fundraising events and family nights. That may be impacted for some families, attendance to these events may drop.
Updated 9/18	Here's a new thought / concern. Looking ahead at the calendar, I realized that the proposed date for the vote is one week before parent/teacher conferences. I'm sure you've already thought of this, but I can just imagine how many parents might want to talk about the boundaries at that time. Is it possible to give district wide "advice" about how to respond to this subject as professionals at conference time? ...possibly both in writing AND have principals reiterate this information in a team meeting on the Friday before conferences? Just a thought. Maybe you've already considered this. I know some teachers would know how to respond to questions or thoughts from upset parents as change can be hard, but I bet some teachers might welcome some ideas about how to respond. Thanks!
Updated 9/18	Can we get the Bryn Mawr (off of 176) subdivision in the d47 district? It's the school closest to us and with the boundary changes I feel like it makes the most sense to change the boundary for the neighborhood.
Updated 9/20	I do not support either of the two proposed options as presented. However, the survey does not appear to allow for that response. Toward the end, respondents are required to select one of the two choices in order to submit the survey, with no option to indicate opposition to both, request alternatives, or simply express dissatisfaction. Because that question is mandatory, anyone who disagrees with both proposals is forced to either pick one anyway or abandon the survey entirely. This structure concerns me because it will produce data suggesting parents are choosing between these two options, when in reality many of us may not support pursuing either one. I'd ask that the district either revise the survey to include a genuine "neither of these" or open-response option, or supplement the quantitative results with a clear accounting of how many parents expressed opposition to both proposals through other channels, so the school board sees an accurate picture of parent sentiment before any decision is made.
Updated 9/20	I understand the district is looking for ways to address enrollment, staffing, and space challenges, but I question whether grade-level centers are the right solution for our students, families, or staff, particularly if they will only rebalance enrollment for two or three years. A change of this magnitude should provide a stable, long-term solution. If enrollment is expected to shift again, it is difficult to justify the level of disruption this proposal would create. I am especially concerned about the logistical and transportation burden this proposal would place on families. Moving children outside their neighborhood schools could complicate daily routines and transportation. Some neighborhoods have never required elementary busing because students attend their neighborhood schools within walking distance. Under this proposal, those families could suddenly need bus transportation for half their elementary years, adding costs and complexity for what may ultimately be a short-term enrollment adjustment. These challenges would be particularly difficult for working parents and families with multiple children. The impact on teachers and staff should also be carefully considered. Moving teachers between buildings and reorganizing school communities can disrupt established teams, relationships, and routines and may negatively affect staff morale and retention. Stable, connected school communities benefit both staff and students. Grade-level centers could also reduce parent involvement. Neighborhood K-5 schools make it easier for parents to volunteer in classrooms, participate in PTO activities, and attend school events. When families have children in different buildings, volunteering becomes more difficult. This could reduce the parent support and community involvement that are essential parts of our schools. Most importantly, K-5 neighborhood schools provide students with stability, belonging, and a strong connection to their local community. They also support students' social-emotional well-being by providing continuity and consistent relationships with teachers, staff, and peers. K-5 schools create an important opportunity for older and younger students to learn from one another. Younger students benefit from having older students they can look up to and learn from, while older students develop leadership, responsibility, and confidence by serving as role models for younger children. These relationships help create a strong sense of community and connection as students grow through elementary school. Grade-level centers would disrupt those relationships and natural opportunities for mentorship while placing additional burdens on families, teachers, and staff. Before making a change of this magnitude, the Board should consider not only whether it addresses today's enrollment numbers, but whether it will remain effective and appropriate for the district over the longer term. Families deserve stability and confidence that another major boundary change will not be necessary in just a few years. I respectfully ask the Board to reject the grade-level center proposal and pursue alternatives such as the Dual Language Academy that preserve K-5 neighborhood schools, minimize disruption, protect staff morale and parent involvement, and provide a sustainable approach to enrollment management.

