STEVENS POINT AREA PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICT

Point Proud Schools 2040

Meeting 7 Outcomes-10/21/26

37 Task Force members in attendance (plus two non-voting Board members)

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

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

Large group questions during 2026-27 enrollment overview presentation:

- Q: Why did Roosevelt's enrollment go down over the past year? R: A larger 6th grade class left Roosevelt, replaced by a smaller kindergarten class. This may occur again by 2027-28. The current Roosevelt 6th grade class has 88 students and the current kindergarten class has 68 students.
- Q: What happened with high school enrollment? R: Overall, there was a 4 student increase in grade 10-12 enrollment, including SPASH, PODs, and CFC.

Large group questions during SPASH Suitability Exploration presentation:

- Q: What are Learning Centers? R: Modern version of what is commonly called "study hall". This year, the District added executive functioning, organization, and work initiative training into Learning Centers, which requires staff support that would need to increase if 9th graders were shifted to SPASH.
- Q: What is Advisory? R: Modern name for what is commonly understood as "home room". Students typically have the same Advisory teacher all 3 years. ACT testing is also through Advisory. If 9th graders were shifted to SPASH, more Advisory sections and teachers would be required, or Advisory sections would need to increase in size,
- Q: Would 9th grader moving to SPASH with associated teachers limit the number of travelling teachers? R: TBD. As a general default schedule rule, the District wants as few travelling teachers as possible.
- Q: What is the maximum number of students ever attending SPASH? R: in the in early-2000s, SPASH enrollment approached 2,170 students. Hallway crowding was an issue. The school operates differently today.
- Q: What SPASH class size assumptions did the design/build firms offering opinions on SPASH capacity use? R: They generally used the upper end of the District's SPASH class size policy—30-32 students.
- Q: Have we asked SPASH students about issues like class size, enrollment, hallway crowding, and other matters that might inform the Task Force's work? Can we? R: This has not been done to date, but may be considered as part of an outreach strategy. The principal offered that enrollment, class sizes, and ability to program common spaces (e.g., one lunch on block day) are very good now.
- Q: Can was also ask 9th graders how they feel about being in a Junior High building? R: Again, can be considered as part of outreach.

- Q: Did the design/build firms suggest creating a "wing" or separated space for 9th graders, etc. at SPASH? R: Yes, to a certain extent and with different potential price tags attached. Such an approach likely extends beyond the "targeted building remodeling" ideas.
- Q: What year is current referendum debt scheduled to be retired? R: 2039.
- Q: Did the design/build firms discuss any need for storm shelters or other upgrades at SPASH? R: No to shelters, but firms noted that certain levels of improvements require accessibility and other code upgrades. They also noted that the District should assume a 5% increase in capital costs each year.
- Q: Are reported average class sizes at SPASH being reduced by low enrollment in certain elective classes? R: Average class sizes overall at SPASH are around 24 students, with average core class sizes around 27-28.
- Q: Could the suggested "targeted building remodeling" dollars at SPASH instead be made available to improve other buildings? R: To be able to afford the presented "targeted building remodeling" expenses at SPASH without a referendum, the District would likely have to restructure its current debt and close an elementary school building to save on annual expenses there. It is certainly possible that, in the alternative, such "targeted building remodeling" dollars could instead be applied to capital needs at other school buildings.
- Q: What would restructuring debt look like? R: This might include extending the payback period 2 or 3 years, but this would depend on a variety of factors including interest rates.

Large group questions during long-range facilities plan Path 2 presentation: The consultant presented a long-range facilities plan titled "Path 2 – K-5/6-8/9-12 Transition & Elementary Consolidation", plus three Early Learning variations to that path: "ELa-Continue Current 4K Program"; "ELb-Expand Full-Day 4K to All Schools"; "ELc-Establish Early Learning Center". The following questions and responses were offered during that presentation:

- Q: Is Path 2's suggestion of closing two elementary schools in the mid term phase influenced by the proposed shift of 6th graders out of the elementary buildings also part of Path 2? R: Yes, plus the facts that there is currently excess building capacity at the elementary level and a projection of decreasing enrollment.
- Q: Would all of the suggested mid term actions in Path 2 happen at the same time? R: The general idea is that SPASH upgrades would happen first, but then the rest of the main actions would likely happen in the same year.
- Q: Is it correct to assume that Path 2/Variation ELb would still rely on community partner sites to serve some 4K students. R: Probably. With one section of full-day 4K at each remaining elementary school, about ½ of 4K students would still be at partner sites. There *may* be an opportunity for 2 4K sections at a few schools without bumping into capacity. Also, some parents may prefer having their child at a community partner site for 4K.
- Q: You noted that Wausau did not have more bus routes after closing 3 elementary schools. But student time on busses increase. R: We will inquire and report in Q&R.
- Q: Would it be safe to assume that grade 7-9 projections would be similar for grades 6-8? R: Yes—certainly by the mid term phase when suggested changes under Path 2 would occur.
- Q: How much would it cost to rebrand a "junior high school" as a "middle school" (e.g., signage, letterhead)? R: This would have to been looked into—they could still be called junior highs if preferred.
- Q: What is ideal percentage of maximum building capacity to use to calculate working capacity? R: The design/build firms all advised 80%.

- Q: Does the suggested percentage of working capacity used at SPASH in Path 2 include capacity increases that may be achieved by the suggested “targeted building remodeling” projects? R: No, even though “targeted building remodeling” would seem likely to include subdividing spaces for at least a handful more classrooms, thereby possibly increasing capacity. For example, four more classrooms could conceivably increase capacity by around 100 students.
- Q: Path 2 suggests identifying two elementary buildings to close in the short term phase, and then actually closing them in the mid term phase. Is this the appropriate amount of lead time? R: The benefits are that families have a chance to adapt or their kids often grow out of elementary school in the meantime, and it provides time to solidify new attendance areas. But waiting too long to execute such changes can allow the matter to fester. The Task Force could view these two actions of being separated in time by a year or two if preferred.
- Q: Is it going to be feasible to defer elementary attendance area changes to the mid term phase (i.e., 2031 or later)? R: It appears so, though Plover-Whiting may be at or slightly above its working capacity by then. The alternative of adjusting attendance areas twice in, say, a 4-5 year period did not seem a good approach in Path 2.
- Q: Does the reported 84-89% of combined elementary capacity filled in 2035 with 7 buildings in Path 2 include 4K? R: Yes.

Small group exercise results: Each of the eight small groups was then asked to respond to three questions to compare Path 2 and its Early Learning variations to the Task Force’s four evaluation criteria, which are listed as follows: 1. Maintained or Enhanced Student Opportunities; 2. Manageable Student and Family Impacts; 3. Fiscal Responsibility; 4. Efficient Building Utilization. Responses are recorded below:

1. <u>Against which of the four evaluation criteria does Path 2 PERFORM WELL in your opinion? Why or how?</u>

Group A Responses:

i. Fiscal responsibility

ii. Student opportunities

Group B Responses:

i. It performs well with #1, 3, and 4.

ii. For #1, the opportunities for ninth graders and sixth graders will be enhanced (overall)

a. Proper PD and support would be <u>CRUCIAL</u> for implementation from the staffing perspective.

Group C Responses:

i. 1 – Enhances opportunities for 4K, 6th and 9th

ii. 3 – If closing two elementary buildings – <u>no referendum</u>

iii. 4 – Nothing under 70%

Group D Responses:

i. How to perform well

ii. #3 fiscal responsibility - Closures = $

iii. #4 building utilization - Simple % occupancy math

iv. #1 opportunities - More opportunities for 6th and 9th

Group E Responses:

i. Fiscal responsibility

ii. More extra/co-curricular opportunities

iii. Efficient building utilization

iv. There are lots of questions/uncertainties!

Group F Responses:

i. Fiscal responsibility and building utilization - With having time to prioritize and watch trends

Group G Responses:

i. Criteria 1 - More opportunities for 6th graders to try new courses

ii. Criteria 2 - For the task we are given, this is manageable

iii. Criteria 3 - Allow significant savings by closing two buildings

Group H Responses:

i. 1 - Maintain or enhance student opportunities

a. 6th graders have more options

b. 4K for more families

2. <u>Against which of the four evaluation criteria does Path 2 PERFORM POORLY in your opinion? Why not or how not?</u>

Group A Responses: n/a

Group B Responses: Manageable (yes) impacts, but manageable ¹ ideal/easy

Group C Responses: 2 – A lot of change BUT manageable

Group D Responses:

i. Path 2 performs poorly:

a. #2 very subjective per family

i. à easily question 1. (the same)

ii. Temporary (but significant) disruption but alleviate long-term

b. #3 only 2x repurposed buildings first closures

Group E Responses:

i. Reduced class choices because of enrollment concerns

ii. Family impacts – changes can be hard

Group F Responses: How are we actually defining “poorly”? Because if we look at the criterion 1 and 2 it certainly would have them perform not as well, but does that necessarily equate to “poorly”?

Group G Responses:

i. Criteria 1

a. Overall fewer opportunities for ninth graders if they move to SPASH (electives)

b. Grey area: not necessarily good for all students

ii. Criteria 2 - This will be a hard change

Group H Responses:

i. 2 – manageable students and family impacts

a. This presents so many changes for families, especially at once

ii. 3 – fiscal responsibility

a. Any $ saved on closing elementary will immediately be spent on SPASH remodels (that aren't needed)… this doesn't even touch 10 year projected capital needs

b. Doesn't feel great to divert millions to the tech ed classes or gym when these were both recently updated

c. Going to need to spend a lot on consultants

iii. 4 - efficient building utilization

a. Forcing 9th into SPASH is NOT a more efficient utilization SPASH

b. Middle school buildings are not at appropriate capacity

iv. Overall, we did not feel that this path (or any of its variations) weighed well against the criteria. What it achieved is aligning the district with the state standard, but we questioned at what cost.

3. <u>How do the Early Learning variations (ELa, ELb, ELc) affect criterion evaluation? How about whether a building is closed versus repurposed</u>

Group A Responses: n/a

Group B Responses:

i. The choice between ELa, ELb, and ELc could play a large role in which elementary would close.

ii. Repurpose idea: childcare with elder care

Group C Responses:

i. ELb = most enticing

ii. ELc = cool but goes against fiscal responsibility

Group D Responses:

i. How does capital ELa factor in?

ii. ELa ++ criteria #1

iii. ELb ++ criteria #1

iv. ELc à see #2.3, ++ critical #1, -- criteria #4

Group E Responses:

i. Bringing 4K in if 6th is out improves building utilization

ii. ELc creation will reduce funds available SPASH modifications

iii. ELb better ELc because easier on families for transportation

iv. Other thoughts:

a. Is closing two elementary schools? What is best for students/families? It is not just about the numbers!!!!!

b. Lots more specific info would be needed to make informed decisions

Group F Responses: It really seems to muddy the waters more and seems to shift the “optics” and favorability of certain variations as opposed to last month.

Group G Responses:

i. Criteria 1

a. ELa good for enhancing student opportunities

ii. Criteria 4

a. By closing or repurposing schools, we are moving kids to other schools, moving those buildings closer to working capacity.

iii. Sharing information about how and why with families will be key

Group H Responses: n/a

Path 2 Evaluation Matrix: Each of the eight groups was then asked to fill out a matrix which evaluated Path 2 and each of its early learning variations against the four evaluation criteria, and provided further opportunity for comment. Responses are recorded below:

Group A	**Path 2, Variation ELa**			**Path 2, Variation ELb**			**Path 2, Variation ELc**			Comments
	Yes	No	Unsure	Yes	No	Unsure	Yes	No	Unsure	
1. Maintained or Enhanced Student Opportunities	4	1		5			5			
2. Manageable Student and Family Impacts	4	1		5			4			
3. Fiscal Responsibility	5			5				5		
4. Efficient Building Utilization	4	1		2		3		1	4	
Totals	**17**	**3**		**17**		**3**	**9**	**6**	**4**	

Group B	**Path 2, Variation ELa**			**Path 2, Variation ELb**			**Path 2, Variation ELc**			Comments
	Yes	No	Unsure	Yes	No	Unsure	Yes	No	Unsure	
1. Maintained or Enhanced Student Opportunities	5			5			5			
2. Manageable Student and Family Impacts	2	3		4		1		5		

3. Fiscal Responsibility	5			5					5	
4. Efficient Building Utilization	5			5				5		
Totals	**17**	**3**	**0**	**19**	**0**	**1**	**5**	**10**	**5**	

Group C	**Path 2, Variation ELa**			**Path 2, Variation ELb**			**Path 2, Variation ELc**			**Comments**
	Yes	**No**	**Unsure**	**Yes**	**No**	**Unsure**	**Yes**	**No**	**Unsure**	
1. Maintained or Enhanced Student Opportunities	4			4			2		2	
2. Manageable Student and Family Impacts	4			4					2	
3. Fiscal Responsibility	4			4				4		
4. Efficient Building Utilization	4			4				4		
Totals	**16**	**0**	**0**	**16**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**10**	**4**	

Group D	**Path 2, Variation ELa**			**Path 2, Variation ELb**			**Path 2, Variation ELc**			**Comments**
	Yes	**No**	**Unsure**	**Yes**	**No**	**Unsure**	**Yes**	**No**	**Unsure**	
1. Maintained or Enhanced Student Opportunities	4			3		1	4			ELb -4K/EC traveling staff would be spread thin between more buildings
2. Manageable Student and Family Impacts	2		2	2		2	2		2	For all EL variations, we see a larger, temporary disruption, but alleviate impact long-term
3. Fiscal Responsibility	4			4			1		3	ELc – Depends on which building is converted, how/when etc.
4. Efficient Building Utilization	4			4			3		1	ELb – Again, depends on the 4K staffing
Totals	**14**	**0**	**2**	**13**	**0**	**3**	**10**	**0**	**6**	When you say at the outset, you are closing two buildings, that makes a lot of other pieces fall into place. It's a big, hard change, but the benefits become pretty clear.

Group E	Path 2, Variation ELa			Path 2, Variation ELb			Path 2, Variation ELc			Comments
	Yes	No	Unsure	Yes	No	Unsure	Yes	No	Unsure	
1. Maintained or Enhanced Student Opportunities		1	4	1		4			5	Depends on how lots of things are handled/navigated
2. Manageable Student and Family Impacts	3		2	3		2	1		4	ELc Could be great for teachers, but harder for families
3. Fiscal Responsibility	5			5				2	3	If childcare is revenue generating, that minimize expense, that may change things
4. Efficient Building Utilization	5			5					5	Depends on if building usage is maximized (Maybe bring in 3K?)
Totals	**13**	**1**	**6**	**14**	**0**	**6**	**1**	**2**	**17**	

Group F	Path 2, Variation ELa			Path 2, Variation ELb			Path 2, Variation ELc			Comments
	Yes	No	Unsure	Yes	No	Unsure	Yes	No	Unsure	
1. Maintained or Enhanced Student Opportunities			5	1		4	2		3	
2. Manageable Student and Family Impacts			5	1		4	1		4	
3. Fiscal Responsibility	1		4	1		4		2	3	
4. Efficient Building Utilization	1		4	5			1		4	
Totals	**2**	**0**	**18**	**8**	**0**	**12**	**4**	**2**	**14**	

Group G	Path 2, Variation ELa			Path 2, Variation ELb			Path 2, Variation ELc			Comments
	Yes	No	Unsure	Yes	No	Unsure	Yes	No	Unsure	
1. Maintained or Enhanced Student Opportunities	4	1		4		1	4		1	
2. Manageable Student and Family Impacts	5			5				1	4	
3. Fiscal Responsibility	5			3		2			5	In terms of fiscal responsibility, repurposing doesn't meet the mark
4. Efficient Building Utilization	5			5				5		ELa does not meet building utilization
Totals	**19**	**1**	**0**	**17**	**0**	**3**	**4**	**6**	**10**	**ELb Is the most desirable Path 2 variation**

Group H	Path 2, Variation ELa			Path 2, Variation ELb			Path 2, Variation ELc			Comments
	Yes	No	Unsure	Yes	No	Unsure	Yes	No	Unsure	
1. Maintained or Enhanced Student Opportunities	4			4			4			For 6th grade. 9th gr. opportunities might be maintained. Good for 4K.
2. Manageable Student and Family Impacts		4			4			4		Closing two elementaries at once is abrupt. These are making big changes at once.
3. Fiscal Responsibility		3	1		4			4		Saved money is immediately allocated to 9th à SPASH Transition
4. Efficient Building Utilization		3	1		3	1		2	2	Seems like junior highs are underutilized and SPASH and elementary very full
Totals	**4**	**10**	**2**	**4**	**11**	**1**	**4**	**10**	**2**	**We want excess capacity left in elementary for pull out and other future needs**

All Groups	Path 2, Variation ELa			Path 2, Variation ELb			Path 2, Variation ELc		
	Yes	No	Unsure	Yes	No	Unsure	Yes	No	Unsure
1. Maintained or Enhanced Student Opportunities	25	3	9	27	0	10	26	0	11
2. Manageable Student and Family Impacts	20	8	9	24	4	9	8	12	16
3. Fiscal Responsibility	29	3	5	27	4	6	1	17	19
4. Efficient Building Utilization	28	4	5	30	3	4	4	17	16
Totals	**102**	**18**	**28**	**108**	**11**	**29**	**39**	**46**	**62**

Individual member written meeting evaluation responses (following meeting):

1. <u>At its November meeting, the Task Force will review more alternative facilities plan paths. Any more ideas for new paths-or variations to Paths 1 and 2- that you would like to see?</u>
    a. 4k-5,6-9 (or 6-7, 8-9), 10-12
    b. Not sure if K-5, 6–7, 8–9, 10–12 is being considered for presentation. I would like to see that plan presented.
    c. It is difficult to make decisions when we say closure/repurposing. Those have vastly different outcomes. Can we tease out one versus the other?
    d. Can the middle schools handle 6 to 9th graders?
    e. Only close one elementary school for path two. Close elementary school earlier for path one. Wait to shift grade 9 until population drop.
    f. Could it be looked at (unless this is path) having sixth grade move, along with ninth grade, but then repurposing a building to a more special purpose facility à like a charter school type or expansion of a PODs-style school?
    g. 4kà5, 6-7, 10-12 path like “2” in terms of timeline, materials, gradual change.
    h. Variation – in looking at 4K options, would the district consider an option in which 4K is in all the buildings but some are still half days? Families might still want that option instead of full day. In a district building instead of a community site. Sixth to ninth at junior highs path with 4K – 5 @ elementary and 10–12 @ SPASH. Path 2, but only closing one elementary school.
    i. I am looking forward to path three.
    j. Using the two pairs, what would it look like to repurpose the intended closed buildings to be used for other district buildings such as Bliss?
    k. 4k-5/6-7/8-9/10-12. With variations or notes to add. 4K to all schools; close 2 elementary schools and repurpose one as elementary charter school and addition of in-district virtual school.
    l. Need time to talk more on path 2 à in groups. Have questions answered. Do 4K teachers have prep time equivalent for K-5 teachers? Variationàfor an alternative in K5 like Tomorrow River.
    m. What other opportunities or programming could be an option? What are the responsibilities or programming like between 4K and K – five? Special ed/services for teachers? Increase in students with emotional/special ed services coming into

educational setting. Possible cuts in part C, having children having a valuable education (eq 4k) opportunity for early intervention.

n. Only one school closed… With the changes of school alignment. And the B option would be something better?

o. I'd really like to explore a charter school/alternative setting for EL and elementary.

p. Need to look at SPASH building on additional gym with some moderate remodeling in classroom footprint. Not a ninth grade wing.

q. I would like to see 4K-five, 6–9, 10–12. What would path two look like if you just closed one elementary building?

r. They were already pretty comprehensive.

s. Would like some discussion on implementation. This could make or break any plan.

t. Four day 4Ks in buildings?

u. I don't need to see more options.

v. What would repurposing look like? possible elder care?

w. Can we talk about closing only one school and not two? We like path two, but…

x. Maybe a path to one middle school.

