

# MADISON METROPOLITAN SCHOOL DISTRICT
# COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT POLLING REPORT
# NOVEMBER 2026


**Submitted by:**

MARCI HORNER
EDUCATION SOLUTIONS GROUP
4320 WEST KENNEDY BLVD, SUITE 200
TAMPA, FLORIDA 33609
502.599.0400
mhorner@mgt.us

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

**INTRODUCTION** ..... 3

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY** ..... 4

Strategic Findings ..... 5

Implications for Future Planning ..... 7

**METHODOLOGY** ..... 8

Community Engagement Overview ..... 8

Participant Overview ..... 8

How the Findings Were Developed ..... 9

Interpreting the Findings ..... 10

Limitations ..... 10

**OVERALL THEMES** ..... 11

Overall Themes Identified Through Community Engagement ..... 11

Summary of Overall Themes ..... 15

**CONSIDERATIONS FOR FUTURE SCENARIO DEVELOPMENT** ..... 16

Key Considerations for Future Scenario Development ..... 16

Implications for the Next Phase of Planning ..... 20

**THEMES BY PARTICIPANT TYPE** ..... 21

Parent/Guardian of Student(s) ..... 21

MMSD Staff Member ..... 23

Current MMSD Student ..... 25

Madison Area Community Member (No Current MMSD Students) ..... 27

Prefer not to respond ..... 29

**Key Finding** ..... 31

**Supporting Evidence** ..... 31

**Summary of Feedback** ..... 31

**THEMES BY SCHOOL/BUILDING** ..... 32

**School or Building** ..... 65

**Associated Respondents** ..... 66

**Key Finding** ..... 66

**Supporting Evidence** ..... 66

**Summary of Feedback** ..... 66

**THEMES BY RACE/ETHNICITY** ..... 67

**American Indian or Alaska Native** ..... 68

**Asian / Asian American** ..... 70

**Black / African American** ..... 72

**Hispanic/Latino/Latina/Latinx** ..... 74

**Two or More Races/Multiracial** ..... 76

**Pacific Islander or Native Hawaiian** ..... 77

**White** ..... 78

**Prefer not to respond** ..... 80

**Key Finding** ..... 81

**Supporting Evidence** ..... 82

**Summary of Feedback** ..... 82

**CONCLUSION** ..... 83

**APPENDIX: FREE RESPONSES** ..... 84

**Do you have any additional thoughts or information to share?** ..... 84

# Introduction

Madison Metropolitan School District (MMSD) is continuing its comprehensive review of attendance boundaries, school utilization, enrollment patterns, and future facility needs to support high quality educational opportunities for students across the district. As enrollment patterns shift and residential development creates different demands across school communities, the district is evaluating how existing facilities, potential new construction, and attendance area adjustments can support both current and future student needs. These considerations require balancing educational opportunities, equitable access, operational efficiency, and the long term sustainability of district facilities.

Building on the first round of community engagement conducted between May 4 and June 1, 2026, MMSD partnered with MGT to conduct a second round of engagement during fall 2026. While the initial engagement focused on identifying community values, priorities, and concerns, the second round provided participants with an opportunity to evaluate more specific planning goals and potential approaches. The survey gathered feedback on classroom availability for kindergarten, school utilization targets, attendance area adjustments associated with potential new construction, and opportunities to repurpose existing school facilities. Participants also evaluated potential approaches to addressing growth on the east and far west sides of the district and the future use of existing facilities.

The second round of engagement collected feedback through October 21, 2026, with the first recorded substantive response received on September 25. A total of 856 substantive responses were included in the analysis, representing perspectives from parents and guardians, district staff, students, community members, and other stakeholders. Participants provided feedback through scenario goal ratings, priority rankings, evaluations of potential growth and facility approaches, and written comments. Together, these responses provide insight into both the level of support for specific planning approaches and the considerations participants believe should guide their development and implementation.

This report summarizes the findings from the second round of community engagement using a structure consistent with the district's first public engagement report. It presents the overall themes identified through participant feedback, examines ratings and rankings of planning priorities, and compares support for potential approaches across participant types, school communities, and racial and ethnic groups. The findings are intended to help MMSD understand areas of agreement, differences in perspective, and the potential implications of various planning approaches. Community feedback represents one component of the district's broader planning process and will be considered alongside enrollment projections, demographic analyses, facility conditions, transportation considerations, and operational needs as future scenarios are developed.

.

# Executive Summary

The results indicate greater support for new construction than for repurposing existing facilities, although respondents distinguished between supporting a general approach and endorsing its potential implementation. The proposed construction of Acacia Ridge Middle School on the Far West Side received support from 499 respondents (66%), while 91 (12%) opposed the approach and 162 (22%) were neutral. Similarly, the proposed construction of Sprecher Elementary School on the East Side received support from 490 respondents (65%), with 89 (12%) opposed and 170 (23%) neutral. Facility repurposing received support from 403 respondents (54%), while 197 (26%) opposed the approach and 151 (20%) were neutral. Although all 3 approaches received more support than opposition, participants raised questions about construction timing, enrollment projections, financial sustainability, and the consequences of changing existing school uses. These findings suggest that community receptiveness to facility investments depends partly on understanding how individual proposals would address educational needs and affect existing schools.

The priority rankings provided additional context for interpreting these results. Among parents and guardians, proximity to home received 54% of first place student experience selections and 51% of first place attendance area planning selections, demonstrating the importance of accessible neighborhood schools. However, continuity, demographic diversity, and balanced utilization also emerged as important considerations, with respondents differing on how these objectives should be weighed against one another. Educational programming rankings identified STEM as the most frequently selected option in the first and second positions, while visual and performing arts led the third and fourth positions. Additional dual language immersion also emerged as an important priority, particularly among Hispanic/Latino/Latina/Latinx respondents, where 50% selected it as their highest programming interest. Together, these findings indicate that participants valued expanded educational opportunities while considering how those opportunities relate to neighborhood accessibility, student stability, and existing instructional conditions.

Feedback on the 5 Scenario Planning Goals further distinguished support for proposed facility approaches from assessments of how well the scenarios addressed specific objectives. Respondents generally provided stronger favorable assessments of goals related to new construction, attendance area adjustments, and classroom capacity than of expanded programming through facility repurposing. Favorable ratings combined Extremely Well, Very Well, and Somewhat Well responses. Lower favorable ratings and greater uncertainty regarding programming through repurposing suggest that participants sought additional clarity about how changes to existing facilities would translate into educational opportunities. These findings reinforce the distinction between supporting repurposing as a potential approach and evaluating whether the scenarios adequately address its intended programming benefits.