	I am writing to the board to express my concern with the survey sent to families today, September 14. Some questions in the survey are biased. Particularly, the questions about which option you would choose. This proposal is not an either or choice. There is a third option, which is to vote no to both proposals, and convene a transparent committee with diverse backgrounds, including input from the BPAC. This either or option on the survey does not accurately represent all available possibilities since it does not allow for "no" option. By forcing people to choose one or the other, this may give you skewed results because it will show people being in favor of one proposal, while the reality may be that they disapprove of both. As elected members of the board, it is imperative you listen to your constituents. There is a petition with 1,066 and counting signatures stating the community wants the board to vote no and engage with the community to come up with a solution that will address the concerns of the district (class size, preschool access, long bus rides, future subdivisions and more). Here is a link to the survey: https://www.change.org/p/ask-crystal-lake-district-47-to-vote-no-to-boundary-options-vote-no?recruiter=1364907366&recruited_by_id=d49c3b30-e5c3-11ef-bf52-297b38901ff7&utm_source=share_petition&utm_campaign=psf_combo_share_initial&utm_term=psf_combo_share_initial&utm_medium=copylink&share_id=7k8KRQgnNq&fbclid=IwERFUAUJVVNdWzG9mBWZkaWQWUOazkStWxXFYrIdQ_IqdDqF9JbrfMwV4dG4DYWVIAjEXAHnJdGMQGYXBwX2IkQY2Mjg1NgZnZkAAR6USz2mFz1tFPKrvMohXl6MKssIzIsJ59z55kQqdkS9SrQB8UCRtjhnmhHZA_aem_Eq0hFkUJaaII_RSZRVRVGGKw Please ask to change the wording on the current survey to take the time to gather unbiased information allowing for no vote and engage with our community to make our district better. We all have the same goal, to do what is best for our children in the community.
Updated 9/20	I am in favor of a standard boundary change adjustment rather than one of the radical, flawed recommendations of the District. Here is a well-researched proposal for a boundary adjustment: https://www.facebook.com/groups/CrystalLake_IL/posts/28365462729758836/ The district should have presented a plan like this in addition to its recommendations to prove its claims that an adjustment is insufficient and unprecedented change is required. I am particularly opposed to the grade center proposal. The construction of grade centers will involve significant disruptions, including relocating teachers' classrooms and materials, such as library collections, and rebuilding facilities, such as playgrounds. I expect that the shift will degrade teacher morale, with the effects passed on to the students. In a few years, the grades housed at each center may need to be reconfigured to maintain balanced enrollment, so this is not as permanent a solution as it seems. Elementary age students from the same neighborhoods and families will be bused at different times to different grade centers. Bus traffic increases, parents of multiple children have their schedules complicated, and their coordination with schools and teachers becomes more difficult. Many students will have to travel farther to more distant grade centers. My daughter attends North Elementary, the only state-designated School of Excellence in the District. There is no guarantee that the grade centers that replace North and Husmann would retain this status, an embarrassing loss. I have talked to other parents who share my concerns. I believe that it would be a major mistake to accept the unpopular recommendations of the District.
Updated 10/5	For the next meeting, would it be possible: 1. For the district's counsel to be present to share their response to concerns expressed by the community regarding the creation of a multilingual center? 2. To share the costs associated with each option and any tax impacts? 3. To share the specific information regarding the community proposed scenarios #1 and #2 in the presentation? 4. Confirm when will BPAC be involved in the decision process? 5. To share the concrete start and end times if grade level are selected?
Updated 10/5	I am appalled at the new "solutions" I am hearing for option A- split young siblings up/multi grade option. The shuttle option is the worse idea I have heard so far yet. There is no world where I am okay with my five year old going on TWO busses to get to school. Option A at this point is a complete logistical nightmare for families, busses and young children. I cannot stress enough how AWFUL of an option this is. And 10-15 minute start difference?! So I risk making my child late because I'm dropping off at another school and now have to rush to a new one in morning rush hour traffic? I hate the idea of the dual language academy but at this point I am just asking the board to vote for this option.
Updated 10/5	For this boundary issue, why not use the money to build a new school? That for sure has to help.