2. <u>What went well this meeting? What could've gone better? How?</u>

a. I really appreciated the discussion and discourse today. After discussion about SPASH and the cost behind it has left me feeling like what's the point? There is no good answer and it feels very disheartening and disappointing. I was reminded of the Shrek meme… "some of you may die, but that's a sacrifice I'm willing to make".

b. Combining path two and the EL variations made things a little muddy. Our table tried to separate them.

c. I like the info about SPASH work for ninth graders. Comparing all EC variations with the secondary changes to make one decision on the matrix is difficult. One decision should be made and then the other. Comparing applies to oranges hard to say yes, no, unsure because they could be in conflict.

d. This meeting went well.

e. Good conversation and sharing of opinions.

f. Good group discussion

g. I feel like what may have been better is more small group time paired with larger group discussion. It was extremely interesting to hear all of the different perspectives because it really can influence my stance on things.

h. Path two is very solid. Well done.

i. Packets/handouts could be double-sided and grayscale to save a bit of money and be more environmentally friendly

j. The discussion at the end was interesting – it would have been nice to have more time. It was difficult to incorporate the early learning components into path two.

k. Group discussion is interesting. I would like more time for share-outs and regroup and discuss as a whole.

l. The variations of ELa,b,c did not feel like meaningful differences.

m. Discussion groups went well. Gone better– too much info – confusing, overwhelmed with data.

n. More data.

o. Different ideas were shared; we were very opposite of the first table (H).

p. I don't think we received an agenda ahead of time. I find that helpful to dust the cobwebs off.

q. Discussion was lively and positive. Glad to be getting some decisions finally!

r. I thought this was the best meeting yet – maybe because we are in a rhythm? But the information about SPASH was great, the balance between large/small group discussion was good, etc.
s. Good discussions and info. Timing didn't quite hit this time.
t. Good repeat of familiar discussion pattern and means of feedback. Appreciate the consistency.
u. Good groups, lots of discussion, respectful.
v. The new information/presentation was very informative and helpful
w. Good discussions, could use more time and it would be helpful to have time to write out thoughts and answers
x. The discussion time was very helpful!
y. Longer time for large group discussion
z. Plenty of time to discuss. Good use of time.
aa. The flow felt – less rushed and good amount of discussion.
bb. Adequate time to discuss items! Thank you!
cc. While the information is fresh in our minds, would be good to get into debate rather than showing highlights of our small group discussions.
dd. Good small group discussion. Good differing of opinions.
ee. Our table was great. Good conversations and thoughts.

3. <u>What additional information (or reminders) do you feel you need to complete the tasks ahead?</u>

a. Need more information about cost versus timeline. Lots of unknowns are causing us to feel this is muddy/confusing/gray.
b. Not sure
c. None
d. None
e. None
f. How would the district decide which elementary schools will close?
g. When speaking about the reasons for moving ninth graders to SPASH – I'd like to explore ways to address the issues mentioned without moving them to SPASH. I think some of them could be addressed by path three in November.
h. I think it would be interesting to work at tables with people of similar experience/roles, i.e. parents, community, teachers
i. Time limits before I present – sorry if I talk too much J
j. Survey students on feeling
    i. Grade
    ii. Male/female
    iii. Size –
        1. hallways
            a. Too big
            b. Just right
            c. Too small
        2. Classrooms
            a. Too big
            b. Just right
            c. Too small
        3. Activities - Sports, music, etc. now worked in

k. 4K to k-6 teachers responsibilities/prep. Boundaries. What other opportunities? ELc à charter, what type of other programs are available? Online learning options? Tomorrow River Charter School. PODs and virtual offer many opportunities now another option would be sweet

l. More information of the timeline and $ details.

m. We will need at least two more meetings in early 2027 to pick final path recommendation.

n. Costs/feasibility of four grade levels at middle school/junior high.

o. Having 4K in more buildings will spread 4K/EC traveling teachers even more thinly. These young students will be served less. Keeping 4K at only a few buildings, or possibly adding classrooms of 4K to those buildings could help consolidate those staff members.

p. Building closure specifics, and how many repurposed?

q. I'm not sure I need more information. Really, I just need to sit with the material and digest.

r. If 4K is moved to the ELC would there still be 4K in buildings?

s. None – at this point, show us the rest of the options, including new responses and let us fill out tally sheets, and vote.

t. How will the two locations be determined if two schools are closed?

u. Feedback from students.

35 Task Force members in attendance (plus one non-voting Board member)

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

District staff in attendance: Cory Hirsburnner, Superintendent; Chris Nyman, Assistant Superintendent/Director of Elementary Education; Michael Kurtz, Director of Business Services; Nicole Baumann, Executive Assistant to the Superintendent

Large group questions during initial staff/consultant presentation:

- Q: How do we dispel information on schools closing and other aspects of the Task Force process that are untrue or otherwise premature? R: The District's Director of Communications has discussed a communications plan with the Board, which will be advanced in the coming weeks, on which Task Force member participation is appreciated.
- Q: Explain the difference between the regional Rural Virtual Academy and the District's Online Learning Center. R: All RVA instruction is online, and it serves grades K-12. Most of the OLC's participants also get some education in the District's bricks and mortar school buildings, and it serves grades 7-12.
- Q: If the SPAPSD were to host its own virtual academy, would its students be counted as SPAPSD students, and could they participate in co-curricular activities? R: Yes and yes.

First small group exercise results: Each of the eight small groups was asked to discuss and respond to three questions reflecting on and synthesizing work from previous meetings, and then discussing ideas for potential "paths" for the future. Responses are recorded below:

1. <u>What has discussion so far taught us about potential grade group changes, school consolidation, and the interaction between them?</u>

Group A Responses:

i. What comes first, chicken or egg? Both affect one another.
ii. Priority needs to be found to know where to start
iii. There is no one right answer

Group B Responses: Enhance 4K maintain all other grades

Group C Responses:

i. Seems as though more are on board with sixth grade moving up, but nervous of "waterfall" effects of moving ninth
ii. An impression of Point being behind being 10-12
iii. Both sides of shifting grades is needed or not with adjusting lines

Group D Responses:

i. That ninth graders go through two transitions
   a. Becoming high schoolers
   b. Moving to SPASH
ii. Adding 4K to the most utilized schools

Group E Responses:

i. Group changes are possible
ii. How complicated the decisions are (moving parts)
iii. Highly emotional

Group F Responses: People have big, strong opinions when it comes to our kids and community schools
Group G Responses: What happens with buildings really depends on what happens with grade levels
Group H Responses:

i. Circling around these issues
ii. Consensus around grade band shifts à specifically sixth grade
iii. Number support closing 1 to 2 buildings à alternative K-6 (7-10)

2. <u>How does the discussion so far interact with possibilities and interests for attendance area shifts and other school facility-related changes?</u>

Group A Responses:

i. We can't please everyone
ii. Even without closure, borders are redrawn
iii. 4K has been brought up in important discussions; could be a great selling point to community
iv. Conversations around expanding alternative schools/options
    a. Virtual (in-house)
    b. Expanding CFC to lower grades

Group B Responses: Maintain school, climate community, like potential long-term phasing
Group C Responses:

i. Adjusting lines is necessary
ii. Looking into more nontraditional options is important

Group D Responses: None listed.
Group E Responses: Redistricting is necessary
Group F Responses:

i. We want more discussion for redistricting
ii. Lots of discussion about our struggles. We think more conversation about what we are doing well.

Group G Responses: Attendance area shift is unavoidable for elementary
Group H Responses:

i. What is the order of events?
ii. How does one domino impact another?
iii. What is Plan B?

3. What ideas/outlines do you have for potential "paths" for the Task Force to consider?

Group A Responses:

i. Just because everyone else is doing it doesn't mean we do
ii. The districts that have ninth at high school usually have two high school buildings
iii. Ninth to SPASH is just not feasible now, but could be doable later
iv. 6/7 middle school at Ben
v. 8/9 at PJ junior high
vi. Repurpose 2-ish elementary
    a. One could be 4K/birth-3?
    b. Expand CFC to 7/8th – intervene early for early success
    c. Daycare buildings in school buildings
vii. Research shows early intervention/education has best outcomes
viii. In-district virtual academy
ix. Growth mindset! We are making positive changes

Group B Responses:

i. Short term = poor
ii. ELB – poor, if three additional sites need renovation
iii. long term – closure - performs well
iv. long term – repurpose – poor

v. <70% utilization = poor result. Very conservative “kick the can down the road”

Group C Responses: Sharing a repurposed building as ECC and a non-traditional option

Group D Responses:

i. Moving school boundaries is an easy way to level out building utilization
ii. How does ending open enrollment change building utilization numbers after adjusting boundaries to schools?

Group E Responses: Grade realignment (6 to middle. 9 to high school)

Group F Responses:

i. Virtual options are an example of something that we are excited by and want to learn more about.
ii. Education to everyone about what our school district needs
iii. Some sort of alternative elementary option! Example elementary version of PoDS, Waldorf, Montessori
iv. Question: school consolidation – what happens to the resources at a school that may close?
v. 4K In every elementary school cost?

Group G Responses:

i. Grade group changes = phase 1
ii. Reconsideration of future consolidation and building usage = phase 2
iii. Outcomes:
a. What are our priorities?
b. What has to happen first?

Group H Responses:

i. Meeting needs related to childcare cost
a. Helps create support? -4k -daycare
b. Numbers on childcare
ii. Attendance area shifts - projection maps?
iii. Cross-generational centers - address, young and aging
iv. Survey – what does community support?

Large group questions during long-range facilities plan Path 1 presentation: The consultant presented a long-range facilities plan titled “Path 1 – Moderate Change”, plus three Early Learning variations to that path: “ELa-Continue Current 4K Program”; “ELb-Expand Full-Day 4K to All Schools”; “ELc-Establish Early Learning Center”. The following questions and responses were offered during that presentation:

- Q: How much would it cost to add 4K to each building that does not now have 4K? R: Current buildings did not require a significant amount of change to accommodate 4K. Each new site would need to be evaluated.
- Q: Is there room to add all 4K students to all elementary school buildings? R: Yes, if attendance areas were shifted.
- Q: When was elementary attendance areas last changed. Didn’t Washington and Jefferson have a slight attendance area shift between them? R: No major shift in decades. There was a small shift between Washington and Jefferson within the last 10 years.
- Q: In the consultant’s example, shifting 30 Washington students to Bannach may not provide enough room to add 4K students at Washington, as those 30 students would be across six grades. How would that really work? R: Good point. It may require a greater-than-30 student shift away from Washington to allow 4K to be there.

Second small group exercise results: Each of the eight small groups was then asked to respond to three questions to compare Path 1 and its Early Learning variations to the Task Force’s four evaluation

criteria, which are listed as follows: 1. Maintained or Enhanced Student Opportunities; 2. Manageable Student and Family Impacts; 3. Fiscal Responsibility; 4. Efficient Building Utilization. Responses are recorded below:

1. Against which of the four evaluation criteria does Path 1 PERFORM WELL in your opinion? Why or how?

Group A Responses: Path one performs well on [criterion] number two, as it has a low impact on families * passive * bare minimum

Group B Responses:

i. We are outliers: 7-9 and 10-12. Shift to 9-12 creates opportunity for elementary
   a. School consolidation and/or more 4K students served at district sites –"domino effect"
   b. Meeting criteria three and four with this
ii. Shifts could meet criterion one – less transitions
iii. Opportunities – will they increase or decrease – some of both

Group C Responses:

i. Well = #2 = minimum number of families affected
ii. OK = #1 = maintaining opportunities

Group D Responses:

i. ELa - maintain
ii. ELb - Enhanced

Group E Responses: Perform well under all criteria (maintain current status)

Group F Responses:

i. Criterion 1: Maintains, but does not enhance
ii. Criterion 2: Manageable/minimal
iii. Criterion 3: Short-term not as much but definite, long-term benefits
iv. Criterion 4: Moving neighborhoods balances, capacity usage

Group G Responses: None recorded on flipchart.

Group H Responses:

i. #3 fiscal responsibility -OK
ii. #4 – OK – marginally better
iii. #2 – family impacts - best it can be

2. Against which of the four evaluation criteria does Path 1 PERFORM POORLY in your opinion? Why not or how not?

Group A Responses: Path one performs poorly on number one because it is status quo (at best) and likely will take away opportunities.

Group B Responses:

i. More bussing and cost associated, bus drivers available?
ii. Loss of school community and culture
iii. Trauma
iv. Transition time – line more like Kennedy move to PJ's over more than one year

Group C Responses:

i. Poorly = #4 = getting underutilized… which leads to #3 = missed opportunity cost
   a. Save $ and give new opportunities, this doesn't

Group D Responses: None recorded on flipchart.

Group E Responses: None perform poorly

Group F Responses:

i. Criterion 1: Maintains, but does not enhance
ii. Criterion 2: Manageable/minimal
iii. Criterion 3: Short-term not as much but definite, long-term benefits

iv. Criterion 4: Moving neighborhoods balances, capacity usage

Group G Responses: None recorded on flipchart.

Group H Responses:

i. #1 – only enhances 4k opportunities (marginally)

ii. Enhances environment at Plover-Whiting

3. <u>How do the Early Learning variations (ELa, ELb, ELc) affect criterion evaluation? How about whether a building is closed versus repurposed?</u>

Group A Responses:

i. ELb could maybe be a way to "save" buildings – but is it feasible?

ii. ELc would be good for number one – or opportunities for early childhood

Group B Responses: One change at a time, phasing of changes cohorts for criterion one or two

Group C Responses:

i. ELa – OK. meh. See #1 & #2

ii. ELb - #2 families connected. Harder for. #4 (too Full) and therefore #3

iii. ELc – weaker for #3. Stronger for #1. Only one that addresses #4. Disrupting families.

Group D Responses: None recorded on flipchart.

Group E Responses:

i. ELa is status quo

ii. ELb is positive performs well on 1

iii. ELc is performing poorly against 2 or 3

Group F Responses:

i. ELa
   a. Not ideal for families
   b. Good building utilization

ii. ELb
   a. Or student opportunities
   b. Excellent for families
   c. Good usage of buildings

iii. ELc
   a. The possibility of more student opportunities – 4K could have access to music, art, PE teachers
   b. More expenses just in busing and building updates
   c. Other thoughts – 4K standardized curriculum with K-5

iv. Endowment system for the school district? Side quest thought.

Group G Responses: None recorded on flipchart.

Group H Responses:

i. ELc – how does repurposing a building save money?
   a. Need info on operations

ii. Closing – More fiscally responsible

Path 1 Evaluation Matrix: Each of the eight groups was then asked to fill out a matrix which evaluated each of the variations of Path 1 against the four evaluation criteria, and provided further opportunity for comment. Responses are recorded below:

Group A	Path 1, Variation ELa			Path 1, Variation ELb			Path 1, Variation ELc			Comments
	Yes	No	Unsure	Yes	No	Unsure	Yes	No	Unsure	
1. Maintained or Enhanced Student Opportunities	2	3		2	3		4		1	Ela – maintains but we want to ENHANCE!

2. Manageable Student and Family Impacts	5			5			3		2	
3. Fiscal Responsibility		3	2			5		1	4	Fiscally responsible to use buildings efficiently but it's not the only factor
4. Efficient Building Utilization		1	4	3		2	1		4	Efficient vs ideal (this is our chance to hit ideal)
Totals	**7**	**7**	**6**	**10**	**3**	**7**	**8**	**1**	**11**	**4k in same building as 6th is too much**

Group B	Path 1, Variation ELa			Path 1, Variation ELb			Path 1, Variation ELc			Comments
	Yes	No	Unsure	Yes	No	Unsure	Yes	No	Unsure	
1. Maintained or Enhanced Student Opportunities	4	4		4					4	
2. Manageable Student and Family Impacts	4			4						
3. Fiscal Responsibility		4			4			4		In long-term Ela & ELb save on building operating costs due to closure
4. Efficient Building Utilization		4		4			4			
Totals	**8**	**12**	**0**	**8**	**4**	**0**	**4**	**4**	**4**	

Group C	Path 1, Variation ELa			Path 1, Variation ELb			Path 1, Variation ELc			Comments
	Yes	No	Unsure	Yes	No	Unsure	Yes	No	Unsure	
1. Maintained or Enhanced Student Opportunities		5			1	4			5	
2. Manageable Student and Family Impacts	5			5				1	4	ELc - Concern for family transitions
3. Fiscal Responsibility		2	3		3	2		3	2	
4. Efficient Building Utilization		4	1		4	1			5	
Totals	**5**	**11**	**4**	**5**	**8**	**7**	**0**	**4**	**16**	

Group D	Path 1, Variation ELa			Path 1, Variation ELb			Path 1, Variation ELc			Comments
	Yes	No	Unsure	Yes	No	Unsure	Yes	No	Unsure	
1. Maintained or Enhanced Student Opportunities	4			4			4			
2. Manageable Student and Family Impacts	4			4			2		2	
3. Fiscal Responsibility	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	
4. Efficient Building Utilization		4		4			4			
Totals	**9**	**6**	**1**	**13**	**2**	**1**	**11**	**2**	**3**	

Group E	Path 1, Variation ELa			Path 1, Variation ELb			Path 1, Variation ELc			Comments
	Yes	No	Unsure	Yes	No	Unsure	Yes	No	Unsure	
1. Maintained or Enhanced Student Opportunities	4			4			4			
2. Manageable Student and Family Impacts	4			3		1		4		
3. Fiscal Responsibility	2		2	1		3		4		
4. Efficient Building Utilization		4		4				1	3	
Totals	**10**	**4**	**2**	**12**	**0**	**4**	**4**	**9**	**3**	

Group F	Path 1, Variation ELa			Path 1, Variation ELb			Path 1, Variation ELc			Comments
	Yes	No	Unsure	Yes	No	Unsure	Yes	No	Unsure	
1. Maintained or Enhanced Student Opportunities	4			4			1		3	Ela-maintained not enhanced. ELc-need more info.
2. Manageable Student and Family Impacts	4			4				4		
3. Fiscal Responsibility	3		1	4				1	3	ELc – need more info
4. Efficient Building Utilization	4			4			1	3		
Totals	**15**	**0**	**1**	**16**	**0**	**0**	**2**	**8**	**6**	

Group G	Path 1, Variation ELa			Path 1, Variation ELb			Path 1, Variation ELc			Comments
	Yes	No	Unsure	Yes	No	Unsure	Yes	No	Unsure	
1. Maintained or Enhanced Student Opportunities	4			4			4			ELb – A long time for kids to be in 1 building as sixth grade stays put
2. Manageable Student and Family Impacts		1	3	3		1	4			ELa – Currently doesn't meet bullet one and this doesn't change that. Unsure due to school closure and multiple buildings for siblings. ELc-more flexibility in 4K program to work with families (before/after school)
3. Fiscal Responsibility	2		2	1		3			4	ELc-Like idea of all in one building, but cost is unknown, like possibility of daycare as a revenue generation possibility
4. Efficient Building Utilization	4			4			3		1	
Totals	**10**	**1**	**5**	**12**	**0**	**4**	**11**	**0**	**5**	

Group H	Path 1, Variation ELa			Path 1, Variation ELb			Path 1, Variation ELc			Comments
	Yes	No	Unsure	Yes	No	Unsure	Yes	No	Unsure	
1. Maintained or Enhanced Student Opportunities	3	1	1	5			1		4	
2. Manageable Student and Family Impacts	5			5			4		1	
3. Fiscal Responsibility	5			Meh				2	3	Fiscal responsibility as compared to what? Path ELb Doesn't cost more but doesn't save $. Neutral responsible.
4. Efficient Building Utilization	5			5					5	
Totals	**18**	**1**	**1**	**15**	**0**	**0**	**5**	**2**	**13**	