Written feedback revealed that building utilization and enrollment distribution were not viewed as sufficient measures of successful planning on their own. Respondents described how overcrowding could limit individualized instruction, increase staffing demands, and reduce access to specialized learning spaces, while substantial enrollment reductions could affect staffing flexibility and the sustainability of established programs. Concerns involving Mendota and Emerson, Schenk and Kennedy, Lake View, and other school communities illustrated how changes intended to improve utilization at one location could introduce challenges elsewhere. Participants also questioned whether enrollment projections adequately account for residential development, school choice patterns, and differences in student support needs. These

perspectives reinforce the importance of evaluating future scenarios through their educational and operational consequences rather than building capacity percentages alone.

Analysis by participant type, school affiliation, and race and ethnicity further demonstrated that planning priorities varied across communities. School level findings identified differences in first place priorities, support for new construction and repurposing, and assessments of scenario planning goals. For example, respondents associated with Olson expressed particularly strong support for Acacia Ridge, while feedback from other school communities raised concerns about neighborhood continuity, potential repurposing, and the distribution of students across existing facilities. Responses across racial and ethnic groups also highlighted differences in priorities involving multilingual education, neighborhood accessibility, and educational resources. Although these findings do not establish uniform preferences within individual groups, they identify localized considerations that may be less apparent in districtwide results and warrant attention during future scenario development.

The following 3 strategic findings summarize the most consequential messages from the second round of engagement. They integrate support for proposed facility approaches, assessments of scenario planning goals, and the priorities and concerns identified through ranking questions and written responses.

## Strategic Findings

| Strategic Finding | Supporting Evidence | Summary of Feedback |
|---|---|---|
| 1. New construction received majority support, but respondents emphasized the importance of demonstrating how investments would improve educational conditions and address long term enrollment needs. | Far West new school: 499 supported (66%). East Side new school: 490 supported (65%). Among parents and guardians, proximity received 54% of first place student experience selections and 51% of first place attendance area selections. | Participants generally recognized the potential value of additional school capacity, particularly in areas experiencing residential growth or overcrowding. However, support for construction did not establish agreement with proposed attendance boundaries, school locations, or implementation timelines. Respondents questioned whether enrollment projections sufficiently accounted for housing development and existing school choice patterns, while others advocated using available capacity at current facilities before investing in new buildings. The findings indicate that future construction decisions should demonstrate how additional capacity would improve classroom conditions, maintain reasonable transportation distances, and support sustainable enrollment across both new and existing schools. |

| Strategic Finding | Supporting Evidence | Summary of Feedback |
|---|---|---|
| 2. Facility repurposing generated more divided feedback, reflecting differing expectations about educational programming and the preservation of existing neighborhood schools. | Repurposing existing facilities: 403 supported (54%), 197 opposed (26%), and 151 neutral (20%). Among parents and guardians, STEM led the first and second programming rankings at 28% and 27%, while visual and performing arts led the third and fourth at 27% each. Additional dual language immersion received 50% of first place programming selections among Hispanic/Latino/Latina/Latinx respondents. | Respondents expressed interest in expanding language immersion, STEM, arts education, and other specialized opportunities, but differed on whether these programs should be established through separate schools or integrated into existing facilities. Some viewed repurposing as an opportunity to address underutilization and expand educational services, while others raised concerns about the loss of neighborhood schools, unequal access to specialized programs, and potential reductions in staffing or resources. Feedback from communities associated with Lapham, Marquette, and O'Keeffe demonstrated particularly strong concerns about preserving established educational models. The findings suggest that future repurposing proposals should clearly identify their educational purpose, anticipated beneficiaries, and effects on existing school communities rather than treating alternative facility uses as interchangeable strategies. |
| 3. Participants emphasized that future scenarios must balance neighborhood accessibility, student stability, educational equity, and instructional capacity rather than prioritizing enrollment efficiency alone. | Among parents and guardians, 54% ranked the closest school first for student experience, while 34% ranked short travel times second. For attendance area planning, 51% ranked proximity first, 27% ranked continuity second, and 35% ranked diversity third. Written feedback identified concerns about classroom crowding, transportation, staffing, and student transitions. | Respondents consistently connected attendance boundaries with educational experiences extending beyond geographic assignments. Families emphasized the importance of walkable schools, established relationships, and manageable transportation, while others cautioned that maintaining existing boundaries could reinforce demographic disparities and unequal access to resources. School specific responses demonstrated that enrollment changes could relieve overcrowding at some locations while reducing staffing flexibility or increasing instructional demands elsewhere. Participants also requested clearer information about feeder pathways, transition protections, and the resources available to receiving schools. The findings indicate that future scenarios should be evaluated through their combined effects on student access, classroom conditions, demographic composition, and the sustainability of educational programs. |

## Implications for Future Planning

The second round of engagement provides MMSD with a clearer understanding of community preferences regarding the 3 potential growth and facility approaches. The results indicate that new school construction on the East Side and Far West Side has comparatively strong support among respondents, while repurposing existing facilities may require additional explanation and evaluation of its potential impacts. However, these findings should not be interpreted as approval of specific school locations, attendance boundaries, or implementation plans. Participants evaluated broader approaches rather than final scenarios, and their responses reflect the information available during the engagement period.

As the district continues developing future scenarios, the findings suggest that evaluating community preferences alongside operational feasibility will be particularly important. Enrollment projections, school capacity, facility conditions, transportation needs, and financial considerations will help determine which approaches are practical and sustainable. Future scenario comparisons can also benefit from clearly identifying the schools and neighborhoods potentially affected, the educational opportunities that would be maintained or expanded, and the transition considerations associated with each approach. Presenting these details will help distinguish general support for a planning strategy from community perspectives on its specific implementation.

Overall, the second round of engagement demonstrates that participants recognize the need to address enrollment growth and facility utilization while maintaining strong educational experiences and stable school communities. Although preferences varied across the approaches presented, the feedback provides meaningful direction for future scenario development by identifying areas of stronger support, potential concerns, and topics requiring additional consideration. These findings will inform MMSD's continued planning efforts alongside other district information and future community engagement.