Updated 10/5	We are currently a Coventry family. Under either proposal, we would ultimately become a Canterbury family—either immediately if the MLL school is located in Coventry, or when our child reaches 4th grade if the grade-level centers are implemented. We live just 0.3 miles from Coventry and can walk to and from school. As a family with two working parents who are both teachers, having a neighborhood school this close is incredibly important. It allows us to manage drop-off and pick-up while keeping our child connected to the community right around our home. I understand the district's transportation guidelines and the 1.5-mile requirement for bussing. However, after this change, we would be approximately one mile from Canterbury—still under the 1.5-mile threshold. Asking an elementary-aged child to walk one mile home, potentially without an adult, is not a reasonable expectation. Even if families were given the option to pay for transportation, I believe that should be considered. Busing needs to be offered more broadly, particularly to families who are being uprooted from their neighborhood "home" school due to district decisions. These families did not choose to attend a school farther from their homes. Transportation should be part of the solution when the district creates that change.
Updated 10/5	How many students would be required to change schools under each proposal? - Would students be able to remain at their current school through the end of an elementary cycle? - How would families with siblings at different schools be accommodated? - Regarding the Dual Language Academy proposal, would Mr. Grubbs remain the principal at Coventry? - What would the expected start, dismissal, and transportation schedules look like? - How would students receiving IEP or other support services be affected? - How will the district measure whether the recommendation improves student outcomes, rather than primarily improving enrollment balance and operational efficiency? - What safeguards will be in place to minimize disruption and maintain students' sense of belonging and community?
Updated 10/5	Which school would house the Dual Language Program for that option? Districts nearby (Palatine) tried this recently and it did not go well. For students, parents, families that have their home school and the school that houses the dual language program, would those families get a say on if their child is enrolled in a dual language class? If not, how will you be supporting parent choice in their education for a monolingual education and ensuring that parental rights in educational decisions are upheld?
Updated 10/5	I do not see any reference to the Aspire program in the FAQ or proposal materials. Is there a plan for these students?
Updated 10/5	I understand the challenges you are facing and simply want to state the following: Changing to a multi-language academy would be a huge mistake - it would foster discrimination and prevent valuable interchange between students of different nationalities/backgrounds who could benefit from being with/learning from each other. Thus finding a resolution that separates families the least and prevents as much bussing as possible would be preferable.
Updated 10/5	I sincerely request that board votes no on Grade level centers (GLC). While I recognize that a lot of thought and effort was put into the proposed options, please remain open to the community concerns rather than explaining them away. GLCs would create an unnecessary burden on the families with young children in our community. Just because other districts have adopted this structure, does not mean it's the best option for our schools. I have a kindergartener and a toddler. With GLCs, my children will never attend the same school. My sister's school district in Mahomet, IL has GLCs and she explained the problems it has caused for her and her young kids and only heightened my concerns. She would strongly prefer traditional K-5 for her kids. 1. Dropoff and pickup time burden for parents and kids having to spend precious free time in cars in siblings car lines or bus stops & shuttles (lost sleep & free time for students) 2. So many classes for each grade in one school separates kids more. While the board sees this as a positive, this large pool to mix students actually separates friendships and reduces continuity for kids. My sister's experience was that it was "heartbreaking" for the first few years with her son struggling to maintain friendships due to no familiar students in his classes year after year 3. Degrades family community with multiple young kids. Fewer shared events, reduces likelihood for parents to volunteer and fundraise. My sister shared that her GLCs have a lot of turnover with PTO, difficulty recruiting and retaining consistent volunteers 4. The board mentions that walker families don't want a boundary redraw. GLCs would force every family to move from their current school to another school at some point, including those walkers. Many of those children will end up being bused or driven to their secondary GLC anyway so that cannot justify this proposal 5. Parents are aware that children transition from Prek and later into middle schools. It is dismissive to not acknowledge that another school transition at this young age is impactful and stressful to students and families regardless of transition prep. New facility, new administrative staff, new encore staff, new culture. Our schools were not designed as GLCs. Changes would need to be made. Perhaps use those funds to build an addition where needed in combination with moving boundary lines. Students are transported across Route 31 and 176, so why is crossing Route 14 unacceptable? A boundary redraw could be done now and then reevaluated after the effects of the new construction are more clear. If the projections were not correct, it would be much more difficult to undo the drastic structural changes of GLCs if classroom sizes remain an issue several years from now. I urge and plead for the board to vote no to GLCs for district 47. A no vote to these options does not mean a no change vote. Thank you for your thoughtful consideration.