The following is a summation of all groups' scores of each Path 1 variation against the four criteria:

All Groups	Path 1, Variation ELa			Path 1, Variation ELb			Path 1, Variation ELc		
	Yes	No	Unsure	Yes	No	Unsure	Yes	No	Unsure
1. Maintained or Enhanced Student Opportunities	25	13	1	27	4	4	18	0	17
2. Manageable Student and Family Impacts	31	1	3	33	0	2	13	9	9
3. Fiscal Responsibility	13	11	11	7	9	14	1	17	17
4. Efficient Building Utilization	13	17	5	28	4	3	13	4	18
Totals	**82**	**42**	**20**	**95**	**17**	**23**	**45**	**30**	**61**

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

1. <u>At its October meeting, the Task Force will review more alternative facilities plan paths. Any more ideas for paths that you would like to see?</u>
    a. An alternative K-5/6 elementary model (Waldorf, Montessori, etc.)
    b. I don't really think so at this time.
    c. 6/7 8/9 after we figure out 4K
    d. 9th grade at SPASH. 6th grade at junior highs
    e. Like the idea of continuing to explore other opportunities for an elementary building to draw students to district.
    f. I am interested in paths that adjust grade levels.
    g. 4k→5th grade, 6th-8th, and 9th-12th. Buildings used for alternative schooling options.
    h. I really liked that. We started the meeting tonight with some Hope. More conversation about bringing students back into the district. Pathways to "alternative" options to keep students in the district.
    i. I like that path one is a gradual approach that doesn't preclude grade level shifts, but also gives time for enrollment shifts and the down payment to make grade shifts more physically responsible. I like that it also takes a slower approach to looking at which school to close after 4K is included in a full capacity.
    j. With both paths, I would close at least one elementary, maybe two, and maybe open an alternative elementary (Waldorf, etc.). I would like to see two grade shift options:
        i. 9→high school and 6→junior high
        ii. 6→junior high only
    k. I'll look at whatever you have. I am always unsure when it comes to "fiscal responsible" determinations as I feel there are too many variables I don't know.
    l. Non-traditional learning options at a building after drawing new lines, instead of closing.
    m. Grade band shift K-5, 6-8, 9-12. Repurposing/consolidated elementary to non-tradition/alternative program (Waldorf ,Montessori, language immersion, etc.)
    n. Waldorf/project based/virtual/etc.
    o. Move 6→2 jr. High. Move 9→High school. Bring in all 4k.
    p. Integration of ninth grade at SPASH with and without sixth added to "middle school".
    q. I really want to see 4K-5, 6-7, 8-9, 10-12 path.

r. 9th to SPASH – cost. 6th to PJ/Ben. 4K to all elem. Redistrict. Repurpose an elementary school – TRCC style?
s. Until seeing more plans, it's difficult to suggest additional paths or variations. One area seemingly ignored to date is the notion of enhanced district revenue or better use of capital → see below about fiscal responsibility (question 3 t)
t. 4k-5, 6-7, 8-9, 10-12. Alternative instruction site (virtual, charter, etc.)
u. I think the recommendation needs to be made to the school board (explicit) that, along with whatever attendance/building changes, we need to intentionally plan on revisiting school attendance areas every decade or so, moving forward to prevent such imbalances from happening in the future. Sixth grade needs to transition out of k-5 schools. Addition of other alternative schools (in district virtual,k-6 charter option) would benefit our district greatly.
v. Not necessarily more, but more transitions isn't necessarily bad. Current. 6→7 transition is huge as well as 9→10. By adding another "middle step", we make the jumps more manageable.
w. Move sixth and ninth to different buildings, close 1 to 2 elementary buildings.
x. My group did not discuss 6-7/8-9 at two junior high buildings – I would love more discussion on that option.
y. Could be out of scope, but curious about closing one junior high and combining into one. For example, all at Ben Franklin with some additions. Close PJ's L, even though I love PJs. It's the oldest building.
z. Grade realignment.
aa. School close, grade alignment
bb. Yes, grade alignment path.

2. <u>What went well this meeting? What could've gone better? How?</u>
a. I like the matrix comparison of the three options. I look forward to trying Paul's online comparison tool.
b. Tension seemed higher (frustrations). Maybe it is time to eliminate some options.
c. I think by having the communications plan shared with us was a positive as well as the transparency with who is all being included in that process. This is the first meeting in which I've experienced a bad grouping. My group had one member who was extremely rude and hostile. I was ready to leave during the first small group discussion due to how uncomfortable I felt.
d. Meet and small group.
e. First discussion seemed pointless. I still want to be able to see/pathways to review before meeting so more prepared for discussion
f. Enjoyed the clear information and allow discussion time.
g. I feel like I need more info about cost and other past to compare.
h. Nice to see a plan dashboard and talk through it. Would have preferred low/medium/high to yes/no/unsure for ratings of criteria.
i. I love the conversation tonight lots of good thoughts and positive movement.
j. Our table was the best! I always appreciate the time for group discussions. There was a lot of time spent recapping and I think more time could have been spent with discussion/paths.
k. Last meeting felt that really angry energy, this felt much better and appreciated the conversations.
l. I liked filling out the criteria rubric within the small group. It helped to guide conversation.
m. More time for final path discussion and matrix
n. I enjoyed getting to the path discussion, and I also enjoyed the amount of small group discussion (a small group/large group balance was good).
o. Great discussions to create our own options.

p. Great discussion; more authentic opportunity to share ideas rather than respond to specific plans with a yes/no binary.
q. Great discussions that led to authentic options and thoughts.
r. My table partner shared excellent points and conversation on topic.
s. Great reassurance about the purpose of this group. I appreciate Cory's preamble. Clearly presented path 1.
t. Good balance between small group discussion and large group information.
u. Good group work.
v. It was not as big of a ruckus, but some folks need to upgrade to their outside voices.
w. Great small group time. Let's start moving things faster.
x. The slides on relationship to criteria were very helpful, although too much time was spent reviewing the slides, walking us through the plan, considering it just reiterated what was on the handouts.
y. I like this path "practice run" evaluation with scenario options. To lay it out this way will be helpful with all options!
z. Good discussions, fun information, helpful to have the sheet to look at options and think through pros/cons. I would like more information on actual costs and savings and building utilization.
aa. It was a lot to digest 1A, 1B, 1C versus criteria 1, 2, 3, 4 – wish there was a better way to differentiate.
bb. My group was great and worked efficiently.
cc. Spending more time on one plan helped. Also appreciated knowing we won't have to get into the weeds about specific attendance lines or changes.
dd. I loved how much small group we had.
ee. Good discussion, getting close to defining a plan.

3. <u>What additional information (or reminders) do you feel you need to complete the tasks ahead?</u>

a. Not at this time.
b. I would suggest asking for model ideas via email or form before the next meeting. 2.5 hours goes quickly. -People need time to think.
c. I've been saying for a couple of meetings more additional information.
d. Current enrollment -third Friday. Give us by school and grades (separate) 1,2,3,4
e. -30→how many grades Washington. If 4K is in every building, it needs to be supported by every building: Bathrooms, Prep time, Specials, Special Ed/EC, Programs, Behavior support
f. $ of moving grade levels
g. How do we compare shifting building numbers to classroom/space availability? Communication plan- should we consider talking about attendance area changes in perspective to how often it happens elsewhere? I wonder if our community thinks what we've been living is normal when MDR says it is not.
h. I'd like to learn more about what an early learning center would look like and visit some other variations of repurposing a building (community center, immersion school, Waldorf charter, etc.)
i. More info about cost of alternative school options (virtual, language, immersion, alternative elementary school)
j. More chocolate.
k. I think we are curious to hear about what recent costs were to retrofit elementary schools to include 4K and what they might look like in other schools.
l. How many more 4K staff need to be hired to do 4K across district?
m. Still interested in cost to move ninth to high school. I know that's being worked on. I would like more details about increasing attendance at the junior high… How would they function at 900/950 kids?

n. Really appreciate the comments regarding there not being a decision made and other myths going around.
o. No specific suggestion beyond intended agenda.
p. $ estimates
q. What is the bottom line of savings needed to avoid a referendum?
r. I want to hear more from Mike about his meeting with district financial planner about district budget/fiscal health. The information from vendors about what capital SPASH would need to add ninth graders, hopefully this will be available in October, as opposed to November. Running out of time!!
s. All that renovation $ info, but add Ben/PJ info!
t. It feels like there is increasing sentiment towards and weight applied to the grade group discussion – suddenly everyone knows what's best for kids, everyone is suddenly a child psychologist! Grade groups should fall as a consequence of the larger picture, namely, declining enrollment, and fiscal responsibility. Some are treating this as a grade group task force, which is missing the point!
u. Space for special programs… Typical classroom? Bigger? Smaller? How many?
v. More information on costs related to 4K in buildings (salary, course, building renovations, building use)
w. I feel like some of the discussion centers on keeping status quo. I'd like to assure that our time results in change -it is needed.
x. Cost associated with dedicated kindergarten.

31 Task Force members in attendance

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

District staff in attendance: Cory Hirsburnner, Superintendent; Chris Nyman, Assistant Superintendent/Director of Elementary Education; Michael Kurtz, Director of Business Services; Nicole Baumann, Executive Assistant to the Superintendent; Sarah O'Donnell, Director of Communications

Large Group Comments/Questions During Initial Consultant Presentation:

i. Q: Does Task Force have at least one staff person from each elementary building? R: No. The selection process sought volunteers and did not require one member per school.

ii. C: We were asked to review grade group configuration options against the "fiscal responsibility" criterion without fiscal details for the options. R: It is true that dollars and cents for options were not collected or shared, but presentation did review the potential SPASH building improvements that might be advisable if 9th grader were shifted there. The team will bring more information about SPASH building suitability for 9th graders at later meetings, but will not have time and expertise to provide detailed costs during this process.

iii. Q: Is there potential for state or federal funding directed to shift the District to more standard grade groupings? R: No.

iv. C: I had the feeling that the District's team had a particular outcome in mind at the last meeting (shift grade groups to K-5, 6-8, 9-12) and the Task Force was put in a position to endorse that. I hope we have more discussion time devoted to grade reconfiguration. R: There will be more time to discuss, and apologies offered for the rush at the end of the July meeting. The Task Force can continue to consider and ultimately advise an option that retains only grades 10-12 at SPASH too, or phases a change in some years later.

v. Q: Have Task Force members come up with different grade group options? Have they been asked to? R: We considered seven different grade group options at the last meeting; if there are more, the team is open to hearing them.

vi. Q: Asking for clarity: do we have to come up with a solution that saves the District money? R: A reasonable question that we can work to provide a better answer to.

Large Discussion on Whether to Explore Junior High Consolidation: When the consultant requested a show of hands, six Task Force members wanted to discuss the possibility of consolidation from two junior high/middle school buildings down to one. The consultant asked those six members to share their rationale. Reasons included:

- PJ Jacobs it is the oldest building in our district.
- The Ben Franklin site likely allows for expansion of that building if needed. Could we expand
- "I want to explore all options. I am not necessarily in agreement with consolidating the junior highs, but I want to explore it to be sure."

With Task Force consent, the consultant suggested that the possibility of Junior High consolidation be discussed in small groups.

Large Group Comments/Questions During Consultant Presentation on Potential Elementary School Building Consolidation:

- C: We know some schools are increasing and some are decreasing in enrollment, but that is not reflected in the presented table (from slide 13 of presentation). Q: Why was the data presented like this instead of options specific to schools? R: The presented table shares excess building capacity (i.e., empty seats) across all elementary schools, and what the equivalent number of school buildings that represents given the average working building capacity of 440 students. We are mostly interested in knowing whether and to what extent the Task Force wishes to pursue the general idea of elementary building closure/consolidation at this meeting. The outcome will impact how attendance areas get rebalanced and also a later discussion to narrow to particular buildings.
- C: The presented table suggests that bringing all 4K students into SPAPSD school buildings would be a good way to retain the current number of elementary schools, if desired. This step may also open up space at private providers for younger children.
- Q: The presentation suggests approximately $625,000 less in staff expenses per year were one elementary school building to close. Might that number vary a bit if 6th graders shifted away from the elementary school buildings? R: Maybe somewhat. This estimate assumed continuation of the K-6 elementary configuration.
- C: I don't think the District/Task Force should assume much revenue from the sale of any of its current elementary school buildings if closed. PJ Jacobs could generate revenue based on its location in the City and relative to UWSP.
- Q: Would or could 4K students be shifted to one site, leading to one of the current elementary school buildings being repurposed as an early learning center? R: This could be explored by the Task Force.

Small group exercise results: Members in each of the 8 small groups were asked to first create (on post-it notes) their own individual lists of "pros", "cons", and "considerations/questions" for consolidating/reducing the number of elementary school buildings. Members in each group then placed their post-it notes on labeled flip chart sheets, clustered like responses together, then discussed the outcomes. Each group then discussed the potential of closing a junior high school. Some groups chose to record their responses using a similar "pros", "cons", and "considerations/questions" format, while others did not. Each individual response is recorded below.

<u>Group A</u>

Pros of potential elementary building consolidation:

i. Saving money annually
ii. Saving $
iii. Saving $
iv. Money
v. Less excess capacity
vi. Utilizing buildings fully
vii. Criterion #3 (Fiscal Responsibility)
viii. Criterion #4 (Efficient Building Utilization)

Cons of potential elementary building consolidation:

i. Longer bus rides
ii. Class sizes
iii. Increased class sizes
iv. Hard to feel that class sizes will stay the same
v. Loss of community

vi. Kids split up ☹
vii. Driving more students/families away to homeschooling?
viii. Support needs met fully of all students
ix. Losing hard-won supports/supporters
x. Criterion #1 (Maintained or Enhanced Student Opportunities)
xi. Criterion #2 (Manageable Student and Family Impacts)

Considerations/questions:

i. Could we just realign boundaries?
ii. Can redrawing boundaries solve this w/o closing a school?
iii. Why can't we redraw lines?
iv. Will we be pushing more students out of our district with higher class sizes, more behaviors and less support per child?
v. Would an ELC (early learning center) be an option?

Regarding potential Junior High building consolidation:

i. PJs is marketable
ii. Doesn't the city want to do a bunch of stuff to Goerke anyway? City would buy.
iii. Would it be easier to build on Ben than SPASH?

<u>Group B</u>

Pros of potential elementary building consolidation:

i. Allow sustainable growth for the district
ii. Allows the justification of grade group shifts
iii. Savings if building is closed
iv. Combining schools means more specialist staff to support students who are no longer having to travel
v. Cost savings of consolidating schools
vi. Better utilized facilities

Cons of potential elementary building consolidation:

i. If closing an elementary school, families from that school would be forced to find a new school community
ii. May be a hard transition for some families
iii. Families who have to move will be upset
iv. Splitting up friends from consolidated schools
v. Longer bus routes potentially
vi. Custodial, cafeteria, aid staff will be reduced, meaning job loss
vii. Extended busing for kids from consolidated schools

Considerations/questions:

i. Would we re-allocate funds or count it as our $1 million in savings?
ii. If we have all of these ideas, and they all get wrapped in referendum and get shot down, then what?
iii. Each school has a history and unique community. How do we fairly choose which one to close?
iv. How will the transition happen? By grade? (start taking K and not backfilling?) (close and move all kids in one year?)
v. Will the consolidated school faculty and staff also be moved or reduced? If so, by how much?
vi. What renovations will be required for schools that receive kids from a consolidated school?
vii. How will opt in/out affect districting predictions on school enrollment of consolidated schools?

Regarding potential Junior High building consolidation: We suggest leaving both schools open. Ben Franklin would (otherwise) require additions, and P.J. Jacobs is historically significant. Also, if we close a middle school, either one becomes overfilled, or if we don't move sixth graders up, we still have to deal with dropping enrollment and undercapacity in elementary schools.

Group C

Pros of potential elementary building consolidation:

i. $1 million a year in school closing would help with budget cut expect expectation of $1 million per year
ii. Saving close to $1 million in operating budget per year
iii. Fifth grade in elementary school- fewer moves for kids and families
iv. Full 4K in elementary schools.
v. Helps community
vi. Send 4K to elementary built community support. Seamless for kids.

Cons of potential elementary building consolidation:

i. Busing – how does this affect length of bus ride? Is it significant?
ii. Potentially more complicated busing routes, and more pick up/drop off congestion
iii. Community attachment to local elementary where all neighborhood kids attend together
iv. Community unrest with school changes
v. Limiting flexibility of classroom use i.e. all used for instruction rather than pull out or targeted learning/treatment
vi. Fifth grade to junior high. This pushes the issue that we must send ninth to SPASH.
vii. If no grade group changes are made, including 4K not help young parents
viii. Locking in current class sizes (large) when smaller sizes can be beneficial to learning in earlier grades
ix. Will more families choose to open enroll out of district if their elementary school closed?
x. Now, 4K and so many settings-hard to do special education
xi. Change is always hard

Considerations/questions:

i. Can we/should we leave all schools open if we make all elementary full 4K?
ii. Which schools are Title 1 and what additional funding do we get or want to maintain with that designation?
iii. People will be (rightly) upset to close buildings we recently upgraded through referendums.
iv. Early learning center open to community build support and community EC at center
v. Make an early learning center. Give employees option to use. Then openings open community.
vi. PODS?

Regarding potential Junior High building consolidation:

Pros:

i. Sports teams will perform well
ii. PJ Jacobs is the oldest building -retire it
iii. 7-8 Ben would work well
iv. Sixth grade students doing well; more class options.

Cons:

4. It seems like this option requires either money or nontraditional grade groupings. I dislike both.
5. SPASH is already so scary because of its size, will a 7-8 consolidation help or make this worse?
6. 7-8 consolidation requires SPASH to go 9-12
7. A 7-8 consolidation doesn't help with elementary

8. Send sixth graders up, almost push 9-12 option. Fiscal?
9. Busing students further is more expensive
10. Facilities are not ready for that many students (gym, sports, cafeteria)

Considerations/questions:

4. 6-9 □ does P.J./Ben have room for 6-9?
5. PODS?

Group D

Pros of potential elementary building consolidation:

4. Potential cost savings
5. Potential improved equity among schools
6. Staff travel reduction
7. Face in so the building is utilized to attract other populations, i.e. homeschool, etc.
8. Ability to repurpose a school for 4K or other type of alternative elementary school
9. Community perception about fiscal responsibility

Cons of potential elementary building consolidation:

4. Big transitions? Separating current class/groups of students.
5. Class size
6. Job loss
7. Tough for lots of humans in the period of change
8. One fewer building blocking us into a more traditional school model

Considerations/questions:

4. Timeline for implementation
5. Impact on staffing (teachers)
6. School choice policy/practice. Intradistrict.
7. Staffing realignment/licensing
8. Open enrollment. More in? More out?