# Methodology

## Purpose of the Community Engagement Process

Madison Metropolitan School District (MMSD) conducted a second round of community engagement during fall 2026 to gather feedback on specific planning goals and potential approaches to addressing enrollment growth, school capacity, attendance boundaries, and future facility needs. Building on the first round of engagement conducted in May and June 2026, this phase shifted from identifying broad community priorities to evaluating potential planning strategies. The purpose was to better understand which approaches participants supported, where concerns or uncertainty remained, and what considerations should inform future scenario development.

Community feedback represents one component of the district's broader planning process. The findings are intended to inform future decisions alongside enrollment projections, demographic analyses, facility conditions, transportation needs, financial considerations, and operational requirements. The engagement was not designed to select a final scenario or determine specific attendance boundary changes, but rather to provide additional insight into community preferences as MMSD continues evaluating potential options.

## Community Engagement Overview

The second round of community engagement was conducted during fall 2026, with the first recorded substantive survey response received on September 25 and the survey closing on October 21, 2026. Participants provided feedback on planning goals related to school capacity, four year old kindergarten classroom availability, attendance area adjustments, and potential facility investments. The survey also asked participants to evaluate 3 broader approaches involving new school construction on the East Side, new school construction on the Far West Side, and repurposing existing school facilities.

The survey included a combination of structured response questions and opportunities for written feedback. Participants rated planning goals, ranked priorities, evaluated their level of support for the 3 approaches, and provided additional comments regarding potential impacts and considerations. This structure allowed the analysis to identify measurable patterns of support and opposition while also examining the concerns and perspectives that informed participants' responses.

## Participant Overview

| Response Options | Count | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Parent or Guardian of a current MMSD student | 581 | 75% |
| MMSD Staff Member | 178 | 23% |
| Current MMSD Student | 6 | 1% |
| Madison Area Community Member (no MMSD current students) | 98 | 13% |
| Prefer not to respond | 30 | 4% |
| Total | **770** | 100% |

***Note:** Some questions allowed participants to select multiple responses; therefore, totals may exceed 100%.

Methodology

A total of 856 respondents participated in the second round of community engagement, although not all respondents answered every survey question. Of these participants, 770 answered the participant type question, identifying their relationship with MMSD as a parent or guardian, district staff member, student, community member, or another listed category. Because respondents could select more than one relationship with the district, the combined category counts exceed the 770 respondents who answered this question. Participants also provided information about their associated schools or buildings and, when they chose to do so, their race and ethnicity. These characteristics were used to examine whether perspectives varied across different segments of the MMSD community.

Participation varied across respondent groups and school communities. Some schools and demographic groups had substantially more responses than others, providing different levels of detail for the analysis. To help readers interpret these differences, the report identifies participation levels by school or building and presents response counts alongside percentages when comparing the 3 planning approaches. Groups with limited participation are interpreted cautiously, while categories with no responses are identified without drawing conclusions about their perspectives.

## How the Findings Were Developed

The findings presented throughout this report integrate quantitative and qualitative feedback to provide a more complete understanding of community perspectives. Quantitative analysis was used to evaluate how participants rated planning goals, ranked priorities, and expressed support, opposition, or neutrality toward the 3 proposed facility approaches. Qualitative analysis identified recurring concerns, priorities, and considerations expressed through written comments. Together, these methods help explain both the response patterns observed and the broader issues participants believe should inform future planning.

For the proposed new school construction and facility repurposing questions, Strongly Support and Somewhat Support responses were combined into an overall Support category. Similarly, Strongly Oppose and Somewhat Oppose were combined into an Oppose category, while Neutral / Undecided responses were reported separately. For the 5 Scenario Planning Goals, Favorable combines Extremely Well, Very Well, and Somewhat Well ratings, while Less Favorable combines Slightly Well and Not Well at All ratings. Respondents indicating insufficient information to evaluate a goal were reported separately. These goal ratings measure how well the scenarios addressed specific planning objectives and are distinct from support for the proposed facility approaches. Counts and percentages were calculated using valid responses to each question within the relevant group. Percentages are presented as whole numbers, and totals may differ slightly from 100% due to rounding.

Priority rankings were analyzed by identifying the most frequently selected planning priority at each rank position. This approach shows which priority received the greatest number of first place selections, which received the greatest number of second place selections, and so forth. The analysis emphasizes the frequency of selections at each position rather than calculating an average ranking across all priorities. An option appearing most frequently at a lower position should not automatically be interpreted as having limited overall interest, as each rank position was evaluated independently. The results describe the distribution of selections at each rank rather than establishing a single weighted ordering of all priorities.

Written comments were reviewed to identify recurring ideas, concerns, and recommendations related to the district's planning goals and proposed approaches. Similar responses were grouped into broader themes reflecting common perspectives across participants. The Overall Themes section summarizes these recurring messages without treating the number of comments associated with a theme as a direct measure of community support. Where relevant,

quantitative findings provide additional context for the qualitative analysis. Respondents were permitted to skip questions, and usable responses were retained even when participants did not complete every survey item. As a result, response totals may vary across questions and analytical groups.

## Interpreting the Findings

The report is organized to move from districtwide findings to more detailed comparisons across participant types, school communities, and racial and ethnic groups. The Overall Themes section identifies recurring priorities and concerns, while the Considerations for Future Scenario Development section translates these findings into areas for further evaluation. Subsequent sections examine scenario goal ratings, priority rankings, and support for the 3 proposed facility approaches within each respondent group. Quantitative results are supplemented by written feedback to explain how perspectives varied across communities and to identify considerations that may not be apparent from districtwide results alone.

Differences between respondent groups should be interpreted in relation to both the number of responses and the distribution of support, opposition, and neutral selections. A group with a high percentage of support but few respondents provides a more limited basis for interpretation than a group with a larger response count. Similarly, neutral responses should not automatically be interpreted as opposition or a lack of information. They may reflect uncertainty, mixed perspectives, or a preference to withhold judgment until more detailed scenarios are available.

## Limitations

As with any community engagement process, the findings presented in this report should be interpreted within the context of the participation and information available during the engagement period. Participation was voluntary, and the results should not be considered statistically representative of every student, family, staff member, or community member within MMSD. Additionally, not every participant answered every question, resulting in differences in response totals across the analysis.

Some respondent groups and school communities had relatively limited participation, which restricts the extent to which their findings can be generalized. School and building affiliations also reflect respondents' reported connections to those locations rather than a representative sample of each school community. Where participants could identify with more than one category, subgroup totals may exceed the overall number of respondents. The report therefore presents counts alongside percentages and distinguishes stronger response patterns from findings based on smaller groups.