Updated 10/5	I am extremely concerned about Recommendation 1 and the disruption it would create for my children. My daughter currently attends Indian Prairie. In 2027–2028, she would be moved to Glacier Ridge for second grade, only to be moved AGAIN to Woods Creek for third grade. She would attend three different elementary schools and change schools two years in a row. My son will also be entering kindergarten that year. My children would finally attend the same school at Glacier Ridge, only to be separated one year later when my daughter is sent to Woods Creek while my son remains at Glacier Ridge. I would then have two elementary-aged children attending two different schools, with separate transportation, schedules, events, and school communities. Our location makes this even more difficult to understand. We live extremely close to Indian Prairie, yet our small pocket of homes would be moved away from Indian Prairie and ultimately sent even farther to Woods Creek. I understand enrollment and capacity must be considered, but these are young children, not just numbers on a map. Please reconsider this area and the impact Recommendation 1 would have on families like mine. Moving my daughter twice in two years and separating siblings between two elementary schools does not provide the stability and sense of community I want for my children.
Updated 10/5	Sorry disregard my question on where I can find the boundaries with dual language program. Side note. I hope you go with the dual language program. It opens the option for it to more students, while giving those students a better concentrated education. It also solves some district issues while allowing more families to stay at their schools. It is already a program that people join on their own, more people need to understand how it actually works. Great idea.
Updated 10/7	I spoke at the September board meeting about enrollment numbers and the data on the website. At that meeting you presented updated building capacities along with updated enrollment. Thank you. These capacity numbers are different from the original capacity numbers (boundary considerations presentation 2025 and data FOIA'd) and they change depending on the recommendation. Could you explain why the capacity numbers are changing? For example, North had space for 742 and then on slide 4 it shows 627 and then slide 13 shows 675 capacity. This affects the percentages that are listed. It's hard to compare the percentages when the bottom number is changing. With these new capacities and enrollment numbers can you update the boundary maps on the webpage? Currently when the enrollment is divided by capacity, these don't match the maps on the boundary page. For example, right now every school is within capacity (based on the new presentation), but the maps still show that several schools are at or over capacity. I think it would be beneficial to families for the district to update the maps posted on the boundary page so that they match the current data in the September presentation. The visual of the maps is helpful for many people to see what enrollment looks like at the schools. In these enrollments that are listed in the current presentation, are SPED and pre-K populations included? These populations seem integral to the reasons that the district has to make these changes. If pre-K is moved out of Glacier, can that section of the school be used for other K-5? How will SPED programs be moved? How many kids are moving schools? If you move kids out of Coventry in Recommendation 2 (academy), where will all these students go? Based on the new presentation, it looks like Glacier will have more students in it. Where are these students coming from? Will the district move students out of IP and Woods Creek into Glacier and move kids from Coventry to those schools? How many kids would actually have to change schools in the academy version? It is clear all North and Canterbury dual kids would move, but what about all the schools, how will the students in other schools be affected? It seems that both of these recommendations move a lot of students. It is true that up to 3 schools may be at capacity if the developments really come in, and class sizes are inconsistent. However, are we prepared to support every single kid emotionally, socially, academically, and students who need their teams in this massive restructuring of the district? How many more staff will you need to hire to support all these students? Development Changes! Understand that the developments will bring in children. Could you provide data to show if these developments are already open, which ones will have new families moving this spring (for enrollment purposes), and which ones are one to two years out. It shows that in the 2025 presentation that you had 327 (kids or families?) and now only 280 are listed as entering the district. If enrollment is going down, are you considering that this 280 number might drop even more? Will these schools actually be over capacity next year? Or is this 280 for the next few years? Class sizes/Class sizes have been another integral reason for why we need these changes. What data can you provide class sizes will equal out in these schools? What does D47 consider as an appropriate class size before needing to split a classroom? I notice in the data from a FOIA request by Margaret Valladaras from 9/11/26 that class sizes are lower than in previous years from the year the boundary committee started to review information. This is good! There are sections at several schools that are definitely over capacity: a second grade class at Canterbury, a first grade class at North, and fifth grade classes at Coventry. These are highlighted in red and yellow in the FOIA'd document. Is 22 students considered the threshold before there is a need to create a new class? Board Consideration! To avoid shifting a large population of students, have you considered moving the new developments to schools that have capacity. Husmann appears to have capacity with the new numbers, a ride to Husmann instead of Canterbury or North may be similar bus ride distances. Can the board decide to move the developments to other schools? Has this been considered?