Regarding potential Junior High building consolidation:

Pros:

1. Unity
2. Combines elective classes with low numbers

Cons:

i. Too many kids!
ii. More transportation/parent drop-off
iii. Can stay in district if there are two

Group E

Pros of potential elementary building consolidation:

i. Saving money
ii. Cost savings
iii. Save money
iv. If we bring all four K students, can possibly “save” an elementary from closure
v. Allows for repurposing a building for community/district needs
vi. If we bring all 4K students, opens up childcare options in centers
vii. Potential community/early childhood site
viii. Utilizing buildings more efficiently

ix. If sixth grade moves, they have access to higher-level experiences. Tech, Ed, science, FACs, foreign language
x. Consolidated resources. Easier to get SPED teachers and school counselors; these are hard to fill.
xi. Potential expanded programming. Orchestra band, clubs, additional classes.
xii. Even out the number of students per school
xiii. More efficient busing

Cons of potential elementary building consolidation:

i. Bus cost increase
ii. More busing less walking
iii. Further busing
iv. Many closed buildings become an eyesore
v. Job loss
vi. Neighborhood community?
vii. Breaking community relationships/history with school
viii. Change is hard
ix. Upset families
x. Families from closed schools will be upset

Considerations/questions:

i. How can we sell this to the community?
ii. Can we do this in stages?
iii. What kind of campaign for a referendum can you plan on top of school closures?
iv. What happened when Emerson school closed?
v. Can we tear down school for community i.e. parks, affordable housing
vi. What criteria would be used to decide which buildings close?
vii. What impact would this have on FTE?
viii. What plan with district leaders put into place to obtain strong teachers?
ix. Classroom space versus capacity-would buildings be able to add classrooms?
x. If we choose to close an elementary school, could we do a seven year phase out? Year one remove K. Year two removed K and one. Year three remove K and one and two etc. Minimal impact to current student/families but still facilitates transition.
xi. Are we still going to trim $1 million a year from our budget if we close schools?
xii. How quickly can money saved be available for updates?
xiii. How many students who can bus choose to be driven anyway?
xiv. How open with the community as a whole beat to opening up an alternative style Montessori etc. early childhood center?
xv. If repurpose for the community, who foots the bill?
xvi. How do we leave enough flexibility to change course in the future should data/population/etc. change?

Regarding potential Junior High building consolidation:

i. Would only be feasible if 7-8 building
ii. Would maybe help consolidate resources/staff
iii. What would financial impact be to close either building?
iv. Sports impact?
v. Busing impact?
vi. Tech Ed/culinary arts/labs-how can we accommodate?

vii. UWSP be interested in PJs?
viii. Which school makes more sense?

Group F

Pros of potential elementary building consolidation:

i. Options to have 4K in all/more buildings
ii. Less transition 4K to 5K
iii. Addresses some childcare needs in our community full-time 4K
iv. Potential revenue on sale of building
v. Cost savings
vi. Less traveling staff at 4K
vii. More opportunities for early intervention 4K

Cons of potential elementary building consolidation:

i. Staff loss, i.e. kitchen staff, custodial, office staff
ii. Extra bus drivers and buses available
iii. Busing costs
iv. Students from closed school go to different new schools
v. Loss of community/culture
vi. School closure disrupts family ties
vii. Increased driving time for families

Considerations/questions:

i. Where is the capacity to reassign elementary students?
ii. Centrally located schools
i. Financial feasibility for all elementary to have 4K classes
ii. Is the district thinking of expanding to all-day 4K only?
iii. Special education spaces with a bathroom would be lost to 4K?
iv. Pros and cons for closing Kennedy
v. With building closures, receiving schools would need more special education spaces
vi. Explore one EC Center

Regarding potential Junior High building consolidation:

i. PJ's is the oldest building – what are its operational costs?
ii. 1,400-1500 students is a large size for a junior high in one building
iii. Phasing out consolidation
iv. Doesn't mean criterion one and two due to enrollment in one building
v. With the community support, consolidating elementary and junior high at the same time?
vi. Task force 2055

Group G

Pros of potential elementary building consolidation:

i. Efficiency to drive savings
ii. The cost savings of closing one building would help meet the $1 million
iii. Potential for money savings
iv. Potentially meets criterion three and four
v. Options for other grade configurations district-wide
vi. If 4K is expanded at schools, the childcare opportunities should improve – maybe

Cons of potential elementary building consolidation:

i. The logistics of having to determine when this happens (if it were to happen) criterion two (Manageable Student and Family Impacts) impacted
ii. Does not meet criteria; too much initial disruption and high class size, but then becomes normal
iii. Student and community impact/stress
iv. Redrawing school boundaries
v. Change or extra transportation
vi. Increase busing cost/complexity

Considerations/questions:

i. Family engagement: is already a challenge in some areas. How would family engagement and student identity be factored into the decision of which school? Meaning if there is already a current school with good engagement for families, it may weigh more in the decision to close the school.
ii. Gaining community support for consolidation when it doesn't include improvements to remaining open schools.
iii. Timeframe for rolling out consolidations?
iv. If a student is moved to new school, will open enrollment be used to keep a student in the current school if the parent asks?
v. Childcare trends may affect (force) the school district to absorb 4K/EC.
vi. Will referendum be needed to consolidate grade schools?
vii. Do geographic/community boundaries need to be in our evaluation for consolidating schools?

Regarding potential Junior High building consolidation:

Pros:

i. Fewer administration costs and building expenses
ii. Consistency of student, education, and experience (once consolidated)

Cons:

i. Consolidation only feasible with ninth grade shift to SPASH
ii. Enrollment too high for one junior high/middle school in the immediate

Considerations/questions:

i. Do we need to build a new middle school for both?
ii. Recommend not to consolidate

<u>Group H</u>

Pros of potential elementary building consolidation:

i. More efficient staffing, less traveling
ii. It efficiently utilizes sites
iii. Savings annually for operating/staff
iv. Reduce duplicate staff
v. Worst potential is one whole empty building may as well see where we can
vi. Fewer empty seats/buildings
vii. Reduce resources needed
viii. Academically, would prefer grade 6 out of elementary

Cons of potential elementary building consolidation:

i. Difficulty dealing with empty buildings
ii. We are not prepared for stable growth by eliminating a site

iii. Emotional/social disruption
iv. Uprooting current families in closed school
v. Fight families to make the change
vi. Loss of jobs and expect more of current employees
vii. Larger class sizes
viii. How do we decide who loses? Opens up questions about fairness.
ix. Lack of space available for how to adjust for future of learning
x. Lack of space for addition, student supports

Considerations/questions:

4. How will specific schools be identified for consolidation?
5. How does this affect special/MAPELS schedule?
6. The damn map – why are we not talking about redrawing it?
7. How/where to other support services go and are supported?
8. Can we afford not to consolidate?

Regarding potential Junior High building consolidation:

Pros: Manage cost (potential)

Cons:

i. Too many kids in one building
ii. Extra busing
iii. Fight with community for which school (tradition)
iv. Remodeling would be needed

Small Group Reporting on School Consolidation: Following the small group discussions, the reporter from each small group was asked to share with the full Task Force its group's responses to the following questions:

- What are the primary pros and cons of elementary school building consolidation?
- What is your group's preliminary advice on elementary building consolidation?
- What is your group's preliminary advice on junior high building consolidation?

Group A

a. Pros: Criteria 3 and 4 performance good.
b. Cons: Criteria 1 and 2 performance not good. Emotional and community impact.
c. Advice/Thoughts: Still consider, but could we look at attendance areas together or first?
d. JR High: PJ building and site may be marketable; City or UWSP as possible buyers?

Group B

a. Pros: All sustainable growth and cost savings and better utilization of facilities.
b. Cons: Change is hard, and could be a hard transition for shifted families. More bussing.
c. Advice/Thoughts: Each school has unique history—how do we choose? Phase this in?
d. JR High: Leave both open. Don't fight more battles by suggesting this.

Group C

a. Pros: Fiscal aspect.
b. Cons: Transportation—more bussing and congestion. Community feelings. Loss of flexibility for the future. Our schools generally don't have flex spaces; excess capacity has helped mitigate this fact to date.
c. Advice/thoughts: Worth considering, but maybe in future.
d. JR High: Don't close

Group D

a. Pros: Less staff travel. More equality among schools.
b. Cons: Job loss. Change.
c. Advice/thoughts: Logical to close a school or two, but wisely (repurpose? phasing?)
d. JR High: No consolidation.

Group E

a. Pros: Cost savings. 4K in to all buildings might "save" a building from closure. Closure might allow repurposing for community need.
b. Cons: Emotional challenges. Transportation. Keep closed school in district hands for future flexibility, but possible eyesore of closed school.
c. Advice/thoughts: If attempt consolidation, do it wisely.
d. JR High: More questions than anything else; only possible if grade 7-8 building.

Group F

a. Pros: Similar to other groups. Also, if can get 4K in more buildings, then one less transition.
b. Cons: Similar to other groups. Also, affecting families with cultures built around school. Would transferred special ed students to receiver school overwhelm that building?
c. Advice/thoughts: OK to keep exploring, but could we also look at an early learning center?
d. JR High: Discuss junior high consolidation in "Task Force 2055"!

Group G

a. Pros: Similar to other groups.
b. Cons: Similar to other groups.
c. Advice/thoughts: Consolidate elementary school in short term based on priority on cost and enrollment criteria (1 and 2), but criteria 3 and 4.
d. JR High: Don't consolidate now. A transition from a smaller elementary school to a large junior high not desirable.

Group H

a. Pros: Similar to other groups?
b. Cons: Will we lose flexibility for changes in education if we close a building? We have seen major changes over the past 5 years—will we have major future changes too?
c. Advice/thoughts: For financial reasons, may need to at least repurpose a building.
d. JR High: No consolidation.

Large-Group Comments, Thoughts, Questions Regarding Preliminary Facility Plan Components:

i. Q: Where does revenue come for 4K? Would an early learning center affect that? R: 4K students are counted as 0.60 full-time equivalent students for state aid purposes, and when 4K students attend at a private site, the District reimburses the private provider. Absent state legislation changes, 4K reimbursement from the State would not increase if there was a separate early learning center (ELC).

ii. C: Our small group talked about an ELC as a possible reuse for a centrally located, closed elementary school building, including expanded 4K and Early Childhood programs. We would like to learn more about other districts' experiences when repurposing one building as an ELC.

iii. C/Q: We had a lot of discussion about what attendance area shifts look like. Also, how might attendance areas be affected if families could only able to attend their geographically assigned school (i.e., no intra-district transfers)? R: This can easily be modeled and we will do that.

iv. C/Q: I can see bringing 9th graders to SPASH if the cost were in the $1-2 million range, but not in the $10 million range (referendum). We need community and financial support. If that doesn't happen,

the Task Force would only be making its recommendations based on a hope. Can the team provide a general idea and general cost for what would need to happen to the building to get 9th graders at SPASH? R: We can and will get you more information to help overcome this challenge. For example, we may be able to model how programming would have to change if 9th were added to SPASH without another auxiliary gym and other spaces added.

v. C: Our small group came to the tentative conclusion that it does not feel that fiscally the District can just continue what it is doing (no changes), but also committed to the idea of phasing.

vi. C: I felt that the question about whether to discuss junior high consolidation was presented too abruptly, without supporting information.

vii. C: I support pursuing an ELC because I am concerned that some private daycare centers/preschools will be forced to close for financial reasons. There needs to be consideration for absorbing preschool/4K children in this event.

viii. C: I support focusing on elementary schools in the first phase of efforts.

At the close of the conversation, Task Force members agreed to allocate small group time at the start of the next meeting to discuss responses to the questions posed at the end of the August meeting but also to allow the project team to bring forward a couple alternative "paths" with phasing.

Individual member written meeting evaluation responses (following meeting):

1. <u>In your preliminary opinion, which of the following should the Task Force focus further discussion on:</u>
   i. Not closing any school buildings (5 votes)
   ii. Closing one school building (22 votes)
   iii. Closing more than one school building (7 votes)

   Note: A handful of members selected more than one choice, and a handful selected none at this time.

   Comments:
   i. Let's talk about PODs/CFC
   ii. Two elementary schools. Possibly reuse one for early childcare/4K.
   iii. How would opening a 4K center change the news in the district
   iv. More interested in repurposing
   v. Ideally, closing one building would be more comfortable, but using the info presented in the criterion for chart, I support closing two.
   vi. Consolidate and repurpose.
   vii. Specifically repurposing an elementary school
   viii. Repurposing rather than closing
   ix. I am open to consolidation; however, we would need more information on how redrawing the map would redistribute students and change building utilization
   x. Don't close more than one, but repurposing another is OK
   xi. I think two will cause too much of an uproar. We need to clearly explain and re-allocate savings to improve alignment changes.
   xii. I need more information to fully decide
   xiii. Not really a fiscally viable option to not choose one to close/repurpose
   xiv. Too emotionally invested in the staff at each of the elementary schools to make an objective opinion or statement
   xv. Use it as a centralized location for daycare, 3K and 4K. What potential cost would be?

xvi. Closing one school building makes more sense given declining enrollment and building capacity. It is logical.

2. <u>At its September meeting, the Task Force will begin considering alternative “paths” (different combinations of steps to a long-range target). Any particular ideas for paths-or at least components-that you would like to see?</u>
   i. Path 1 repurposing an elementary school for an early childhood dedicated building. Path 2 repurposing an elementary school for a different or upgraded charter school. (PODS only covers so many grades). I personally like the Waldorf style of TRCCS, and we initially attended there (open enrolled out), but because we live on the west side of Point, it no longer became financially feasible. Doing something geared towards STEAM would be interesting.
   ii. Ideas:
      1. Timeframe to close one elementary that includes consideration for families and students and potential disruption. Redistricting plans.
      2. Timeframe for adding ninth grade to SPASH that includes design and costing for building renovations, community impact and financial feasibility and planning time for parents/students to transition.
      3. Financial feasibility and making improvements/to both MS/JH buildings to enhance student opportunities.
   iii. I’d like to talk about closing or repurposing PODS. It seems like it’s been overlooked as an outlier. I’d also like to talk about short-term reapportioning attendance areas, midterm, closing an elementary (specifically maybe Jefferson), and long-term a 4K-5, 6-8, 9-12 grade grouping, but only when ninth graders can more comfortably fit into SPASH without large capital expenses, while preserving programming.
   iv. Grade groups of K-5, 6-8, 9-12. Mothball one of the elementary schools.
   v. 4K/Early childhood daycare. PODs and CH alternative; attendance area shift
   vi. Ideas:
      i. 2027 to 2028 referendum work to get money for capital SPASH.
      ii. Elementary realignment 2028 and 4K current plan, plus maybe 4K dedicated building 2028-2029.
      iii. SPASH expansion for ninth construction 2028 to 2032
      iv. Shift ninth to SPASH and sixth to middle school 2033
      v. Done by end of 2034
   vii. A site for 4K and how that changes things with the possibility of an EC center; how do the numbers look? From there, look at if we need to close one to two schools. Then look at how to change borders.
   viii. All boundaries, versus closing any potential schools or repurposing buildings for childcare centers, etc.
   ix. Ideas:
      i. Grade group shift
      ii. Elementary building consolidation/repurposing/attendance areas
      iii. Early childhood center
   x. It’s important to think/present this as steps to an ultimate result. i.e. something at 2030, 2035, 2040.
   xi. Planning the different phases of change. Next task force to consider additional changes; we are talking about a lot of changes. Can the community handle/accept all of these changes at once?
   xii. Redistrict options

xiii. I'd like to see a step that explains our recommendation or the school board's final decision to the community
xiv. Redistrict first
xv. Ideas:
- K-5, 6-8, 9-12
- Consolidation of elementary schools
- Redistricting, but keeping things as is for short/medium term

xvi. Current thoughts:
i. Go to 9-12- H.S.; 6-8 MS, K-5 model.
ii. Redraw neighborhood feeder map to redistribute students based on projections
iii. Make a 10-year plan for school consolidation based on population growth, etc.

xvii. I don't think we are anywhere near ready for paths. Until we have an endgame, we can't establish the steps to get there.
xviii. Ideas:
- Looking at actual costs to update
- Discussing how saved money from consolidation can be re-allocated to new projects and then savings
- Can an elementary school gradually close by not taking new students for five years?

xix. Ideas:
- 9 □ SPASH, 6 □ Junior high, all 4K to elementary, close one elementary building
- 9 □ SPASH, 7-8 at one junior high, all 4K to elementary, close one junior high building
- SPASH and junior high the same, close one elementary
- Close one elementary now/soonish, save money/start modifying SPASH, then mid-late term move grade groups
- I would like to see data on redistricting elementary schools to best fit schools. Would repurposing a building to EC or therapeutic day school be an option?

xx. K-5, 6-8, 9-12. One building ECE repurpose. Phasing.
xxi. Interested in learning more
xxii. I think doing this in steps might help the community adjust more easily, so move ninth grade up first
xxiii. Closing one or two buildings but using it either for community or special education and 3K and 4K
xxiv. I trust the options that will be sufficient.
xxv. Timeline.

3. <u>What went well at this meeting? What could have gone better? How?</u>
i. Spacing of the tables was better for volume, though there were fewer people in attendance. My group was considerate and listened to my different perspectives. Having enough small group discussion time likely significantly contributed to this.
ii. Good discussion. Thank you.
iii. I liked more time to discuss as a group because so many group members are eligible, have good ideas, and help me refine my own ideas. I don't mind a little homework if it means having adequate discussion time, like pre-reading materials.
iv. + group talk time/processing time
v. I really enjoyed how much time we got to have a conversation; I understand that we cannot have that every time.
vi. Being able to talk in group! Yeh. Make water cold, not lukewarm.
vii. Great discussion. Provided more time.

viii. I appreciate the time to discuss and have more open communication. I would like to know what other options are available to the district and if they are possible, like an early learning center or charter school.
ix. Great, small and large group discussions during this meeting
x. Could we have the overview/outcomes from previous meetings printed on the back of the agenda for us to review as we come in? Seems unnecessary to have a review read word for word from the slide. Enjoy long time to discuss with small group.
xi. Good group discussion
xii. More small group discussion time, authentic conversation
xiii. The information given was just enough to have a productive conversation
xiv. Presenters walking around and talking with the groups
xv. Discussions are good. Giving guidance is hard; can't just let us go rogue, but don't want to push in a direction.
xvi. The amount of small group discussion was fantastic. I'd like to know if any of our discussions have surprised Mark and Nick or anyone in the board who has attended these meetings
xvii. Lots of discussion! Much better. Can the school board/leaders weigh in on some of this??? Like, to our faces?
xviii. The additional discussion time was much appreciated. It definitely felt like we had more ownership at this meeting. How did district leaders feel about the discussion? Unsure if they are backing this, and that makes it hard to feel like it can happen with fidelity.
xix. Getting to discuss in groups
xx. I appreciate the extra discussion time as well as the preview of September's meeting
xxi. I really liked the Post-it note strategy and then discussion. We could really compose every individual's ideas.
xxii. Better presentation/group discussion time balance. I like having some time for large group discussion after the small group reviews.
xxiii. It would be interesting to meet with similar people at tables to give feedback on options. Teachers with teachers, etc. thank you for the extra time to work with the table. I also appreciate the smaller group size at the table.
xxiv. Great discussion time
xxv. Enjoyed the discussion. I came in with a ton of opinions that were firm and leave with much less firm opinions.
xxvi. I like the nominal group technique; I think that allows all voices to be heard.
xxvii. Discussion time went well. More info on cost of each school if possible.
xxviii. Appreciated more discussion
xxix. Felt like more authentic discussion and enough time to digest before sharing
xxx. I liked both the big and small group discussions

4. <u>What information do you feel you need to complete the tasks ahead?</u>
   i. If the task force is supposed to make a recommendation, I really need to see more of the financials. Show me, comparatively on some spreadsheet, basically what is going to cost to keep some of these old buildings open and at what point it is no longer financially feasible to keep that building open? Because that would factor into any faced decision/recommendation I'd have.
   ii. I have appreciated the information received so far. I am realizing I need to spend an hour prior to our next meeting to warm up.
   iii. I would like to know more about Title I funding, which of our elementary schools are getting it, and how maintaining that can work with consolidation. I think it will be important to revisit what buildings have AC, what schools are currently suitable to host 4K, and which schools

have specialized supports for students with different needs as we talk more closely about closing an elementary school. I like a spit-balled number of cost to build new school buildings or to add on because I don't think everyone has an understanding of current construction costs.