The findings also reflect participants' evaluations of the planning approaches presented during the second round of engagement rather than fully developed implementation scenarios. Support for new school construction or facility repurposing should not be interpreted as approval of a particular site, attendance boundary adjustment, school reassignment, or implementation timeline. Future scenarios may introduce additional considerations that influence community perspectives as more detailed information becomes available.

Community engagement is one important source of information within MMSD's broader planning process. The results provide insight into community preferences, areas of agreement, and potential concerns, but they do not independently establish the feasibility or appropriateness of a particular planning approach. The district's continued evaluation will also consider enrollment projections, facility capacity, educational programming, transportation, financial sustainability, and other operational factors.

# Overall Themes

The second round of community engagement identified recurring priorities related to neighborhood school access, enrollment growth, educational equity, student stability, and the future use of district facilities. While participants generally supported strategies intended to address capacity needs, their responses revealed important differences in how they evaluated the potential consequences of those strategies. The feedback demonstrated that community members considered school assignments, transportation, demographic diversity, and educational programming to be interconnected elements of the district's planning process rather than separate objectives.

The analysis also revealed a distinction between support for broader facility approaches and satisfaction with how specific planning goals were reflected in the scenarios presented during the fall 2026 community sessions. This was particularly evident in responses concerning facility repurposing, where interest in expanded educational opportunities was accompanied by questions about program accessibility, financial sustainability, and the effects on existing neighborhood schools. The following themes integrate findings from all 3 ranking questions, scenario goal ratings, support for proposed approaches, and open ended responses. They summarize the primary considerations participants believe should inform the next phase of scenario development rather than establish a definitive ranking of community priority.

## Overall Themes Identified Through Community Engagement

| Overall Theme | Key Findings | Summary of Feedback |
|---|---|---|
| Theme 1: Neighborhood School Access and Proximity Remain Leading Priorities | 436 respondents (55%) ranked attending the school closest to home as their highest student experience priority. Proximity also received the most first place attendance area planning selections, with 388 respondents (52%). | Participants viewed neighborhood schools as important to student relationships, family involvement, transportation accessibility, and community identity. Feedback connected proximity with the ability to walk or bike to school, maintain neighborhood friendships, and participate in school activities. While respondents recognized that attendance boundaries may need to change, many questioned adjustments that would assign students to more distant schools when closer options remained available. |

Overall Themes

| Overall Theme | Key Findings | Summary of Feedback |
|---|---|---|
| Theme 2: Enrollment Growth and Facility Capacity Require Geographic Solutions | The Far West new school approach received 499 support responses (66%), while the East Side approach received 490 (65%). School utilization was rated as reflected at least somewhat well in the scenarios by 452 respondents (58%). | Participants generally recognized the need to address enrollment growth, particularly where residential development is increasing demand for school space. Feedback emphasized that new construction should respond to geographic enrollment pressures rather than simply increase districtwide capacity. Respondents also raised concerns about scenarios that could shift overcrowding between existing schools or leave other buildings substantially underutilized. |
| Theme 3: Demographic Diversity and Equity Must Be Balanced With Neighborhood Access | Diverse student populations received the most third place attendance area planning selections, with 271 respondents (37%). Diversity also tied for the most fourth place student experience selections, with 185 (24%). | Participants expressed differing perspectives on the relationship between neighborhood schools and demographic diversity. Some emphasized preserving integrated learning environments and cautioned that relying exclusively on proximity could reinforce residential segregation. Others questioned attendance assignments that require longer commutes or divide established neighborhoods to achieve demographic balance. Feedback also highlighted the importance of aligning staffing, services, and educational resources with student needs rather than relying solely on enrollment distribution. |

Overall Themes

| Overall Theme | Key Findings | Summary of Feedback |
|---|---|---|
| Theme 4: Student Stability and Feeder Continuity Are Important Implementation Considerations | Continuity of existing attendance areas received the most second place planning selections, with 219 respondents (30%). The closest school and short travel times were the most frequent first and second student experience priorities. | Participants emphasized the effects of attendance area changes on existing school relationships, sibling arrangements, and transitions between elementary, middle, and high schools. Concerns were particularly evident where proposed adjustments could separate neighborhoods from established feeder pathways or require students to change schools during their educational progression. Respondents differed on whether existing assignments should be preserved, but frequently emphasized the importance of thoughtful implementation and transition provisions. |
| Theme 5: Specialized Programming Presents Opportunities, but Preferences Vary by Educational Model | STEM received the most first and second place educational programming selections, with 184 (26%) and 193 (27%), respectively. Visual and Performing Arts led the third and fourth positions, with 183 (26%) and 189 (27%). | Participants expressed interest in expanding educational opportunities through STEM, language immersion, visual and performing arts, International Baccalaureate, Montessori, and other specialized models. However, preferences varied considerably, and respondents questioned whether concentrating programs at selected facilities would improve equitable access or create additional competition between schools. Feedback emphasized that specialized programming should complement strong educational opportunities throughout the district rather than substitute for them. |

Overall Themes

| Overall Theme | Key Findings | Summary of Feedback |
|---|---|---|
| Theme 6: Facility Repurposing Requires Greater Clarity About Educational Benefits and Community Impacts | Repurposing existing facilities received 403 support responses (54%), compared with 197 opposed (26%) and 151 neutral (20%). Only 273 respondents (36%) favorably rated how the repurposing goal was reflected in the scenarios, while 279 (37%) indicated insufficient information. | Participants recognized opportunities to use existing facilities for additional educational programming and community services, particularly where enrollment has declined. However, feedback raised concerns about potential school closures, changes to neighborhood identity, transportation access, and the concentration of specialized programs. The difference between general support for repurposing and favorable assessments of the scenarios indicates that the potential uses and consequences of individual facility changes warrant further explanation. |
| Theme 7: Transportation, Walkability, and Student Safety Extend Beyond Distance | Short trips to school received the most second place student experience selections, with 263 respondents (33%). Proximity remained the leading first priority across both school experience and attendance area planning. | Transportation concerns extended beyond the distance between home and school. Participants discussed pedestrian safety, major road crossings, bus availability, travel times, school drop off conditions, and the effects of transportation on family schedules. Some also raised concerns that specialized programming or revised attendance areas could create additional barriers for families without reliable transportation. These perspectives highlight the importance of evaluating practical school accessibility alongside geographic proximity. |