Updated 10/13	As the parent of multiple children in the district, I've been following this whole boundary review process closely. I'm sorry to hear you are now facing legal action over all of this, but I'm also not surprised. I believe you will continue to have extreme pushback until you publicly address a few fundamental issues you've been ignoring. First, the middle school boundary review process seemed like theater. From the beginning, you stated that you wanted to align better with the high school boundaries; then, after receiving feedback, you presented two options that were basically the same, both aligned very closely with the high school boundaries, and both ignored concerns about walkability entirely (for example, kids living within a half mile of Hannah who now go to Bernotas). This gave the strong impression that you had already decided what you were going to do before asking for parent involvement and that the whole feedback process was just theater. Second, you are advocating major changes that will affect virtually every child in the district, and the biggest justification is "new developments" (which are not necessarily popular to begin with). This gives the impression that you are prioritizing the needs of families who don't yet live in the district ahead of those who are already established. A major factor for parents when buying a house is which school their children will attend. You need to address why you cannot simply use noncontiguous boundaries to add new housing developments to those schools that have additional capacity. Finally, you have not adequately justified why such a dramatic change is even necessary in the first place. Yes, class sizes are unbalanced, but none of them are "overcrowded" and it is not affecting the quality of education (also, class size changes year-to-year as the population changes, and the number of sections of each grade changes to accommodate that). Yes, there are non-contiguous boundaries, but they don't split neighborhoods up, so I don't understand why they are a problem. Yes, Pre-K is centralized, but it's also optional, and there are many other preschool options. Yes, some schools are built close together, but that won't be addressed by any of your solutions. In short, the only "why is this change necessary" that you have provided a meaningful explanation for is the "new developments." Whatever decision is made, the parents looking to buy into new developments will know ahead-of-time which school their children will be attending. If that means a longer bus ride, then they will know that going in and will not be surprised. You are asking for the rest of us to give up the privilege of knowing when we bought our house what schools our children would be attending in order to give it to people who don't yet exist.
Updated 10/14	(shared by a parent) Summary of Survey to Dual Language, Bilingual Interventionists, and Coventry Teachers Regarding Boundary Changes 9.21.26 A copy of the CLETA boundaries survey with additional questions about the specific impact of the proposed language academy was sent to DL, bilingual, and Coventry teachers (those who will be most affected by this option) to gather their thoughts. Teachers from Spain were not included in the CLETA survey; therefore, this survey is a more complete representation of dual language and bilingual teaching staff. Forty-five teachers were sent the survey and 30 (73.3% [22] DL/bilingual) anonymous responses were received. 83.3% (25) do not support either option. 13.3% (4) support a language academy and 3.3% (1) support grade level centers. Three of the four teachers (all DL or bilingual interventionists) who support a language academy question its successful implementation. These teachers want an exemplary non-segregating school, bilingual principal, targeted professional development, detailed plans, and continued enrollment in the DL program. Teachers (83.3%) need more information about the impact on multilingual students and staffing changes/cuts/plans before they can support an option. At least 50% of teachers report that they need more information about class sizes, enrollment projections, class size projections, impact on special education students, and educator placement process before they can make any decisions. The majority believe that the proposed language academy will negatively affect dual and mono language classes (70% think it negatively affects dual; 63% think it will negatively affect mono). Most DL, bilingual, and Coventry teachers feel that the proposed language academy will negatively affect all students regardless of their native language or skin color. Even more teachers feel that areas such as family involvement (e.g., PTO), afterschool and evening activities, encores, and time on the playground will be negatively affected by the proposed language academy. Teachers shared that their voices are not being heard. The proposed options are not boundary changes but reorganizations of student instruction. They want to understand why a boundary redraw is not an option. These options create problems that are bigger than balanced class sizes. They are concerned about the lack of transparency from the district, academic disruption, staff retention, family involvement, social-emotional