iv. What timeframe are we talking, when would this happen? If a decision is made, which would require a referendum to fund it, and then the referendum doesn't pass, do we end up just doing nothing?
v. I think the paths are a great idea so we can actually see something
vi. More info on early childhood centers and 3-5 EC and daycare
vii. Estimates for cost to add ninth grade at SPASH. Facility expansion with detail.
viii. Is an early learning center an option, and how does that change the use of buildings? Examples of what other districts are doing and how it's working.
ix. Plan for rolling out the next steps moving forward
x. Would like to spend some time/energy, addressing early childhood, 4K, 4K special Ed and childcare needs of the community. Is there a path of solving multiple problems?
xi. Really worried about 9-12, would need to go to referendum and that doesn't meet criterion three and from last month's presentation it sounds like the voters wouldn't support athletic additions. Don't want to waste our time if community doesn't want this. Need more info about cost at SPASH and referendum, consider consideration.
xii. More on open enrollment
xiii. I agree with my peers that further information about the generalized cost of moving ninth graders to SPASH would be helpful
xiv. Cost of sending ninth SPASH extra for gym?
xv. Information regarding a possibility of an early childhood center centrally located – viable or not; and redistricting/redrawing lines and the impact
xvi. What does a 1.5 empty building equivalent actually look like at a site, assuming that the schools have been distributed to level out their capacity? How many rooms at each site would be vacant at 1.5?
xvii. I still think our biggest what-if is based on what would be required to bring the ninth grade to SPASH. Every other decision depends on that, in my opinion. I'm truly scared to base all our decisions on SPASH only for it to crash and burn due to the lack of funding, resources, and/or community support. I don't want the dominoes to fall, and we are back at square one.
xviii. Approximate money saved, closing a junior high building – More or (significant) than closing an elementary building? Reiterate: what's the minimum money needed to move ninth grade to SPASH? How much money would be ideal, and are there any middle points that would make sense?
xix. What are absolute hard sells to the community? What does the community not support?
xx. Is doing nothing a fiscally viable option?
xxi. More info on costs, expenses, and what the anticipated expenses are. What will the phasing look like?
xxii. Can we do a pulse of the community?
xxiii. Info on cost for each school
xxiv. $$$
xxv. I need to keep up on reading the information posted between meetings

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

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

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

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

Large-Group Comments/Questions During Initial Consultant Presentation:

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

Large Group Questions During and After SPASH Principal Presentation:

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

- Q: What do we know about student achievement and well-being under a 9-12 model vs. the current 10-12 model? R: For student achievement, the best indicators may be that SPAPSD's comparable districts all have a 9-12 model and all demonstrate higher academic achievement at the high school level. Under the SPAPSD's current grouping, teachers and administrators have one fewer year to get to know students. Students also currently have to transition once to high school-like classes and systems in 9th grade then another time to the actual high school building in 10th grade. 9th graders cannot, in the SPASPD, generally participate in social activities at SPASH (e.g., homecoming). Procedurally, having 9th graders at SPASH would streamline student records, grading, transcripts, etc.; at present, the District has three schools now serving high school level students.
- Q: Would potential capital improvements at SPASH (e.g., more classrooms, auxiliary gym) require a referendum? R: Yes, though its amount would depend on the level of improvements proposed.
- C: As a retired person, it may be difficult to get across to people the need to add on to SPASH for 9th graders, bring 6th graders up, and then close elementary buildings. I think it would be a hard sell.
- C: I disagree. The argument to standardize to the rest of State is strong.
- Q: From a financial perspective, hypothetically, could the money saved by closing an elementary school be redirected to expanding SPASH? R: Generally, these would be different pots of money. SPASH improvements would be capital, and most cost savings from closing an building would be operational.
- Q: Is there a market for closed school buildings? R: It depends on the building and its location. Wausau recently sold three buildings for a reasonable price, while outdated buildings that would have to be demolished take longer and sell for less.
- Q: How much in operational costs can be saved in closing one building? R: That information will be shared at the next meeting, but generally in the $600,000-$800,000 per year range.
- Q: Why is the DC Everest district bringing 9th graders to its high school building? R: To remove one transition, address an aging junior high building, and reflect declining enrollment.

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

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

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

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

Criterion 1 - Maintained or Enhanced Student Opportunities:

1. Maintenance
2. Good
3. Decrease disruption to current student and parent expectations
4. Does not optimize grade grouping
5. Status Quo
6. Maintain, but could be enhanced
7. Does not align w/ curr. stand
8. Maintained but not enhanced, not growing or evolving
9. 9th isolated
10. 3
11. Maintained if no change
12. Provide full and equal range. Maintain athletics ect.
13. Extra spaces
14. 9th grade losing out on opportunities
15. Maintain
16. We have maintained and harder for 9th grade
17. Maintaining
18. I'm not considering this option
19. Yes consistent
20. No
21. Everything stays same

Criterion 2 - Manageable Student and Family Impacts:

i. Maintenance
ii. Good
iii. No students are affected by change
iv. No change to neighborhoods
v. No change to busing
vi. Status Quo

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

Criterion 3 – Fiscal Responsibility:

i. Depends on the building closing
ii. Potentially fair depending on consolidation
iii. Long-term maintenance costs do not decrease
iv. Not fiscally responsible. Landscape in 10 yrs too unpredictable
v. Needs to be addressed
vi. Managing the current system OK, but underutilization becomes a problem
vii. Need to realign the district
viii. Kicking can down the road
ix. Not working or we wouldn't be here
x. Not really – looking ahead
xi. 3
xii. Does not address enrollment decline
xiii. ?
xiv. Does not feel fiscally responsible
xv. Cost effective
xvi. Continue to burn cash in underutilized buildings
xvii. Continued deferred maint.
xviii. This is difficult because no one has enough money
xix. Not responsible
xx. Not sustainable w/ greater cuts each year
xxi. Consistency. Yes.
xxii. No
xxiii. No changes

Criterion 4 – Efficient Building Utilization:

vii. Depends on the building closing
viii. Fair, depending on consolidation
ix. Disproportionation of building usage to the student population
x. Stable, but decreasing
xi. Needs to be addressed
xii. Problems with building underutilization: main reason we're here. Hard to balance.

xiii. No
xiv. Kennedy – building use low
xv. Would need to look at elem. schools
xvi. Minimal schools impacted or changes needed
xvii. 3
xviii. Not at all. Would need to close elem schools
xix. Too much building available
xx. Inefficient
xxi. Severely underutilized space
xxii. Below closing elementary(s)
xxiii. Currently the same
xxiv. Capacity
xxv. Inefficient
xxvi. Consistency. Yes.
xxvii. No
xxviii. No changes

Other pros, cons, & considerations:

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

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

Criterion 1 - Maintained or Enhanced Student Opportunities:

vii. Enhanced – equal building opportunities in middle grades
viii. We don't have info on this
ix. Gets 6th out of elementary
x. Optimize grade grouping
xi. HS status quo
xii. Enhances
xiii. Maybe some grade-specific opportunities w/ smaller school?
xiv. Improve the 6th-grade experience in middle school?
xv. Too many transitions
xvi. Elective opportunities remain intact
xvii. Maintains elective options. Expand 6th grade options
xviii. More standard aligned 9 still not in HS setting. Brings larger community.
xix. Enhances 6th grade but not 9th
xx. Fewer opportunities for older students to learn from each other

xxi. Not sure split 6-7 8-9 opportunities, math
xxii. Could add 4k to all buildings. Maybe even more EC or daycare
xxiii. Chance for smaller sizes in schools for k-5, 6-7, 8-9
xxiv. 4
xxv. Maintained
xxvi. Streamline learning. ↓ SPASH and co-curricular cuts. More team sports
xxvii. Middle grade opportunities ↓
xxviii. More space?
xxix. About same as today but students. grouped by age
xxx. Not sure
xxxi. Extra opportunities for 6th grade athletics and academics higher
xxxii. Might be able to. Too much transition. Opportunity.
xxxiii. Traveling staff or more staff. No.
xxxiv. No
xxxv. Social emotional **. Grade "teams" more feasible
xxxvi. Concerned this model maybe does not for co-curricular

Criterion 2 - Manageable Student and Family Impacts:

viii. Too many transitions
ix. One family w/ 4 schools?
x. Less fam. Engagement w/ brief time @ schools?
xi. More fams w/ mult. schools @ a time
xii. Additional transitions
xiii. It would be impactful to have an extra transition and transportation for parents
xiv. Too many transitions – busing
xv. More students are affected by adding additional school transition
xvi. Likely to have one close school move and one far?
xvii. Re-zoning is all but guaranteed
xviii. Walkers <-> riders' parents impacted
xix. Manageable – needs to plan for
xx. ↑ in transition
xxi. I think 6-7 and 8-9 is better than now, but not as good as 9-12
xxii. Keep student grade grouping more age-related
xxiii. More transitions. Potentially less accessible buildings (Ben/PJs)
xxiv. Extra transition. Allow for more community connection w/ in grade
xxv. Bigger impacts for families w/ 4 different schools
xxvi. Extra transition
xxvii. Students in diff buildings same family 6-7, 8-9, transporting them bussing
xxviii. Might lead to elem. School closure. Lots of transitions
xxix. 2
xxx. Multiple transitions sucks. This would impact families with multiple children
xxxi. Potential for families to have kids in multiple schools which might be difficult
xxxii. More transitions = pain points for families
xxxiii. Too many changes. Dev appropriate
xxxiv. Moderate impact due to facility swaps
xxxv. More transitions
xxxvi. Too many transitions a lot of different stops
xxxvii. Transition (4) □ transportation

xxxviii. No. 2 transitions
xxxix. No
xl. Multiple transitions. 4th building one fam. could be in
xli. Family impacts: not great. Ex. Parent-teacher conferences. Students: possibly ok
xlii. Individualized (elementary, 6-7, 8-9)

Criterion 3 – Fiscal Responsibility:

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

Criterion 4 – Efficient Building Utilization:

v. yes
vi. We don't have info on this
vii. May be more effective use of buildings if consolidated
viii. Just shuffling the existing utilization impacted, but not condemning
ix. Will need to develop a building plan
x. Less students
xi. Probably the best balance of building utilization, though it tends toward underutilization
xii. Reduces elementary cap. More students in 6-7, 8-9? Better balanced enrollment 6-7, 8-9

xiii. No
xiv. Maybe best for buildings?
xv. 4
xvi. Doesn't sound super efficient
xvii. Capacity has the potential to be greater, and that's good
xviii. Yes
xix. Middle schools become underutilized
xx. Less changes needed
xxi. May cost more for bussing
xxii. Close
xxiii. Small middle school
xxiv. Building capacity potential ↓
xxv. No. Students become too sparse or condensed.
xxvi. No
xxvii. Keeps all elementary under capacity
xxviii. Probably not in further future

Other pros, cons, & considerations:

11. As a middle grade teacher, this addresses inequalities between Jr. High programs. The grading of 9th grade students is consolidated to one building
12. HS transcript concept does not improve
13. 9th grade experience does not improve
14. Elem does not improve
15. 6-7 is the only major educational adjustment from a peer-to-peer perspective
16. Plan for transitions. Retrain staff
17. Transition plan during SPASH upgrades?
18. Fewer students, fewer safety/security concerns
19. Change to a model that isn't efficient
20. How this affects K-5 parents – winners/losers close school
21. More busing what school holds 6-7, 8-9. More transitions
22. This is wacky. Why would people do it?
23. Tell me more about studies regarding more transitions
24. Excessive transitioning
25. If we move 6th grade, what does the district track and field days look like? Breaking up music groups would be a pain point for musical development.
26. NO – too many transitions for families and SE needs of students
27. Extra transportation
28. Capacity ↓. Transportation. Transition.
29. Worse than staying the same
30. 6th grade moved out of elem, less need of more space @ SPASH, 9th still not at SPASH
31. More transition, how does this help?
32. Busing/transp, nightmare

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

Criterion 1 - Maintained or Enhanced Student Opportunities:

vii. Enhance 9th grade
viii. 6th curriculum is typically lumped in w/ 7-8
ix. Fewer options for 9th graders?

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

Criterion 2 - Manageable Student and Family Impacts:

6. No concern other than traffic
7. Zoning -> Almost no impact
8. Less than Grouping A – Boundary adjustments
9. 900 + students in 1 Jr high is a lot. Not sure if that is good or bad
10. This alignment is ok but no need to leave 6th in elementary when moving solves the issue
11. Fewer choices for students in electives, as there wont be enough room
12. Stronger connections at 9-12
13. Extra transition. Allow for more community connection w/ in grade
14. Yes
15. K-6 is a huge developmental range
16. Yes
17. 3
18. Seems manageable. Logical transitions.
19. Similar to current
20. ↑ belonging in 9th grade. ↓ # of students affected
21. More sites for families of more than 1 e.g. multiple sites

22. Classic config
23. More engagement for 9th-grade families. Changes are appropriate
24. Longer connections
25. Little impact on students and families
26. Minor
27. Same transitions. More developmentally appropriate time for 7-8, but it leaves out 6
28. Two school capacity ↓
29. Smallest change while standardizing grade groupings
30. Yes. Keeping elementary consistent.
31. No
32. No major changes
33. Family: probably ok. Could still be a headache. Student: probably ok

Criterion 3 – Fiscal Responsibility:

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

Criterion 4 – Efficient Building Utilization:

viii. Underutilized jr. high
ix. Major underutilization of jr. high
x. Plover Whiting is too full, others are underutilized, too much room at JR Highs SPASH is overcrowded
xi. K-6 – Balance, 7-8 – Not good usage, 9-12 – Logistics needed
xii. Still needs to address elementary overcrowding

xiii. Close 1 jr high too, but could result in longer bus rides
xiv. How to balance the middle schools?
xv. Not enough space for special ed
xvi. Need more room/space at SPASH. Less balance of enrollment at 9-12, more balance at junior high
xvii. Would underutilize Jr. high
xviii. I don't think efficient
xix. Not fiscally responsible but could close building when mon up to SPASH
xx. Lots of space at Ben/PJs or one full building/probably need border change at P.W.
xxi. 1
xxii. If one middle school! Not efficient if 2.
xxiii. HS enrollment likely to decrease even if higher initially
xxiv. ↓ average bus usage
xxv. No
xxvi. No – unless consolidation and add-ons
xxvii. Con- JR highs not best used – HS stuffed
xxviii. Close BF or PJJ
xxix. Potential capacity ↓. High school ↑.
xxx. I don't see how this covers costs.
xxxi. Yes everything is in 9000 capacity
xxxii. No – why have JH so small or overfilled if one closed?
xxxiii. Turn one jr. high to alternative? Elementaries still off balance
xxxiv. In elementary, likely better utilization w/ exception of P.W.. In secondary, could be tight

Other pros, cons, & considerations:

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

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

Criterion 1 - Maintained or Enhanced Student Opportunities:

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

Criterion 2 - Manageable Student and Family Impacts:

ix. This would be positive alignment to standards
x. Easier for 9th graders to transition
xi. Zoning -> some impact (Elem)
xii. Reframing @ junior high 9th grade shift
xiii. Keep jr highs smaller
xiv. I strongly believe this is the best grade/student age alignment
xv. Stronger connections at 9-12
xvi. Extra transition. Allow for more community connection w/ in grade

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

Criterion 3 – Fiscal Responsibility:

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

xxxviii. Community concerns w/ cost
xxxix. Potentially close one school recovering ≈ $800,00/yr
xl. Potentially close a building. Maybe.
xli. Yes – closing/reconf. Schools
xlii. Major changes needed @ SPASH
xliii. Likely a tougher option fiscally
xliv. Improvements that are necessary at high school level

Criterion 4 – Efficient Building Utilization:

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

Other pros, cons, & considerations:

10. HS modernization?
11. SPASH requires its own internal task force for sweeping changes
12. Less students in each elementary could mean closing 1 (or 2) buildings
13. Bringing in another grade, and how do you manage that with 32 doors
14. Model is more widespread
15. How this affects k-5 parents winners/losers
16. Can teachers get onboard w/ no classroom, etc? Harder to return to that for staff
17. It's normal. The traditional config here is odd.
18. Tell me more about social/emotional alignment concerns.

19. W/ re-drawing no need to close school!
20. Is there space in arts (music)? not just athletics
21. Track meet?
22. Balance. Transitions. Con ↑ high school transitions?
23. DO THIS
24. Similar to other school districts
25. Standard model. Consideration for emotional/social increase. Improvement that is needed at high school

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

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

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

Group A flip-chart comments:

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

9. Maintains
10. Not fiscally responsible

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

9. More middle grade opportunities
10. 9th not a HS still
11. Families would have harder transitions
12. Transportation costs
13. Still underutilized buildings
14. How to adjust MS buildings
    e. Close 1?
15. Still need ↑$ for HS

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

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

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

xiv. Standard alignment w/ state
xv. Transportation issues for pick up/drop off
xvi. $ for HS changes
xvii. Comradery
xviii. Closing elementary school

Group B flip-chart comments:

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

xi. Maintains, does not enhance

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

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

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

xvii. Benefits for 9th grades, but decrease in electives
xviii. Alignment w/ traditional cultural experience of American high school

xix. 900+ students is way over 75% ideal capacity, but w/ out consolidating schools 450 is way under capacity
    a. Could result in fewer opportunities for 7/8 students
xx. 9-12 will require more admin, security, ect.
xxi. Less balance @ 9-12
xxii. SPASH #s are too high to move this in 2027

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

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

Group C flip-chart comments:

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

viii. Maintains current systems, prolong inevitable fiscally.
ix. Not efficient.
x. People don't like change, but we must change.

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

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

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

vii. Creates more problems without solving current problems
viii. Not an efficient use of space

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

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

Group D flip-chart comments:

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

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

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

viii. Strong for 3, harder for 2
ix. Multiple transitions are difficult

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

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

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

iv. Our group disagrees about criterion 1

Group E flip-chart comments:

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

iii. NO
iv. Not fiscally responsible
v. Not efficient building use
vi. Minimize impact to students/fam.