Overall Themes

| Overall Theme | Key Findings | Summary of Feedback |
|---|---|---|
| Theme 8: Financial Sustainability and Implementation Transparency Influence Scenario Evaluation | The repurposing goal had the highest share of respondents indicating insufficient information at 37%. Scenarios without boundary adjustments for new construction also generated substantial uncertainty, with 219 respondents (29%) selecting that response. | Participants questioned the financial implications of constructing new facilities while existing schools have available capacity or require modernization. Others supported investments in areas experiencing growth but wanted clearer information about enrollment projections, construction costs, implementation timelines, and potential school assignments. Feedback also emphasized the importance of explaining how scenarios balance competing objectives and how community input will inform subsequent planning decisions. |

## Summary of Overall Themes

The findings demonstrate that community members generally supported addressing enrollment growth and school capacity, but evaluated potential solutions through their effects on educational access, school communities, and districtwide equity. Proximity emerged as the leading priority in both student experience and attendance area planning, while the prominence of appropriately sized enrollment, continuity, and demographic diversity at subsequent ranking positions illustrates the importance of balancing multiple objectives. Open ended responses provided additional context by connecting these priorities to practical concerns about school transportation, feeder pathways, classroom conditions, and the distribution of students across existing facilities. The feedback suggests that the effectiveness of future scenarios will depend not only on whether they improve utilization or accommodate growth, but also on how those improvements affect the educational experiences of students and families.

The educational programming rankings introduce an additional dimension that was not fully captured in the earlier analysis. STEM demonstrated the strongest interest at the first and second positions, while visual and performing arts received the most selections at the third and fourth positions. However, the variation in programming preferences, combined with the more divided response to facility repurposing, indicates that expanding specialized opportunities should not automatically be equated with support for converting existing neighborhood schools. Respondents raised questions about whether specialized programs would remain geographically accessible, how they would affect resources at other schools, and whether investments in existing facilities could achieve similar educational benefits. Together, the findings suggest that future scenario development should evaluate construction, boundary adjustments, and facility repurposing as related strategies, with particular attention to educational quality, demographic effects, transportation accessibility, financial sustainability, and the continuity of existing school communities.

# Considerations for Future Scenario Development

The analysis provided additional insight into how participants evaluated potential approaches to addressing enrollment growth, school capacity, attendance boundaries, and the future use of district facilities. While new school construction received relatively strong support, the findings also demonstrated that participants considered the educational and community impacts of proposed changes when evaluating their benefits. The priority rankings reinforced the importance of neighborhood school access, student stability, and demographic diversity, while the educational programming results introduced additional considerations regarding specialized opportunities and the potential repurposing of existing facilities. Together, these findings suggest that future scenarios should be evaluated through a combination of enrollment, educational, geographic, and operational measures rather than their ability to achieve individual capacity targets.

The considerations below translate the findings into specific areas for evaluation during the next phase of scenario development. They identify where community feedback suggests additional analysis would be valuable, how competing priorities may influence the effectiveness of different approaches, and what information could help distinguish between potential scenarios. These considerations are not recommendations to adopt particular construction projects, attendance boundaries, or facility changes. Instead, they provide a framework for understanding how future planning options could respond to the priorities and concerns identified throughout the engagement process.

## Key Considerations for Future Scenario Development

| Planning Consideration | Supporting Evidence | Application During Scenario Development |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Align New School Construction With Geographic Enrollment Demand | The Far West new school approach received 499 support responses (66%), while East Side construction received 490 (65%). | Evaluate new construction based on where projected enrollment exceeds available capacity rather than districtwide enrollment totals alone. Future scenarios should compare residential development, projected student generation, existing school utilization, and available classroom space within each geographic area. This would help determine whether construction addresses sustained enrollment demand or whether adjustments to existing facilities and attendance areas could accommodate growth more effectively. |

| Planning Consideration | Supporting Evidence | Application During Scenario Development |
|---|---|---|
| 2. Evaluate Attendance Area Changes Through Both Geographic Access and Enrollment Balance | Proximity received the most first place attendance area planning selections at 52%, while balanced utilization was most frequently selected fourth, with 263 responses (36%). | Compare proposed attendance boundaries using student travel distances, walkability, transportation requirements, school utilization, and the number of students reassigned. Particular attention should be given to scenarios that improve utilization at one school while creating additional transportation burdens or enrollment imbalances elsewhere. This would help distinguish adjustments that produce meaningful capacity improvements from those that primarily redistribute students without resolving underlying geographic demand. |
| 3. Assess Demographic Diversity and Educational Equity Alongside Boundary Efficiency | Diverse student populations received the most third place attendance area planning selections, with 271 respondents (37%). Diversity also appeared prominently in the student experience rankings. | Examine how each scenario could change racial, ethnic, and socioeconomic composition across affected schools. Comparisons should also consider access to educational programs, staffing, student supports, and transportation. This is particularly important where neighborhood assignments may reinforce existing residential patterns or where changes intended to improve demographic balance could create additional travel burdens. The analysis should identify both potential improvements and unintended consequences rather than treating demographic diversity and proximity as mutually exclusive objectives. |

| Planning Consideration | Supporting Evidence | Application During Scenario Development |
|---|---|---|
| 4. Incorporate Feeder Continuity and Student Transition Impacts Into Scenario Evaluation | Continuity of existing attendance areas received the most second place planning selections, with 219 respondents (30%). | Evaluate how elementary attendance area changes could affect middle and high school assignments, established peer groups, sibling arrangements, and program continuity. Future scenarios should identify the number of students potentially reassigned at each school level and consider whether transition provisions, phased implementation, or existing student protections could reduce disruption. These considerations are particularly relevant where proposed changes alter established feeder pathways or affect students approaching school transitions. |
| 5. Distinguish Interest in Specialized Programming From Support for Facility Repurposing | STEM led the first and second educational programming rankings at 26% and 27%, while visual and performing arts led the third and fourth positions at 26% and 27%. Facility repurposing received 54% support overall. | Evaluate specialized programming opportunities independently from decisions about which facilities should house them. Future scenarios should consider whether programs could be expanded within existing schools, offered across multiple locations, or established through repurposed facilities. Comparing projected enrollment demand, geographic accessibility, transportation, staffing, and potential effects on existing programs would help determine which delivery models expand educational opportunities without concentrating resources among selected school communities. |