development, changes to the curriculum, transportation, and school communities. Proposed grade level centers will disrupt relationships students build in a k-5 school and add unnecessary school transitions. Families will be impacted by having elementary students in different locations. Many stated that they feel that a language academy is being proposed because it affects fewer students and staff. However, they share that this will segregate multilingual learners and disrupt the DL program fidelity. Additionally DL and bilingual teachers share that they were not consulted about the proposed language academy. They are concerned about the message a separate school sends to students and families, splitting families, English speaking families pulling their children from the program, the work that has been put into aligning the monolingual and dual lingual curriculum, diversity, transition to middle school, cross-cultural learning/friendships, support staff systems, advocacy for the DL program, equity, staff retention, safety of the Hispanic population, large class sizes in the DL program/overcrowded school, ICE, and the community that exists within each school. They value their dual and mono language school communities and cultures. Teachers want what is best for their students and the majority believe that the proposed options will negatively impact all students.
Updated 10/14	My child attends school in District 47, and I am concerned and disappointed by the Board's decision not to hold all meetings regarding school boundaries openly and with the public present. The October boundary meeting was originally scheduled to be a closed door meeting. Could you please clarify why this meeting was not going to be open to the public? Rather than holding the meeting publicly, it now appears that the meeting has simply been canceled. Even if previous meetings regarding school boundaries have been held behind closed doors, the issue has now become a significant public concern. Given the level of interest and concern among parents and community members, choosing not to hold this discussion openly only creates the appearance that important decisions are being made without adequate transparency or public input. At this point, continuing to handle these discussions privately does not look good and does little to build trust with the community. Parents and community members deserve clarity and transparency regarding important decisions that may affect our schools and students. There is no reason for a discussion about school boundaries to be shielded from the families and community members who will ultimately be affected by these decisions. I respectfully ask the Board to explain why the October meeting was scheduled as a closed-door meeting and why it was canceled rather than opened to the public.
Updated 10/14	Thank you for your attention to this matter. I hope the Board will recognize the importance of addressing this issue openly and transparently moving forward. I'm extremely frustrated by the design of the elementary boundary survey. Section D requires respondents to choose between the two recommendations before continuing. There is no option to say, "I do not support either recommendation." That is my position. The survey does not let me express it in the required preference question. Frankly, I find it absurd that a survey seeking community feedback would require families to select a proposal they oppose in order to proceed. Asking which option someone finds less objectionable is not the same as asking whether they support it. Those answers cannot be treated as interchangeable. I recognize that earlier questions allow respondents to express concerns. But that does not fix the forced choice in Section D. My concern is that the final results could show a percentage "preferring" each recommendation without making equally clear how many of those families opposed both. That would give the Board and community a misleading picture of support. Beyond the survey itself, I do not support either proposal. I'm concerned about disrupting established school communities, reassigning students, and, under the grade-level model, adding school transitions and potentially separating siblings. These are significant changes to children's daily lives, not simply adjustments to building utilization. I understand the need to address enrollment imbalances. What I have not seen is a convincing explanation of why a more conventional boundary adjustment would not adequately address the problem with less disruption. I want to see that alternative compared directly with these proposals on student impact, transportation, educational benefits, and total costs. I'm asking the district to correct the survey by adding an explicit "I do not support either recommendation" option and explain how responses already collected will be handled. Please also confirm that any reporting will clearly distinguish relative preference from actual support and include opposition to both proposals. Families should not have to choose between abandoning the survey and selecting something they do not support. This needs to be addressed before the results are used to justify a recommendation. Please confirm receipt by the full Board and provide a response to these concerns.