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

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

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

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

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

ix. OK
x. 9th @ SPASH – benefits already discussed
xi. Classic configuration
xii. Least impact to families
xiii. Academic achievement/mindset shifts
xiv. Social/emotional benefits: Could separate out 6th graders in bldg

<u>Group F flip-chart comments</u>:

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

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

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

9. Criteria 1
    d. Social–emotional needs met extremely well
    e. 6th graders ready
    f. Grade teams
    g. Math students?
10. Criteria 2: Extra transition
11. Criteria 3: Less traveling teachers
12. Criteria 4:
    d. Busing?
    e. No elementary

f. Over capacity

13. Pros:
    d. Social-emotional positive groups
    e. Each grade/course would be consistent due to no "cross buildings"
14. Cons: Extra transition
15. Considerations: Advanced math/other subjects

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

v. Cons severely outweigh pros

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

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

Group G flip-chart comments:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Group H flip-chart comments:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Task Force Member Comments on Options:

   a. I think Option C is the only option
   b. Option C standardizes with the state/country. Option A does not improve the student experience for anyone but sixth graders. Closing schools and moving enrollments will send families into an uproar.
   c. Option B should not be considered. It solves virtually zero problems, but it creates them.
   d. Dependent on $.
   e. Getting to Option C is going to take phasing to win the community over so we can work towards it for 2035.
   f. I feel pretty strongly about moving 9th up to high school. I think there needs to be contraction for both student and facility/budget reasons.
   g. I don't believe the community is ready to support another referendum, especially to increase the footprint of SPASH with declining enrollment. I'm not saying I don't support it and it makes sense, but I don't think the general public will understand and support this option.
   h. I think there may need to be a transition of Group B.
   i. Great concern of putting all our eggs I one basket as Option C will require community support. I would like to discuss Option A more. I know there are large concerns, but I like giving students in 6-9 a similar experience in 2 buildings.
   j. I'm fully against moving 9th to SPASH until massive capital improvement isn't as necessary to maintain offerings.
   k. I think the community would struggle to close a building and add on to others.
   l. What happens to elementary? Closures. Not ready to make a decision, looking further at K-5.
   m. Why aren't we talking about moving boundaries?
   n. Would like to discuss how SPASH actually works with 9–12 for cost. I think it is important to look at a 4K building site/EC learning center.
   o. My ranking is based on redrawing map, so students and current growing neighborhood (for elementary) are moved to schools with projected less capacity. In other words, pre-distributing students to even out school populations.
   p. The schools in this community hold importance culturally. Closing more than one would cause community upset if not outrage.
   q. Still worried about the fiscal cost of adding ninth to high school
   r. 9–12 cohesiveness and learning opportunities/6th with 7–8 would benefit too!
   s. Sixth grade needs to move out of the elementary schools. Ninth grade should be part of capital SPASH if we can fiscally manage it.

t. If we make a change, and need to close the school, we need to consider the waves will be creating an order to pass a referendum to add to SPASH or the work will be null and void.
u. Option C, standardize with state, only issue is fiscally how much? Staffing issue? How will closing one school impact the rebalance of students which school potentially?
v. I am not considering any option but K-5, 6–8, 9–12.
w. I feel Option C also fills personal expectations of what grade grouping should be but I look forward to challenging my rankings over the next month to reflect on other opportunities and challenges with each option.
x. Just need to ensure adjustments were made to allow SPASH students to not lose opportunities.
y. We have to do something with the sixth graders.
z. Even though for Option C, there may be a big fiscal component, I think Option A could have just as much, if not more, of a fiscal impact when you factor in the transportation mess. I like Option A best though, for things like criterion one and two and feel social/emotionally. This may be a better fit.

6. What went well at this meeting? What could have gone better? How?
a. More time is needed for discussion. All interesting.
b. I think people had many strong feelings, and we needed smaller group discussions a little earlier on to trade ideas. Even more discussion was planned for this meeting, and I think it's good we didn't get to it because this topic needed more time for questions, discussion, and consideration.
c. It was helpful to hear from Mr. Vollendorf re: SPASH details. We were asked to analyze models in an insufficient amount of time. (Both individual reflection and group discussion.)
d. Good discussions
e. Very informational. Many topics were resolved.
f. Great meeting. Thank you for the group letters on sign-in sheet!
g. Could we offer an optional pre-meeting tour of secondary facilities for those of us who are not as familiar with SPASH and the two middle schools?
h. I liked the individual worksheets to fill out before and during small groups. I think they were obviously a little space-limited, though. I wish the presentations had been significantly shorter, and we had much more small/large group discussion. We're in that second, more discussion-based phase, so let us chat/discuss.
i. The process of discussion is way too rushed.
j. People that don't work in schools have loud voices, but have no idea how it works.
k. Presentation by principal at SPASH. The study used however, was old and an updated study would be more helpful since enrollment has declined even more in the 12 years since the study was done.
l. The evaluation of Grade Group Options worksheet w/ 4 criterion helped to break things down, see pros and cons, which plans are similar and which vary greatly.
m. It is hard to hear in small group table talk. It is nice to have time to independently process, but we need more time to small group talk. Thank you for having the slides available for note-taking.
n. Having options to discuss gave us an idea where we all stand at that time. Speaker from principal give good info about capital SPASH space.
o. Great information from Mr. Vollendorf. Good group discussion.
p. I'm glad we are moving forward. The small group discussion was rushed, and it was difficult to make a clear opinion/decision.
q. We made actual progress in decision-making, rather than copious information gathering. Could have used more time on worksheets and table discussions I didn't finish.

r. We were rushed to complete comparison. There could have been a standard ranking. Score for us to use to compare all options if one is the best and four is the worst. We could rank each criterion, then have an avenue across all members that is comparable.
s. Talk too long in the beginning. More time and small groups to really discuss- not rushed.
t. Less summary and more time to talking groups (expect people to know what we've already covered).
u. A lot of information shared, mainly on how the high school runs and how it would be able to handle more students.
v. Less time on reviewing previous info. More process time and discussion.
w. Presentation of info is always solid. I am concerned about making changes based on outdated opinions/knowledge about how schools function, what the school culture/climate is like.
x. Good conversation in small group. Appreciated the presentation from John.
y. Thanks for the table assignment on the sign-up sheet. I enjoyed the trivia question last month. I left with a smile on my face, and I learned something. I don't concur with the complaint who said to release those who wanted to be done and didn't want to spend 90 seconds having a laugh.
z. Good discussion, appreciate the information shared. I would like more information on 4K/EC sites and how capital SPASH would work with ninth grade.
aa. Small group discussion was very productive. Sharing out loud a disclosure of what will be expected to present so there isn't a scramble at presentation time of what the expectation is.
bb. High school presentation was neutral and informative. Not enough discussion time when we are supposed to be coming forth with an idea.
cc. Finally moving forward on initial decisions. Good process keep going.
dd. Felt productive! More than previous sessions.
ee. This went well. I didn't have enough time to process this sheet.
ff. What went well with details/grade grouping?
gg. I know my going forward thought and they haven't changed. I want everyone else to get the info they need.
hh. More Q&A time and discussion time. Or perhaps during small group share out have each group share a question they have. John's presentation and information were very valuable.
ii. I like the paper copies of all slides.
jj. Good small group discussion. Great at introducing models for us to look at.
kk. John did a great job of explaining and fielding the questions. Good shared info and then good group discussion.
ll. Would have liked info portion to go shorter and more time for table discussion of the pros and cons
mm. I don't know if it was just my placement in the room today, though I think likely not, during small group discussion, I had a really hard time hearing my group members. I think there was a lot of passionate discussion tonight and I anticipate future meetings to be similar. It would be helpful if I could hear and feel like I could actually contribute to the conversation. Additionally, I felt the small group discussion was more limited on time.

7. <u>What information do you feel you need to complete the tasks ahead?</u>
a. We need to consider what consolidation if any should take place alongside or independent of grade group reshuffling.
b. I would appreciate a more detailed agenda (ahead of time) that would allow for thought before the meeting.
c. Good review and clear plan, but not enough time to discuss and share thoughts as a large group
d. Biggest concern is $

e. Which decision will be prioritized
f. Does the consolidation/closing of any of our 3 Title 1 schools cause any budgetary concerns due to a potential loss of Title 1 funds? Does this need to inform which schools are considered for closing beyond just capacity?
g. I think drilling down on two financial questions: how much $ to bring 9th to high school Specifically, look at a scale/a few different points: (1) $ min go include 9th grade, like bare minimum; (2) $ to bring 9th in with all the bells and whistles; (3) a $ point (or 2) in the middle.
h. How much $ to be gained by closing various buildings, especially the elementary.
i. Please take people on a field trip to SPASH, Ben, and PJ's. Can we hold our next meeting at those schools so people who have never been in them can see?
j. A meeting at SPASH so people can get a feeling for the building and illustrate the needs since this is a critical part of the plan.
k. Look at individual elementary and junior building needs assessments, which buildings need more/less improvement
l. It is hard to hear in small group table talk. It is nice to have time to independently process, but we need more time to small group talk. Thank you for having the slides available for notetaking.
m. Suggesting building adjustments; physically seeing the buildings would be helpful.
n. 4K Opening how it may impact daycare. Current information of the standard model/research that will help support that transition 9 to SPASH. Closing a school money saved? A cost to add on to SPASH?
o. If we did nothing but change school boundaries, what does that do? Not advocating for this, but a question voters might want.
p. More elementary impact information. 4K – 6 is a huge developmental range…
q. True, real world "dollars" benefit of closing a school. This is serious community impact and needs to be ironclad "worth it".
r. If sixth grade moves up, then what happens to K-5 closures? When implement 9 to 12? 2030, 2035, sooner?
s. I think how we would handle the extra space in the elementary schools if sixth graders leave is the biggest factor for me between the current and option C. It would be nice to know more about what those options are is full day 4K in all buildings realistic? Can we use a building as a daycare instead of closing and make some money? How out of the box can we be?
t. Criteria for shutting down schools? Which schools?
u. Does the grade alignment decision come first then we look at building consolidation?
v. How do boundary shifts change enrollments? What if we repurpose an elementary building to be a 4K center? Why aren't we talking about VSIPs/reduction of faculty lives?
w. I am open.
x. How are decisions affect staffing, what opportunities change if ninth grade goes to SPASH.
y. Is creating a 4K site an option?
z. What financial support/puzzle pieces are needed to move ninth grade up? Is it able to be achieved?
aa. Were any draft high school changes drawn out for ninth grade being there? Floor plan/additional building space? Could we meet at SPASH to walk through potential facility changes needed to bring ninth on board there?
bb. More information (cost for each option?)
cc. All of the potential closure information.
dd. Cost to adjust SPASH for grade 9. How does school closings fiscally benefit closing/operational cost versus transportation?

ee. 1 consideration that I hope is brought to the table is the option of switching from only an alternative high school to also an alternative junior high. If we can identify these students and give them more specialized resources from a younger grade, then it would be more proactive rather than our current reactive. The current structure is a disservice to students and staff alike – learning opportunities are being severely reduced due to the lack of resources and space and time.

ff. Likely what will be presented. In order to make a more formal recommendation and feel like I could really stand behind that, I would need to look at and compare numbers. So for example, if the district were to do Option A, what factors (i.e. transportation, building updates) would increase physically, as well as decrease (i.e., selling buildings) first Option C.

STEVENS POINT AREA PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICT

#PointProud Schools 2040
Meeting 3 Outcomes – 6/15/2026

38 Task Force members in attendance

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

District staff in attendance: Cory Hirsburnner, Superintendent; Chris Nyman, Assistant Superintendent/Director of Elementary Education; Michael Kurtz, Director of Business Services; Chris Budzinski, Facilities & Safety Manager; Nicole Baumann, Executive Assistant to the Superintendent

Large-group questions asked during and after a School Facilities presentation:

7. Q1: Has the District ever replaced an entire building on site? R: Not to our knowledge. Bannach is the newest building and it was on a greenfield site. There were also additions to a handful of existing buildings following the 2018 referendum and in the mid-1990s.
8. Q2: Can you talk about Jackson Elementary and its closure? R: This former west side school building was repurposed for the Point of Discovery and Charles Fernandez Center schools in the mid-2010, which relocated from Downtown space. It is a solid building but like many warrants some updates.
9. Q3: Has the District performed a full energy audit of all buildings? R: It is not clear when one was performed. Referendum and other projects have included efficiency enhancements, such as LED lighting on motion sensors and better insulation such as with roofing projects. Energy usage is also monitored regularly. Energy usage is down since last capital referendum, even with added space.

Large-group questions asked during and after a Transportation presentation:

10. Q1: How does the District cycle through school busses? R: The District typically buys replacement busses on a staggered 10-year cycle. This cycle levels costs over time and helps keep more busses under warranty.
11. Q2: Do bus drivers receive benefits? They receive State retirement benefits and may qualify for health insurance depending on number of hours/routes worked.
12. Q3: Has the District explored contracting out all bussing? R: Not recently. It is not clear that there is a regional group with the capabilities; one would have to start or significantly expand operations in the Point area. From what Lamers' charges for its current five routes, it is not clear that privatizing all bus service would be less expensive, and it would be a very difficult decision to later reverse and controlling cost increases may be harder. Remember that private services must make a profit.
13. Q4: Are private students picked up by the same routes as SPAPSD students? R: Yes. Private schools have been cooperative in coordinating schedules to allow this.
14. Q5: Would eliminating an elementary school building allow a reduction in bus routes? R: Maybe, but if too many walking zone students were switched to bussing, there might be cost increases.

Large-group questions asked with reference to a presentation on School Building and Site Overview matrices handouts:

- Q1: Why are "annual operating cost per student" so different among some elementary schools? R: Per student costs tend to be smaller with larger enrollment schools. More students = building better optimized. Other factors include age of building, whether they have air conditioning, and physical building size.
- Q2: Which six referenced schools are considered similar in physical size (square footage)? R: Bannach, Washington, Roosevelt, Plover-Whiting, Madison, and McDill. McKinley is notably larger than this group in square footage. Kennedy and Jefferson are smaller
- Q3: Does the "annual operating cost per student" just cover the regular school year, or does it also include summers for schools with summer programming? R: It covers the entire calendar year. The team can attempt to modify annual operating cost per student to better control for this. Summer programming is run from certain schools because those schools qualify for outside funding.
- Q4: Which buildings have summer school? For elementary school, McKinley, Madison, Roosevelt—run from these schools in large part because they are funding-eligible schools. Grade 7-12 summer school is usually run at SPASH.
- Q5: When have school buildings have been looked at for optimization of use of their square footage, increasing capacity or making rooms better for students or teaching? R: It is unclear when the District last performed such an analysis.
- Q6: What is the goal or ideal percentage for enrollment-to-capacity in a school building? R: A percentage somewhere in the 80s, comparing enrollment to working capacity, seems to be a reasonable target.
- Q7: Not bussing students living within 1 mile of a school in neighborhoods that have sidewalks may make sense, but not in other neighborhoods. If a neighborhood has no sidewalks, are students within 1 mile still required to walk? R: The District also has determined some walking routes and street crossings to be "unusually hazardous", and in such cases students within 1 mile and on that route are offered bussing.
- Q8: What do the arrows after 2035+ in the "Proj. 2035 Enroll & 2035+ Trend" mean? R: It means the consultant's general prediction of enrollment trajectory for that school after 2035.
- Q9: Note that while classrooms in PJ Jacobs are air conditioned, hallways are not air conditioned. R: Noted—the associated matrix can be updated.
- Q10: What the rating for "co-curricular & athletic facilities" be if SPASH changed to also serve grade 9? R: Question added to parking lot—see "questions and responses" document.

Small group exercise results: Each of the eight small groups formed at this Task Force meeting was asked to respond to two questions following the School Facilities, Transportation, and Matrices presentations. Each group recorded its responses on flip-chart pages and then shared results with the large group. Results of all recorded responses are as follows:

22. <u>What did I learn about school buildings and transportation that should particularly inform or influence the Task Force's work?</u>

    Group A suggestions:

    xxiii. Working capacity is only for as-is scenario, doesn't envision potential changes
    xxiv. The buildings are very old

    Group B suggestions:

    xxiv. Looking at building usage and projections, shifting lines are in heavy consideration.

Group C suggestions:

xxix. Some type of redistricting is going to be necessary
xxx. 84 minute bus route is a total of 3 hours of a kid's life each day

Group D suggestions:

xv. How many students w/in 1 mile = more flexibility
xvi. Realization that the buildings are old, and "clustered in age"
xvii. We learned at the 80% ideal, SPASH does not have room currently to add 9th grade [Consultant note—he suggested that ideal enrollment to capacity may be between 80-90%]

Group E suggestions:

xliv. Our buildings are old!
xlv. Are we utilizing transportation options to fullest?
xlvi. What are the other buildings/land owned by the district? What are they used for?
xlvii. Thanks for sharing breakdown of staff and equipment of transportation dept.

Group F suggestions:

xxxvi. Age of buildings
xxxvii. Bussing of private school students
xxxviii. Size of our district
xxxix. Owning transportation is good

Group G suggestions:

xlv. Buildings are old
xlvi. $ for new ones – probably not
xlvii. A lot under capacity by 2040
xlviii. Well-being spaces

Group H suggestions:

xxxi. Age of buildings – ouch!
xxxii. Thanks for Building and Site Overview sheet!

23. <u>What more do I need to learn about school buildings and transportation related to the Task Force's charge?</u>

Group A suggestions:

xxv. Criteria for choosing remodel v. new building?
xxvi. Would like to know comparative information from districts like Wausau
xxvii. What if enrollment doesn't decline; not enough flexibility?
xxviii. How many additional students within 1 mile of Jefferson could be re-districted to go to Jefferson?
xxix. Criterion doesn't include student outcomes

Group B suggestions:

xxxv. Is it feasible to bring up 9th gr. & when with space?
xxxvi. Is actual athletic space available?
xxxvii. When can we no longer sustain the "old" buildings? *Looking at more remodels?
xxxviii. What is 4K change over costs?

Group C suggestions:

xliii. Help us understand culture and demographics of the individual elementary schools.
xliv. What does transportation look like if we redistrict or close a school?
xlv. If we move grades up, do we have data showing leaning efficacy if they are in a different (higher) school? Would it help with learning?

xlvi. Behavioral stats for students who no longer have active time (recess) during the school day.
xlvii. Open enrollment requests per building?
xlviii. Hypothetically… If we double the number of buses and cut the route time in half, will that affect the open enrollment out numbers?

Group D suggestions:

xxxix. Information refined to easier/simple access and re-access
xl. How would grade shifts impact transportation
xli. More info on annual costs
xlii. Age of building does not equate condition
xliii. More transparency of room use vs. class size

Group E suggestions:

xl. Developmental needs of 5-9 grade students.
xli. What non-district events happen at district facilities?
xlii. Is there a benefit to keeping some facilities at a lower capacity?

Group F suggestions:

xxxix. What does an empty building cost?
xl. Do we pay property taxes on buildings we own?
xli. Models/Proposals/Roll out/domino effect

Group G suggestions:

xxxvii. Have dem. att- areas made to optimize walking?
xxxviii. What changes would need to happen at SPASH to acc. 9 grade coming in? classroom/athletic/music
xxxix. What other changes for 3k/4k students? -bathrooms -meal services -playgrounds – access to specials – training of staff
xl. AC? Summer school buildings
xli. Summer school – additional wear and tear
xlii. Cost of update vs. new building

Group H suggestions:

xxix. If we change grade grouping in school, how would that affect per student cost (ex: moving 9th grade to SPASH)?
xxx. Does district geography affect costs, operations and facility usage? Ex: rivers/trains/etc.
xxxi. Also for walking students

Questions placed in "parking lot" during meeting (to be answered at later meeting and/or in Q&R document):

- Is summer school (for buildings that have it) in "operating cost per student" column? If so, what is this impact?
- How would SPASH's "co-curricular and athletic facilities" grade change if 9th graders were moved there?