| Planning Consideration | Supporting Evidence | Application During Scenario Development |
|---|---|---|
| 6. Establish Clear Educational and Operational Criteria for Facility Repurposing | Repurposing received 403 support responses (54%), compared with 197 opposed (26%). Only 36% favorably rated how the repurposing goal was reflected in the scenarios, while 37% indicated insufficient information. | Identify potential facility uses based on building condition, available instructional space, enrollment projections, educational demand, and operating costs. Scenarios should distinguish between using underutilized space for additional programming and converting an existing school in ways that require student reassignment or program relocation. This would allow the district to evaluate the benefits of repurposing against potential impacts on neighborhood school access, educational continuity, and long term facility sustainability. |
| 7. Evaluate Transportation and Pedestrian Safety as Measures of School Accessibility | The closest school received the most first place student experience selections at 55%, while short travel times led the second position at 33%. | Assess more than the geographic distance between a student's home and assigned school. Future scenarios should consider bus ride times, pedestrian routes, major road crossings, transportation availability, and access to before and after school activities. These factors are especially important where boundary changes or specialized programs could require students to travel past closer schools or create additional barriers for families with limited transportation options. |
| 8. Compare Financial Sustainability Across Construction, Renovation, and Repurposing Alternatives | Both new school approaches received approximately 65% to 66% support, while repurposing received 54%. Written feedback raised questions about new construction alongside existing available capacity and facility modernization needs. | Compare capital costs, ongoing operating expenses, maintenance obligations, staffing requirements, and the expected useful life of proposed investments. Scenarios should consider whether new construction would create additional capacity while other facilities remain substantially underutilized. Evaluating these costs alongside educational and geographic benefits would provide a more complete understanding of the long term sustainability of each approach. |

## Implications for the Next Phase of Planning

The findings suggest that MMSD would benefit from evaluating new construction and attendance area adjustments as interconnected strategies rather than independent solutions. Although both new school approaches received relatively strong support, their effectiveness will depend on whether additional capacity is located where projected enrollment demand is greatest and whether associated attendance boundaries provide reasonable access for affected students. Community feedback also demonstrated that improving utilization at individual schools may create different challenges elsewhere, particularly when adjustments affect transportation, demographic composition, or established feeder pathways. A consistent comparison of projected enrollment, available instructional space, student reassignment, and geographic accessibility would help distinguish scenarios that address underlying capacity needs from those that primarily shift enrollment between existing facilities.

Facility repurposing presents a different set of planning considerations. The educational programming rankings demonstrated interest in STEM, visual and performing arts, and other specialized opportunities, but the more divided response to repurposing suggests that program demand and facility decisions should be evaluated separately. A specialized program may attract interest without requiring conversion of an existing neighborhood school, while an underutilized building may offer opportunities that are not necessarily aligned with the most frequently selected programming preferences. Future analysis should therefore consider the educational purpose of proposed programs, their accessibility to students across the district, the staffing and operational resources required, and the potential consequences for existing school communities. This distinction would help determine whether repurposing expands educational opportunities or simply redistributes programs and resources between locations.

The results also reinforce the importance of examining implementation impacts before advancing detailed scenarios. Community concerns about transportation, student transitions, and neighborhood connections demonstrate that the consequences of attendance area changes can extend beyond enrollment and facility measures. For example, an adjustment that improves building utilization may also alter middle school feeder pathways, increase travel distances, or affect the demographic composition of multiple schools. Evaluating these effects together would provide a more complete understanding of the benefits and tradeoffs associated with each scenario. Where substantial student reassignment is anticipated, transition provisions and implementation timing could be considered as part of the scenario evaluation rather than addressed only after decisions are made.

As MMSD continues its planning process, the second round findings provide a foundation for comparing potential approaches through both operational feasibility and community impact. The strongest opportunity is to move from evaluating broad strategies toward demonstrating how individual scenarios would perform against consistent educational, geographic, demographic, financial, and implementation measures. This approach would allow district leadership and community members to understand not only which options address enrollment and facility needs, but also how those options differ in their effects on students, families, and existing schools. By connecting community priorities with measurable scenario outcomes, the district can continue developing planning options that are responsive to engagement findings while remaining grounded in long term educational and operational considerations.

# Themes by Participant Type

The analysis provided insight into how different stakeholder groups evaluated the planning goals, priorities, and potential approaches presented during the fall 2026 community sessions. While several priorities were shared across participants, differences emerged in how respondents weighed neighborhood school access, demographic diversity, enrollment balance, educational programming, and the future use of district facilities. Examining these perspectives by relationship to MMSD provides additional context for understanding where community preferences aligned and where particular groups emphasized different educational or operational considerations.

The following analysis examines each participant group's responses to the 5 scenario goals, 3 priority ranking questions, and 3 proposed facility approaches. Quantitative findings are supplemented by recurring observations from open ended responses to explain the considerations underlying participants' preferences. Because respondents could identify with more than one relationship to the district, participant groups are not necessarily mutually exclusive. The findings should therefore be interpreted as perspectives within each group rather than statistically representative comparisons of the broader MMSD community.

## Parent/Guardian of Student(s)

Parents and guardians represented the largest respondent group in the second round of engagement. Their feedback provides substantial insight into how families evaluated proposed changes to school assignments, educational programming, and facility capacity. The results reflect a strong emphasis on maintaining accessible neighborhood schools while also recognizing the need to address enrollment growth and provide equitable educational opportunities across the district.