Individual member written meeting evaluation responses (following meeting):

8. What do you think went well at this meeting?
    a. Building info was nice
    b. The transportation info was enlightening
    c. Relevant info dump
    d. I think the discussion at our table were great. The clear realization of district transportation and age of buildings & the yearly costs.
    e. Good visuals and explanations
    f. Good to start w/ the charge and revisiting what we've learned
    g. Thank you for going over our "charge" and the recap. It is helpful to reorient and remind ourselves what was discussed.
    h. Information is presented in a thorough manner. Questions are answered when they can be. Always appreciate the guidance for keeping the group on task.
    i. I thought these were the best/smoothest information/presentations
    j. Good small group discussion. Great presentation.
    k. Expectation setting w/ the ask and purpose of task force
    l. Recentering the Task Force charge to keep focus on facilities
    m. Really solid info – helpful when considering the facts
    n. More great data and info
    o. Discussion following data
    p. Presentations were very good & informative. Sharing the agenda and expectations of the upcoming meetings will be helpful to keep future meeting discussions on target.
    q. Good snacks! Great matrices that give at a glance information that is helpful.
    r. Geographically concentrated areas where students live was helpful
    s. Succinct info, good presentations that answered questions
    t. I like following an agenda and way more information provided to make decisions.
    u. Great information
    v. Clear matrices to lay out info
    w. Information was presented efficiently. It was good to re-center on the end goal and I think it will be important to continue to do that.
    x. Group dynamics/respect, info presentation
    y. Great presentation – but wow! So much data.
    z. Many good questions this session! I was really impressed with the thoughtful ideas brought up.
    aa. More time for group discussion was nice
    bb. Good baseline info regarding building age, condition, costs
    cc. Very informative learning about building ages and projected costs to upkeep buildings moving forward
    dd. Presentations were very good/informative. Great group discussion.
    ee. Small group
    ff. Good info on buildings
    gg. The building and site overview sheet was a big help!
    hh. Trivia
    ii. Good discussion

9. <u>What could have gone better? How?</u>
    a. Trivia doesn't feel like the best use of our time
    b. More small group time
    c. Go over how to review this info on the website so we can access it with ease
    d. Access to slide show during meeting
    e. Systems thinkers have a hard time focusing on one or two variables and it benefits us all when we explore the complexity of this challenge. Allow them that space w/ out redirection sometimes.
    f. Could the check-in sheet list what table/group I'm in this month/meeting so I don't have to look at each table?
    g. Break up the lectures for our table to digest information.
    h. No trivia please. Time back if we end early would be much appreciated.
    i. Trivia at start for team building. More time to digest facility expenses and presentation.
    j. As we look @ schools – understanding the demographics and culture of those buildings will be helpful.
    k. Task Force members tended to get off topic. For small group discussion, it may be useful to ask one question at a time.
    l. Keep the Bloom and Poppis coming!
    m. Groups need to be mixed better, have been w/ multiple people more than once in the three meetings
    n. Present questions that we will need to discuss prior to having small group discussions
    o. I would like to see dynamic slides/Excel sheets during the presentation to show what the likely proposed scenarios would do to costs, building populations, etc.
    p. Regarding information presentation, having the numbers and data be more dynamic rather than static would be helpful, but also more comparative info (i.e., if we made this change, then this would be the projected cost/savings). Also getting the Q&R just a weekend prior to the meeting was not ideal. I think with this meeting, it was maybe hard because we had less time between meetings and it was on a different day of the week.
    q. I thought this session went well. I could hear everyone. The slides weren't overwhelming and topics handled in a timely manner.
    r. It felt like the presentation on the buildings was a bit rushed and it could have included more detail on how badly the projects are needed.
    s. Trivia – if we're done – let us go
    t. What are the most pressing needs at each building? How would grade re-alignment re-drawing boundary lines impact this?
    u. A lot of charts.
    v. Cookies?

10. <u>What information do you feel you need to complete the tasks ahead?</u>
    a. Building quality – not just based on age -SPASH Space – 9th grade class size
    b. Staff and benefit information by building. There is NO way all staff will be retained if consolidation is considered.
    c. Suitable data sets
    d. What buildings need the most help/updating
    e. Can SPASH accommodate 9th grade successfully w/ high standards for safety and education?
    f. Comparisons with numbers in different scenarios: grade levels switch, redistricting, etc.
    g. I'd love to hear from people in the field who may have insights the data doesn't tell
    h. Comparable models
    i. Comparison models. If ___ then ___
    j. I would love to see an editable data visualization of the school populations mapped out over time

k. How geographical features influence zoning
l. Data about 6-8 and 9-12 – how do these schools perform – Pros vs. Cons
m. We need information/data on how the changes we are considering will (projected) to impact: a) learning and education of our students, b) the social and emotional growth of students, e.g. do more transitions negatively impact students
n. Trivia preparation ☺
o. What would 4k changes cost to elementary buildings
p. Building quality ratings
q. PTR. – Parent transfer request info, and does that need to be considered, policy need to change?
r. What other land/buildings does the district own?
s. How the decisions we make will look with classes and building usage.
t. What would an EC school look like? Who would attend?
u. If this, then that. Inputs Outputs
v. How long can we operate with such old schools?
w. We need detailed info to show the impact of certain changes
x. I feel like I need better information about operating costs. I need to see the raw numbers, not just cost per pupil. I also need to see pure utility and maintenance operating costs because some included costs like software, media, and supplies, also change per pupil, like staffing costs. Also, which schools host summer school?
y. Really need to know some information regarding knowing at what point is it more fiscally responsible to stop repairing a failing/not modern-and-up-to-date school (and which school) vs building a new school w/ all of the updated and modern amenities?
z. Consensus on shared values. Data is great, but what matters most as we consider how to move forward? I'm not sure we've spent enough time thinking about that.
aa. I am open right now.
bb. Do we have any idea on how the community feels about grade shifts or redistricting for elementary schools? Have surveys been done?
cc. Building capacity #s/% w/out 6th grade, re-done at PJs/BF 6-8 and SPASH 9-12
dd. What is the district's timeframe for making changes? Some schools I feel can continue to operate as is, where others are struggling at the current time.
ee. More info about what changes would need to be made to buildings to accommodate shifts of 4k, 6th, and 9th grade.
ff. Demographics – low income areas. Vacant land – expanding curricula/stem. Another point discover/charter school. Provide options, free room.
gg. What needs to happen to bring 4k into elementary?
hh. Covered in discussion
ii. School realignment simulation to balance student numbers
jj. Value of buildings. District endowments and "wealth" can SPASD cover some expenses without aid of taxpayer dollars
kk. Answers to questions asked in groups

11. <u>Any questions we can answer before or at the next meeting?</u>
    a. Would we consider virtual/project-based/Montessori programming options to adapt to current education trends?
    b. What is the base building operating cost (what does it cost a building just to open the door daily & breakdown)?
    c. Just the ones shared in the big group.
    d. Any plans to make more/less use of old Jackson (PODS/CF)?
    e. What is best for our students and teachers? What are community non-negotiables?

f. What are some non-negotiables?
g. Solutions that are definitely off the table (so we can stay on the right track)
h. What was the capacity of SPASH in 1985? I thought SPASH at one time had over 3000 students, which is better financially, open enroll in or open enroll out?
i. How do we get data regarding how our proposed changes will impact the education of our students?
j. How could walking/ vs. busing students affect transportation costs?
k. Breakdown of how things would look if we did move classes to other buildings. More info on building usage.
l. List of activities that happen at elementary schools after school. Like play practice, sports practices…
m. How feasible is it to bring up 9th grade? Is there space?
n. It looks like the expected 10 year capital needs costs doesn't include adding any air conditioning, is that accurate? I expect that a/c will be a requested addition to many buildings.
o. It was brought up that programming expansion/contraction is an item to be considered, but it feels like we haven't been presented any info on programming that could be expanded/contracted other than 4k. Is this consideration limited to 4K/EC?
p. Is there a formula or some sort of standard criteria by which the district (or state or building experts) evaluate whether a site is worth the capital needed to improve or maintain it? In other words, @ what point is it no longer efficient and/or fiscally responsible to put money into a site with major structural needs?
q. Speaking of trivia – I'm curious about the group. Any local grads? How many elem. Schools represented? School mascots?
r. Are we factoring security into expenses?
s. What are parent perceptions to having kids walk to school?
t. How would elective choices be impacted if 9th graders moved to SPASH? Would they be able to get into elective classes?
u. 1.5 m annually (elementary energy) Pros/cons renewable energy, cost effective??? Considering/optimizing energy efficiency for schools w/ higher annual operating cost □ schools that have had a recent add on. Transportation □ annual operational cost???
v. How well you integrate 9th graders into SPASH with the classrooms available.
w. Covered in discussion

#PointProud Schools 2040
Meeting 2 Outcomes – 5/27/26

42 Task Force members in attendance

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

District staff in attendance: Chris Nyman, Assistant Superintendent/Director of Elementary Education; Michael Kurtz, Director of Business Services; Nicole Baumann, Executive Assistant to the Superintendent; Sarah O'Donnell, Director of Communications

Large-group questions and responses after "Educational Programming Policies, Trends, and Needs" presentation:

- Q1: Do you have any data to compare the percentage of SPAPSD students with disabilities average (16.6% in 2024-45) to the Statewide percentage? R: The State average is 13%-15%.
- Q2: Are special education students included in the District's class size targets? R: Yes, with appropriate supports as needed.
- Q3: What is the typical profile of a student open-enrolling-out of the District? Do they commonly return? Do many students open-enroll-out if they are not approved for an intra-district transfer to another school? R: Most students who open-enroll-out of the District has never enrolled and do never enroll in SPAPSD schools. When resident students do return, returning in 7th or 10th grades is most common.
- Q4: How many District elementary schools qualify as a Title 1 school? R: Madison, McKinley, Jefferson. The District receives supplemental funding for Title 1 schools, which have more than 40% of their students eligible for free or reduced priced lunch. Class size policies are the same as any other school

Small group exercise results after same presentation: Each of the eight small groups formed at this Task Force meeting was asked to respond to two questions asked after the Educational Programming Policies, Trends, and Needs presentation, record their responses on flip-chart pages, and summarize responses for the large group. Results of all recorded responses are as follows:

24. <u>What did I learn about educational policy that should particularly inform or influence the Task Force's work?</u>

    Group A suggestions:
    - xxv. Opt-out largely due to desires for smaller classes, environments we don't offer
    - xxvi. Student ratios at grade levels are much more complicated/nuanced (special ed, pull-outs, testing needs influence space too)

    Group B suggestions:
    - xxv. Surface-level information … (table of teachers)
    - xxvi. Are the numbers really telling the story?
    - xxvii. High needs of students <u>TODAY!</u>

    Group C suggestions:
    - xxxi. Data points are helpful, though the accuracy is in question.
    - xxxii. The large gap between 12th grade and kindergarten was striking.
    - xxxiii. Consider the implications of moving 4k into alternate buildings as enrollment drops

    Group D suggestions:

xviii. Class size, rec. # likely not to change

Group E suggestions:

xlviii. Class size policy data

Group F suggestions:

xl. Surprised by how class size presented average instead of range

Group G suggestions:

xlix. Class sizes

l. Policy vs practice

li. 4K option breakdown (awesome options!)

lii. Percentage of students w/ disabilities keep in mind as we potentially re-allocate resources (buildings/staff/etc.)

Group H suggestions:

xxxiii. Class size

xxxiv. Open enrollment out

xxxv. 4k options

xxxvi. Homeschool, grade levels

25. <u>What more do I need to learn about educational policy related to the Task Force's charge?</u>

Group A suggestions:

xxx. Staffing needs and costs for special reasons, supports

Group B suggestions:

xxxix. Comparative data (testing). Relationship to class size.

xl. Can we look at “human” data?

xli. How does 4k programming:

a. Affect staffing

b. Behavior supports

c. Support staff

xlii. Voucher programs increase property taxes

Group C suggestions:

xlix. Can we compare average class sizes to lowest/highest sizes?

l. Why is there such a discrepancy?

li. Do the projection formulas line up with the data from the last 5 years?

Group D suggestions:

xliv. Looking at the actual needs of the classroom

a. Getting the breakdown a little more clearly (504s, per school, etc.)

xlv. How are we accounting for AI?

xlvi. Comparison of 4K student-to-teacher ratio

Group E suggestions:

xliii. Positions eliminated?

xliv. Impact on offerings?

xlv. We need context and/or breakdown

xlvi. Class sizes and outcomes

Group F suggestions:

xlii. Open-enrollment-out – Receive survey data

xliii. Homeschool Data – Potential survey? Why homeschool?

xliv. Ask would the community want the Waldorf Model

xlv. Identify pipelines out and catch those before the decision is made
xlvi. Are there pipelines at early learning centers feeding TRS?

Group G suggestions:
xliii. Future of education always changing, so can we accurately predict what works long term?
xliv. Percentages/trends of disabilities
xlv. What are our goals?
a. Meeting social/emotional needs?
b. Meeting educational needs?
c. "Prepare each student to be successful" -> how do we define success?

Group H suggestions:
xxxii. Clustering students based on their needs and services provided.
xxxiii. More data by school instead of grade.

Large-group questions and responses after "Financial Conditions and Forecast" presentation:

- Q1: Does a recurring operating referendum allocation decrease if enrollment decreases? R: Yes.
- Q2: Did you factor in declining enrollment in financial forecasts? R: Yes. The assumption was a 40 student decrease per year.
- Q3: Does the District seek to reduce operating expenses by an additional $1 million each year. R: Yes. This becomes more challenging each year.
- Q4: Can you give us examples of what the District has done to cut about $1 million each year? R: Software replacement, professional development, staff and benefit decreases by not replacing certain positions, typically to correspond with enrollment decreases.
- Q5: What types of positions have had the most staffing decreases? R: Certified staff (e.g., licensed staff member or administrator).
- Q6: What type of services are eligible under Medicaid claims? R: Salary and benefits for certain staff that are providing medical services that we provide in school district.
- Q7: Why the significant difference between the District's special education and Medicaid claims and the actual amount received? R: More claims for these funds than there are funds available.

Small group exercise results after same presentation: Each of the eight small groups formed at this Task Force meeting was asked to respond to two questions asked after the Financial Conditions and Forecast presentation (plus one unrelated questions), record their responses on flip-chart pages, and summarize responses for the large group. Results of all recorded responses are as follows:

5. <u>What did I learn about the District's financial position that should particularly inform or influence the Task Force's work?</u>

Group A suggestions:
i. Framing around a $1M cut each year
ii. P.D. needs in best assisting the students going forward

Group B suggestions:
i. How do we keep cutting $1 million every year?
ii. What cuts help vs. hurt?
iii. How are those decisions made?

Group C suggestions:

i. $1,000,000 is a scary number!
ii. Budget decreases lead to increased class sizes
iii. Retirements lead to increased class sizes as they are not replaced

Group D suggestions:
i. Things are not as bad fiscally as was maybe thought
ii. How the million-dollar cut has been addressed thus far

Group E suggestions:
i. Staff demographics (cost savings)
ii. Facilities costs

Group F suggestions:
i. Great teaching of Rev. Limits! Fantastic use of props!

Group G suggestions:
iii. $1M is new annually
iv. ↑ taxes ≠ ↑$ for district
v. Positive projections aren't a guarantee

Group H suggestions:
xix. Revenue limit structure
xx. Operational referendum is essential for function

6. <u>What more do I need to learn about the District's financial position related to the Task Force's charge?</u>

Group A suggestions:
xxiii. Ways that our changing student needs might make new funding possible

Group B suggestions:
xiii. Public Perception – Education on Funding Formulas Laws, etc.
xiv. Voucher programs
xv. Staff cuts/Benefits/Salaries

Group C suggestions:
xi. How far can $1 million get us?
xii. Do we have any say financially how dollars are allocated for building changes?

Group D suggestions:
ix. What needs to be done at each of the buildings?
x. Who determines the priorities (needs vs wants) in the classroom/@ each building?
xi. When do we reach breaking point of the million dollar cuts being met?

Group E suggestions:
ix. Kennedy, 4k costs & retention also PODs and CFC

Group F suggestions:
viii. What kind of capital costs coming up?
ix. How does the district relay the cuts to the public in a way that impacts better understanding… especially when voting on referendum

Group G suggestions:
ix. How can we keep finding a new $1m each year?
x. How will we ensure the arts/electives stay alive?
xi. What % of students w/ disabilities qualify for the higher cost SpEd?

Group H suggestions:
xvii. Insurance costs for facilities?

xviii. Can the District find even more creative revenue options (ex. Paid 4k or child care for profit?)
xix. Could selling a building help?

7. <u>What more do I need to learn about other topics, such as about the District's school buildings, before I can start talking about options for future changes?</u>

Group A suggestions:
x. Inspection reports, best practices on space needs for special instruction/environments

Group B suggestions:
v. Appreciate District efforts to get ahead of issues and avoid a crisis

Group C suggestions:
v. Cost annually to maintain buildings and the connection to the age of the building?
vi. Is the cost to renovate/upkeep higher than building new?

Group D suggestions:
vii. How would changing over grade structure (4k-5,6-8,9-12) impact fiscally?
viii. How would the humanizing aspects look like? it is captured in 2 out of 4 criterion we are using to make decisions?

Group E suggestions:
ix. Recurring costs to have a building?
x. Budget overview

Group F suggestions:
viii. The ins and outs of school choice
ix. What is the # of students opting for school choice and why?

Group G suggestions:
xvi. Before even accounting for school happening, how much is the base cost of running a building?
xvii. Are any buildings more expensive than others?

Group H suggestions:
xv. Age and physical state of facilities
xvi. Value of buildings
xvii. More specific data about line items for $1m cut each year

Questions placed in "parking lot" during meeting (to be answered at later meeting and/or in Q&R document):

- Do we have % of students by specific disability type?
- Is there a disproportionate percentage of non-disabled students open-enrolling-out to other Districts or attending private schools? How about the reverse?
- Do core classes (ELA, Math, SS, Science) have higher class sizes than reported all-class averages?
- How have/do support staff needs increase with more special needs students?
- What are class size averages by elementary school?
- Can we have a breakdown of what types of positions have been eliminated?
- Can we get disability percentages by school?

Individual member written meeting evaluation responses (following meeting):

12. <u>What do you think went well at this meeting?</u>
    a. Information was presented thoroughly, honestly, and in an understandable way for all (not just those in education)
    b. The revenue explanation was so helpful
    c. Chris & Mike were thorough & did a great job of outlining current status of the District

d. Good table adjustment
e. Structure was great. Presentations and then group discussions and report out
f. A lot of data
g. Good balance and flow. Educate Discuss Share. Far fewer interruptions and constant opinions
h. Chunked content with 2 different moments to process/discuss/share
i. Loved the prop for explaining District finance
j. Pacing of meeting; balance between presentation, large group, and small group questions
k. I appreciate the responsiveness to feedback from our last meeting
l. Coffee cup analogy
m. Good conversations and helpful info
n. Good description of revenue vs tax dollars and that we levy taxes to make up for vouchers
o. Helpful info, well-paced. Respectful, thoughtful questions and documents
p. This felt like a more efficient meeting in terms of what we learned in the time. Good facilitation
q. Thoughtful questions that were more related to the topics at hand. Clear presentations
r. Great presenters
s. Mike did an amazing job at explaining the financial status of our district
t. Thank you for asking for definitions, EBD. Thanks for the snacks ☺
u. Financial presentation was very accessible
v. Smaller, mini presentations. I liked the parking lot and that those questions were answered in the document shared via email before this meeting. Well organized
w. Tables are set up much better this week. The financial presentation was very educational.
x. The presentations were broken up w/ small group – very effective. Also thanks for giving acronyms – IE – IED, certified staff, etc.
y. Great financial explanation
z. Providing more baseline info – especially the financial information
aa. Very informative, great to learn about how the financial outlook is
bb. Fantastic revenue limits presentation. I feel much more confident and now able to participate in discussions
cc. Schedule and timing was great. Good information
dd. Got some good data
ee. Much more efficient. Thankful for better seating
ff. The presentations were very informative. I like that we are with new people each time
gg. Discussion at our table was great! Enjoyed the insights on District funding
hh. Holding questions until the end was helpful
ii. Great explanation of material – provided a clear picture
jj. Presentations – especially Mike
kk. Seating arrangement was nicer. Reduction in breaks was helpful to stay on task. Mike's presentation was helpful
ll. Taking time for us to synthesize a few times was very helpful
mm. Good briefing on financials
nn. Being able to keep the parking lot questions at bay a little bit. Having higher level information being able to be broken down in a way that is digestible

13. <u>What could have gone better? How?</u>
    a. Not much
    b. More details on educational programming. Felt surface level and left more questions than answers

c. I feel like this one did a good job of balance between info & group chat
d. Everything went well
e. More detail
f. Primary speakers should be mic'ed up. Table microphones would be amazing. Some people were too quiet.
g. I really need people to remember that at a public school district we educate all students in our District boundaries. The language some are using about special ed students, or other students, borders on not wanting to educate all students. I know it is coming from a place of support for educators and students but it is starting to border on exclusionary language.
h. I appreciate when a timeline is provided
i. Information comparing us to the state
j. Bigger font on slides
k. I would have liked the data presented to have more context, so that its meaningful. Ex: we were given raw ACT scores without context of what proficiency of state averages are
l. Could always have more time for group discussions
m. I really wanted to understand the financial info, but my eyes were glazing over. I'll keep trying. I could use more examples, or perhaps having it explained a different way.
n. I thought things went well
o. The questions and conversations regarding WHY enrollment is dropping is outside this team's purview. I'm concerned that it is drawing attention away from our goals. A comment may be needed that enrollment projections are not something we are supposed to fix.
p. Good mtg. – no answer here
q. Keep it focused – we will not be able to fix everything. i.e., SPED %s
r. Felt the meeting ran very smooth and stayed on topic
s. A formal break allows folks to pause and shift their focus momentarily and to build camaraderie among other members for trust building and better listening
t. For the presenters less reading directly from the slides and more summarizing, adding nuance and commentary to what's being shown
u. Tie into what we actually can DO
v. Trivia!
w. We want the trivia! ☺ Even more group discussion time – I think we really learn a lot from all the great perspectives
x. Still building our knowledge – keep going!
y. Thought it went well
z. Good
aa. I like the big group discussion and would like that to run a little longer
bb. Talking about the fiscal aspects of things was helpful, but also a lot @ the same time. Personally, after a full day at work, that information was a lot to process. I think having had that information at the beginning may have been better placed. So for the next meeting, doing the heavy information @ the beginning.

14. <u>What information do you feel you need to complete the tasks ahead?</u>
    a. Building information, transportation, etc. Possible models and how things change because of each
    b. 4k programming will increase staffing – how is that offset by more FTE cuts? Are we increasing SPED/SLP/Assistants to manage recess or lunchtime
    c. How much does each building cost to operate? What can we save by making changes?
    d. More breakdowns per building. Statewide comparisons of everything.
    e. Facilities cost, which we will get at the next meeting. I like the idea of thinking outside the box

f. More detail
g. Detailed expenses
h. Evaluation protocols for cuts
i. Facility analysis. Staffing expenses per school. Schedule of year & start-end times w/ related policy
j. What does "success' mean to the District? Above and beyond the legal requirements? What kind of experience are they trying to create?
k. Do we know how the expectations for students academically has changed in the past 10-20 years? For example kindergarteners now vs 10-20 yrs ago – what were they expected to know how to do?
l. Unsure. This was helpful. I think the reminder that this is a "wicked" problem w/ messy answers.
m. More information on building costs
n. Information on building operating costs
o. Staff demographics helping to save 1 million… how long will that be a large help
p. I want to know what substantive changes have been made to address decline in test performance. What do we think has worked in getting to the goal of increasing proficiency by 15 points?
q. Broken down data to get a clearer picture of the status of our schools
r. Info on building upkeep
s. Financial look into each building
t. Could we see a budget sheet? Does this committee have any ability to influence finances?
u. More information about moving 6th and 9th grade up to the next building
v. Information about building costs
w. What is the overall goal for our students long term? Someone asked this question very well during our first large group discussion.
x. The question that each group asked should give a good attempt at answering
y. Lots of info about facilities costs and upcoming capital project needs
z. Facility costs each year by building
aa. Funding breakdown per elementary secondary schools/costs to run each building
bb. A lot more detailed/cost breakdowns on the District and facility budgets
cc. What absolutely has to get done. What do we want to do. AI. How do the changes in how we educate affect this group?
dd. More about the human element of the numbers. Who are the students? What needs do they have?
ee. More data about individual buildings/grade levels
ff. How are we going to know how to measure and make decisions on how to group special needs student to specific school?
gg. Keep the data coming!
hh. What is laid out in front – the timeline/agenda seems adequate
ii. Individual schools – enrollments, facilities
jj. When was the last audit of finances for different areas? Energy staff, etc.
kk. Some info to process/complete between meetings would help maneuver focus better
ll. I need to reread the material from the first meeting to keep that fresh in my mind and help relate it to this and future topics
mm. The numbers are certainly helpful but not at all representative of the full picture of things. I still don't understand how this group is supposed to make decisions about what's in the best interest for students & District staff if we don't look at the long-term trends and needs. I also

want to see more information (but data & #s for this could be helpful) on how students needs have changed over the past 5-10 years and what they're projected to be in the next 5-10.

15. Any questions we can answer before or at the next meeting?
    a. Nope! Keep the conversation going. Need to get more public.
    b. Act 20 effects.
    c. When it comes to students with disabilities, are their criteria and who makes the decision to put these studies into each group?
    d. To know if changes to bus routes or days in school would have impact on finances?
    e. How much time do you predict we will need/should allocate to reviewing materials to prepare for meetings?
    f. Breakdown of students w/ disabilities by category including past numbers/trends
    g. From a school climate perspective, are our schools actually open to the conversations of grade shifts? For example, is the climate of SPASH actually conducive to 9th graders?
    h. We said open-enrollment-out students may return at 10th grade. So does the incoming K class actually equal projected graduating class size, or should we assume the class size will increase?
    i. Broken down data to get a clearer picture of the status of our schools
    j. Does school choice take funds from the District? If so can that be stopped and funds kept in the district? (I know we can't, it's a state thing.) Frustrating.
    k. One comment that was made was the assumption that this Task Force is a political face to make it okay to close one of the school buildings and ultimately selling it to offset
    l. Facility costs each year by building
    m. Some parking lot sort of Qs: If there is an open enrollment trend back into Stevens Point for 10th grade due to increased opportunities for high school students, would we expect a small bump if we included 9th grade in high school? And more importantly what/how could we increase opportunities in lower grades to be similarly/more attractive? Mentioned 47 positions eliminated… what were those positions? What programs were affected? How does this $$ work for the district for 4k? Does the state pay more/less for those students? Related, how does $$ work for the childcare offered at Kennedy? Cost to parents? Revenue to District?
    n. AI
    o. Can we see data for individual buildings/grades for SPED and ELL percentages? Why is 4K enrollment going down?
    p. The projection shows a range for building capacity for the top end. Is there a way to know what the number of students is that is the low end making it inefficient to operate a school building? Is the District self-insured for health insurance? If not, has it been considered?
    q. Transportation expenses – we own most of the fleet plus drivers – 1) what would it look like to bid out 2) How much save if we told private schools they had to be on our time schedule? Other districts do.
    r. Is building cap. Just learners or all bodies
    s. What are the best practices in space allocation for special instructors or environments (pull-out groups, extra test time, special ed) and how might this affect space needs in buildings?
    t. Just the questions from the parking lot.
    u. Are there any models or databases (information gathering) that can help provide this information?

STEVENS POINT AREA PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICT

#PointProud Schools 2040
Meeting 1 Outcomes – 4/29/26

41 Task Force members in attendance

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

District staff in attendance: Cory Hirsbrunner, Superintendent; Chris Nyman, Assistant Superintendent/Director of Elementary Education; Nicole Baumann, Executive Assistant to the Superintendent; Sarah O'Donnell, Director of Communications

Small group exercise results: Each of the seven small groups formed at this Task Force meeting were asked to respond to three questions, record their responses on flip-chart pages, and summarize responses for the large group. Results of all recorded responses are as follows:

iii. **What did you discover today that may be important to this process? Any gee-whiz moment?**

Group A suggestions:

i. It is going to be more interesting than I thought
ii. Questions that are unknown, seeing the numbers
iii. How little development is in the Kennedy area
iv. How inter-connected everything is
v. I didn't realize the impact of apartment buildings on growth of the district
vi. Interested to see what options we will end up with as options

Group B suggestions:

xliii. Not declining as much as one thought
xliv. Some were surprised at the excess of Plover-Whiting (others not surprised)

Group C suggestions:

lii. Full day 4K
liii. Housing calculations
liv. So many questions
lv. Information fairly aware of already

Group D suggestions:

xlvii. Data
xlviii. Many, many viewpoints
xlix. Perception vs reality
l. Wow! Populations
li. Point and Plover strategic plans, zoning, etc.?

Group E suggestions:

xlvii. Declining birth rate not worse
xlviii. Ratio of housing types to student generation
xlix. The potential of sites to be over capacity

Group F suggestions:

xlvi. Plover Whiting population
xlvii. Population decline not as bad as we thought

Group G suggestions:

33. Open enrollment statistics… how much can we keep kids here, here?
34. Population statistics… push pull of employment (and climate changes/impacts)
35. Liked the approach to demographics (granular, housing types, etc.)
36. Consideration about rental market?

iv. **What major questions or concerns do you have right now?**

Group A suggestions:

26. Taxes vs students --> how taxes impact this situation?
27. How can projections be impacted by the change of different variables?
28. Open enrollment out is a big concern

Group B suggestions:

8. Impact of lack of childcare on families choosing to live here
9. Can we have smaller class sizes/schools?
10. How will our decisions impact staffing?
11. Can open enrollment stop if school is at capacity?

Group C suggestions:

xxi. Demographics of special populations at schools – what is factored?
xxii. Education support - teacher's space/SPED needs
xxiii. Finances - operation and other breakdown

Group D suggestions:

xxiv. Budget? Number of Buildings? Operational costs?
xxv. Still concerns about maintenance of buildings and facilities
xxvi. Referendum?
xxvii. Modernization?

Group E suggestions:

xvi. What's the condition of each of these buildings?
xvii. Concerns about inaccuracy of PJ Jacobs (projection)
xviii. 3K/4K self-contained students having access to reg-ed peers
xix. Why does district movement happen? Students moving within the district
xx. How is unhoused population served?

Group F suggestions:

xiii. 4K programming decision making
xiv. How will staffing be affected and staff retention
xv. Class size board policy
xvi. What is drawing families in?

Group G suggestions:

xii. Such a push for home schooling
xiii. State funding moving to private schools
xiv. Any potential to "cut back" open enrollment kids leaving?
xv. Test scores

xvi. How can the four criteria actually be equal? How does the financial pillar not dominate? What's the fiscal impact of some of these decisions?

v. What do you think you will need to learn, so we can gear upcoming meetings accordingly?

Group A suggestions:

x. Learn more about the finances and how they are impacted
xi. Can we totally throw out and start fresh…or are we looking for the most minimal disruption?

Group B suggestions:

x. How does the data shift now that Kennedy --> PJ Jacobs?
xi. Which buildings can withstand the upcoming decades (age)?

Group C suggestions:

xii. Finances
xiii. What supports are we going to provide in the future of the buildings?
xiv. Maintenance costs of buildings and amenities in them

Group D suggestions:

xi. Overall goal?
xii. What is driving this?

Group E suggestions:

vi. Criteria/guidelines for school enrollment orders/radius from building
vii. Policy change?
viii. Siblings grandfathered in? Establishment of transfer guidelines
ix. Homeschooling trends/demographics
x. Special ed populations broken down by school
xi. % of existing housing bought by developers and turned into rentals (and even student rentals)

Group F suggestions:

vii. The "human" side
viii. Student needs, early interventions

Group G suggestions:

xi. Didn't hear any information about test scores

Questions placed in "parking lot" during meeting (to be answered at later meeting and/or in Q&R document):

xxxi. More information on open-enrollment-out: where do these students live?
xxxii. How important is child care shortage in keeping births down?
xxxiii. Kennedy actually now goes to PJ Jacobs. How will this affect enrollment projections?
xxxiv. How would District 4K change if more private sites ceased providing 4K? Or closed?
xxxv. How can we deal with revenue strain on private providers thru any SPAPSD 4K expansion?
xxxvi. Is there a District past promise to keep Kennedy open?
xxxvii. Which is more important to District finances: more kids or more housing/tax base?
xxxviii. Can we get enrollment by grade group and school?

Individual member written meeting evaluation responses (following meeting):

iii. <u>What do you think went well at this meeting?</u>
   a. I think everyone came prepared and ready to dive into the data!

b. Great early participation from participants!
c. Meet/greet at table and asked many questioning back and forth
d. Good information - good discussion
e. There was a lot of good conversation and great questions asked
f. Awesome introduction to our group - we have a wonderfully diverse group!
g. Well facilitated and moderated; good information, clear starting guidelines, and big picture question
h. Well organized, clear information, good time/people management
i. Good into/pleased to see broad range of experience on the task force
j. Well run, lots of helpful information
k. Collegiality - small groups
l. I think having the agenda and going through the information first was extremely helpful --> well formatted; also the group members staying supportive and positive and respectful
m. I think there was a lot of good and respectful discussion
n. Good to hear the numbers and have questions answered; good to have time to discuss and share out
o. Everyone was respectful; continued to keep things on task
p. This happened as anticipated! Thanks for the info.
q. Getting a clear view of potential data of projected enrollments
r. Many varying viewpoints
s. Controlled time and subject
t. Well organized content and information
u. Well organized information was easy to understand and engaging; depth of information and time that went into this was impressive
v. Good intro to the task ahead
w. Eased into the discussion; excellent keeping the group on task/on time; I like that we did not go around the whole group with intro
x. It was great hearing so many different ideas and perspectives
y. Good conversations and lots of good information
z. Great initial data was presented. I liked the format.
aa. The information presented was well organized and the presenters were knowledgeable.
bb. Good group work, great questions.
cc. Lots of great information right away, not just intro/get to know the team.
dd. Good conversations and lots of information
ee. Good discussion and good presentation of initial information
ff. I could hear what everyone said - thanks for speaking up.
gg. Small group discussion
hh. Large amount of information given in a way that is still digestible
ii. I think there were great questions and open communication.
jj. Lots of good data and information presented clearly and concisely
kk. Everyone was ready to be positive participants
ll. PowerPoint of presentation was a great visual tool to see data
mm. Very informative. I wasn't expecting it to be so interesting.
nn. Providing the background of the District
oo. Wealth of information - too much at times

iv. What could have gone better? How?
a. Planned 5 minute break
b. A cooler air conditioning

c. Information about Kennedy's population funneling into PJ Jacobs being left out is very concerning
d. I am, frankly, baffled that the fact of Kennedy feeding into PJ was not communicated to MDR before tonight and that it was caught by a member and not Admin team
e. Slightly better time management, rushed at the end
f. Continue to use parking lot to help focus
g. First meeting went well - no complaints
h. Better seating for people facing the wrong direction
i. Presentations have lots of text/data with speaking over the top of it… I would recommend less text/more talk
j. Not sure
k. People seem very concerned about housing trends and policies that encourage affordable single-family housing…it's important but feels irrelevant to our goals here. So I'd like to see facilitators frame and address this so that people maybe spend less time on this, and more time on the relevant topics.
l. Holding some questions to the end or putting them on parking lot ourselves
m. A lot of people's questions could have been answered if they were patient during the presentation
n. More time to dive in/discuss enrollments/demographics moving forward
o. Organize each table better
p. More presenting and fewer questions
q. Having us go through the data/slides ahead of time on our own so more time could be spent during the meeting on Q&A and discussion
r. I think everything went well, a good balance of information and discussion
s. Nothing-great job
t. The table arrangement
u. Send slides out for pre reading, prior to meeting. I like to review one or twice then follow along as information is presented.
v. More consistency between slides and printed documents (bullet/item order, for example) to avoid confusion while listening
w. Had no idea what to expect walking in
x. A little less of entertaining questions that will be handled at a future date. No door prize?
y. I like to look at info ahead of time
z. Don't make me write with this pen. My hand writing looks like this. Do an online poll or email.
aa. More small group discussion to bounce ideas off each other.
bb. Possibly suggest people write questions on post-its to put on parking lot instead of sidetracking the group discussion - only questions related to the slide etc.
cc. I think it is too early to know what could go better. This was mostly informational.
dd. Go into depth on data presented
ee. More snacks for the chatty question askers
ff. Mapping out the meetings to help keep the focus on current step
gg. Need more reflection time to process; less re-presenting of info already provided

v. <u>What information do you feel you need to complete the tasks ahead?</u>
a. I am excited to see the rest of the data! (Building longevity)
b. Noted in the group reports at end of session
c. I need more information about how teachers and staff and students will be affected by any changes
d. What can some major (maybe 3-5 max) struggles each building is feeling - staffing, behavior, repairs, etc.? Can our task force maybe help with those? Multiple birds, one stone?

e. Obviously the financial side of things; I would love as granular/grade-level info/projections as possible, maybe try to do some data visualization stuff?
f. Open enrollment - in and out - where are they going?
g. 6th and 9th grade move data to new schools
h. All the questions asked in the round robin shared
i. Answering a lot of the questions identified and will be coming. Such as fiscal information.
j. More specific goals for finances, how much should we be trying to maintain or decrease facilities spending
k. Info about demographics of students and support educators are receiving
l. What percentage of students are PTR and why
m. How open is the Stevens Point area to change? We've talked for a long time about change but often shy away as a large community to dramatic change. Continued reminder that these changes affect teachers and students.
n. Updated demographic info with Kennedy cost for building upkeep, cost to keep running
o. Building qualities and needed work and cost to keep running properly
p. Everything, especially $
q. Is the district currently collaborating with City of Stevens Point and Plover about these enrollments and housing issues?
r. Weight of the four questions from the board
s. Budgets, expenses, operational costs "true goal"
t. What is the focus?
u. Be able to look over the full report; more specific demographic info. About each building/school
v. More information on the financial aspects and more information on student demographics (SPED)
w. More data on students and budget
x. Open enrollment, student demographics, educational programming
y. Read task force report/study
z. Even more granular detail regarding enrollment (sped, specific grades), complete building conditions, and financial details
aa. Breakdown within schools special education students; how many vacant buildings exist
bb. See flip chart for Group E
cc. Lots more information
dd. Policies on enrollment areas/bus routes
ee. Condition of each building. What upgrades or consolidation options are there?
ff. I need to know the breakdowns of 6th and 9th grade
gg. Keep the data coming!
hh. Adjust the Ben/PJ numbers and we need to know the financials
ii. Understanding the data and its connection to the long term goals; cause and effect of each criterion
jj. I am really interested in understanding tax base and how funds are distributed. How this affects educational needs of students and staff.
kk. Looking forward to more information on finances
ll. I don’t know

vi. <u>Any questions we can answer before or at the next meeting?</u>
a. Is it the best use of 4K to have special ed sent to 18 different sites? What about smaller size schools for families who want them? Transportation for parochial schools - different than public? Make it one.
b. Faculty retention - why is faculty (teaching faculty) leaving prior to retirement?
c. None that weren't previously mentioned in discussions

d. Nothing specific
e. Obviously the financial side of things; I would love as granular/grade-level info/projections as possible, maybe try to do some data visualization stuff? Better (softer) cookies?
f. More detailed breakdown of grades and special populations at the various schools and how that impacts projections
g. What are class size policies? Capacity considers class size policies and spaces for specials, does that include spaces for pull-out services and therapies? Will educators still have opportunities for their own class space if facilities are reduced?
h. What supports do we offer in building now and in the future
i. Very informative first meeting
j. Thank you for providing comedic relief. I think we will be needing it.
k. How do increasing student needs factor into this? How can we make sure that diverse community voices are also being represented in this task force's vision?
l. Answer questions that were asked during final exercise
m. What are teacher's needs? Why are students leaving? How can we bring in more kids? Goals? Student/teacher ratio (special education)
n. Are we going to see financial materials? Will there be any "games"?
o. Not yet more meetings needed
p. How realistic is closing an elementary school?
q. Is anything being done to help with school perception? Specifically, at elementary levels to make sure if borders are re-drawn people don't feel they are being changed to a "lesser" schools.
r. Can we absorb this deficit? Smaller class sizes are a nice feature to attract more people and help more students to get more individualized attention.
s. When it comes to the variables being used to get the projected data, have you used difference scenarios to either increase or decrease projected numbers?