| Key Finding | Supporting Evidence | Summary of Feedback |
|---|---|---|
| Student Experience Priorities | 1st: Closest school, 294 (54%).<br>2nd: Short trip to school, 187 (34%).<br>3rd: Appropriately sized enrollment, 158 (29%). | Parents emphasized proximity and manageable travel times as leading characteristics of a positive student experience. Appropriately sized enrollment complemented these priorities, indicating that families valued neighborhood accessibility alongside school environments that were neither overcrowded nor substantially underutilized. |
| Attendance Area Planning Priorities | 1st: Proximity, 274 (51%).<br>2nd: Continuity, 146 (27%).<br>3rd: Diversity, 186 (35%). | Respondents prioritized assigning students to nearby schools while minimizing changes to existing attendance areas. Demographic diversity also remained an important consideration, demonstrating that parents recognized the need to balance neighborhood accessibility and student stability with equitable learning environments. |

| Key Finding | Supporting Evidence | Summary of Feedback |
|---|---|---|
| Educational Programming Priorities | 1st: STEM, 147 (28%).<br>2nd: STEM, 144 (27%).<br>3rd: Visual and performing arts, 141 (27%). | STEM received the most selections at both the first and second ranking positions, indicating sustained interest in science and technology programming. Visual and performing arts led the third position, demonstrating interest in multiple educational models rather than a single specialized approach. |
| New School Construction | Sprecher Elementary: 375 support (68%).<br>Sprecher Elementary: 62 oppose (11%).<br>Sprecher Elementary: 118 neutral (21%).<br>Acacia Ridge Middle: 376 support (68%).<br>Acacia Ridge Middle: 64 oppose (12%).<br>Acacia Ridge Middle: 116 neutral (21%). | Both construction approaches received comparable levels of support. Parents generally recognized the need to accommodate enrollment growth but emphasized evaluating the effects of new construction on attendance boundaries, transportation, and existing school communities. |
| Facility Repurposing | Support: 310 (56%).<br>Oppose: 138 (25%).<br>Neutral: 109 (20%). | Repurposing generated more divided feedback than new construction. Respondents raised concerns about potential changes to neighborhood schools, program accessibility, financial sustainability, and the educational benefits of converting existing facilities. |
| Scenario Planning Goals | Boundary adjustments for new construction: 354 favorable (67%).<br>Kindergarten classroom availability: 336 favorable (63%).<br>School utilization: 327 favorable (61%). | Parents rated the inclusion of boundary adjustments for new construction most favorably, followed by kindergarten classroom availability and school utilization. These findings indicate that respondents generally recognized how the scenarios addressed construction and capacity objectives, while expressing greater uncertainty or reservations about other approaches. |

## MMSD Staff Member

MMSD staff members provided perspectives shaped by both their professional responsibilities and their connections to individual school communities. Their responses reflected an emphasis on maintaining accessible neighborhood schools while addressing demographic diversity, enrollment distribution, and the educational resources needed to support students. Staff generally favored new school construction, although their evaluations of facility repurposing and specialized programming revealed more varied perspectives about how future investments could affect existing schools.

| Key Finding | Supporting Evidence | Summary of Feedback |
|---|---|---|
| Student Experience Priorities | 1st: Closest school, 70 (43%).<br>2nd: Diverse student populations, 45 (27%).<br>3rd: Appropriately sized enrollment, 48 (29%). | Staff prioritized neighborhood accessibility while placing considerable importance on demographic diversity and manageable school enrollment. These rankings suggest that respondents viewed geographic access, equitable learning environments, and appropriate school capacity as interconnected considerations when evaluating student experiences. |
| Attendance Area Planning Priorities | 1st: Proximity, 68 (42%).<br>2nd: Diversity, 53 (33%).<br>3rd: Diversity, 56 (34%). | Proximity remained the leading first place planning priority, while demographic diversity received the most selections at both the second and third positions. This pattern indicates that staff valued neighborhood accessibility but placed greater emphasis on how attendance boundaries influence student composition and educational equity. |
| Educational Programming Priorities | 1st: Additional Dual Language Immersion, 48 (30%).<br>2nd: STEM, 38 (24%).<br>3rd: STEM, 46 (29%). | Staff expressed the strongest first place interest in expanding dual language immersion, while STEM led the second and third positions. These findings demonstrate interest in language development and specialized academic opportunities, with respondents emphasizing that expanded programming should remain accessible and appropriately supported across district schools. |

| Key Finding | Supporting Evidence | Summary of Feedback |
|---|---|---|
| New School Construction | Sprecher Elementary: 132 support (76%).<br>Sprecher Elementary: 16 oppose (9%).<br>Sprecher Elementary: 26 neutral (15%).<br>Acacia Ridge Middle: 124 support (72%).<br>Acacia Ridge Middle: 19 oppose (11%).<br>Acacia Ridge Middle: 30 neutral (17%). | Staff expressed substantial support for both new school construction approaches, with Sprecher receiving slightly stronger support than Acacia Ridge. These findings suggest receptiveness to additional capacity in areas experiencing growth, while written feedback emphasized the importance of considering enrollment distribution, staffing, transportation, and the effects on existing schools. |
| Facility Repurposing | Support: 102 (58%).<br>Oppose: 50 (29%).<br>Neutral: 23 (13%). | Facility repurposing generated more divided feedback than new construction. Staff recognized opportunities to expand educational programming but raised concerns about staffing, student services, resource allocation, and the potential consequences of converting existing school facilities. |
| Scenario Planning Goals | Boundary adjustments for new construction: 118 favorable (71%).<br>Kindergarten classroom availability: 116 favorable (69%).<br>School utilization: 99 favorable (59%). | Staff rated the inclusion of attendance area adjustments for new construction most favorably, followed by kindergarten classroom availability. School utilization received a comparatively lower favorable rating, indicating greater reservations about how the scenarios addressed enrollment distribution and the instructional conditions needed to support students. |

## Current MMSD Student

Student participation was limited, with 6 respondents identifying as current MMSD students. Although the small sample restricts broader conclusions, the responses provide direct insight into how students evaluated neighborhood school access, transportation, educational programming, and potential attendance area changes. Their feedback was particularly focused on the practical consequences of school assignments, including pedestrian safety, peer relationships, and continuity within established school communities.

| Key Finding | Supporting Evidence | Summary of Feedback |
|---|---|---|
| Student Experience Priorities | 1st: Closest school, 5 (100%).<br>2nd: Short trip to school, 4 (80%).<br>3rd: Appropriately sized enrollment, 2 (40%).<br>3rd (tied): Access to programming options, 2 (40%). | All 5 students completing the student experience rankings prioritized attending the school closest to home, while shorter travel times led the second position. Appropriately sized enrollment and access to specialized programming tied for the third position, indicating that participating students valued educational opportunities and manageable school environments alongside geographic accessibility. |
| Attendance Area Planning Priorities | 1st: Proximity, 4 (67%).<br>2nd: Continuity, 3 (50%).<br>3rd: Diversity, 5 (83%). | Students prioritized nearby schools and maintaining existing attendance areas while also recognizing the importance of diverse learning environments. These rankings suggest that accessibility, established school relationships, and demographic diversity were relevant considerations for participating students. |
| Educational Programming Priorities | 1st: Additional Dual Language Immersion, 2 (40%).<br>2nd: Additional Dual Language Immersion, 2 (40%).<br>3rd: Montessori, 3 (60%). | Additional dual language immersion received the most selections at both the first and second positions, while Montessori led the third position. Although these results demonstrate interest in language learning and alternative educational models, the small number of respondents does not establish a clear programming preference among MMSD students overall. |

| Key Finding | Supporting Evidence | Summary of Feedback |
|---|---|---|
| New School Construction | Sprecher Elementary: 2 support (33%).<br>Sprecher Elementary: 2 oppose (33%).<br>Sprecher Elementary: 2 neutral (33%).<br>Acacia Ridge Middle: 3 support (50%).<br>Acacia Ridge Middle: 1 oppose (17%).<br>Acacia Ridge Middle: 2 neutral (33%). | Student responses were mixed across both construction approaches. Acacia Ridge received somewhat greater support, while Sprecher produced an even distribution of support, opposition, and neutrality. The limited response count prevents broader conclusions about student preferences for either construction approach. |
| Facility Repurposing | Support: 2 (33%).<br>Oppose: 3 (50%).<br>Neutral: 1 (17%). | Facility repurposing received more opposition than support among participating students. The limited favorable assessment of how repurposing was represented in the scenarios suggests that respondents did not consistently view the proposed approach positively, although the small sample does not establish a broader student position. |

## Madison Area Community Member (No Current MMSD Students)

Community members without current MMSD students provided perspectives on how enrollment growth, attendance area adjustments, and facility investments could affect Madison's neighborhoods and the district's long term sustainability. Their responses demonstrated considerable interest in preserving accessible neighborhood schools while recognizing the need to accommodate changing enrollment patterns. Compared with parents and staff, this group expressed greater uncertainty about how several planning goals were reflected in the scenarios, particularly those involving facility repurposing and construction without attendance boundary adjustments.

| Key Finding | Supporting Evidence | Summary of Feedback |
|---|---|---|
| Student Experience Priorities | 1st: Closest school, 53 (62%).<br>2nd: Short trip to school, 36 (42%).<br>3rd: Diverse student populations, 31 (36%). | Community members emphasized neighborhood accessibility and manageable travel times as leading priorities for students. Demographic diversity followed in the third position, indicating that respondents also valued inclusive learning environments alongside the convenience and community connections associated with nearby schools. |
| Attendance Area Planning Priorities | 1st: Proximity, 54 (64%).<br>2nd: Continuity, 30 (36%).<br>3rd: Diversity, 31 (37%). | Respondents prioritized assigning students to nearby schools while minimizing disruption to existing attendance areas. Diversity remained an important consideration, demonstrating that community members recognized the need to balance neighborhood stability with equitable educational opportunities and demographic composition. |
| Educational Programming Priorities | 1st: STEM, 22 (27%).<br>2nd: STEM, 22 (27%).<br>3rd: STEM, 21 (25%). | STEM received the most selections across all 3 ranking positions, demonstrating consistent interest in science and technology programming. Written feedback also identified interest in Montessori, language immersion, and other educational models, although respondents differed on whether specialized opportunities should be concentrated in selected facilities or expanded within existing neighborhood schools. |

| Key Finding | Supporting Evidence | Summary of Feedback |
|---|---|---|
| New School Construction | Sprecher Elementary: 54 support (61%).<br>Sprecher Elementary: 12 oppose (13%).<br>Sprecher Elementary: 23 neutral (26%).<br>Acacia Ridge Middle: 56 support (63%).<br>Acacia Ridge Middle: 15 oppose (17%).<br>Acacia Ridge Middle: 18 neutral (20%). | Both construction approaches received majority support, with Acacia Ridge receiving slightly stronger support than Sprecher. However, neutral responses represented a substantial share of participants, indicating that some community members did not express a definitive position on either investment. Feedback emphasized evaluating construction needs alongside existing facility capacity, enrollment projections, and financial sustainability. |
| Facility Repurposing | Support: 45 (51%).<br>Oppose: 30 (34%).<br>Neutral: 14 (16%). | Repurposing generated more divided feedback than new construction, with comparatively higher opposition and uncertainty about its implementation. Respondents questioned whether converting existing schools would expand educational opportunities or redirect resources away from neighborhood schools. Concerns also included transportation accessibility, financial sustainability, and the effects on established school communities. |
| Scenario Planning Goals | Kindergarten classroom availability: 49 favorable (57%).<br>School utilization: 48 favorable (56%).<br>Boundary adjustments for new construction: 48 favorable (56%). | Community members rated kindergarten classroom availability most favorably, followed closely by school utilization and boundary adjustments for new construction. These findings suggest that respondents generally recognized several core planning objectives within the scenarios, although lower favorable ratings for other approaches indicated uncertainty about how proposed changes would address district needs. |

## Prefer not to respond

The Prefer Not to Respond category included 30 participants who chose not to disclose their relationship with MMSD. Although their specific connections to the district are unknown, their responses provide additional perspectives on neighborhood school access, demographic diversity, enrollment balance, and the potential effects of future facility decisions. Compared with the larger participant groups, these respondents expressed greater uncertainty about several planning goals and more divided preferences across the 3 proposed approaches.

| Key Finding | Supporting Evidence | Summary of Feedback |
|---|---|---|
| Student Experience Priorities | 1st: Closest school, 16 (59%).<br>2nd: Short trip to school, 11 (41%).<br>3rd: Access to programming options, 7 (26%). | Respondents prioritized neighborhood accessibility and manageable travel times, while access to specialized educational programming led the third position. These rankings suggest that participants valued nearby schools and convenient transportation while also considering the availability of educational opportunities when evaluating student experiences. |
| Attendance Area Planning Priorities | 1st: Proximity, 12 (46%).<br>2nd: Continuity, 9 (35%).<br>3rd: Diversity, 12 (46%). | Proximity received the most first place selections, followed by continuity and demographic diversity at the second and third positions. These findings demonstrate that respondents valued maintaining accessible neighborhood schools while recognizing the importance of preserving established attendance areas and supporting diverse learning environments. |
| Educational Programming Priorities | 1st (tied): Montessori, 6 (23%).<br>1st (tied): International Baccalaureate, 6 (23%).<br>2nd: STEM, 9 (35%).<br>3rd (tied): Montessori, 7 (27%).<br>3rd (tied): Additional Dual Language Immersion, 7 (27%). | Programming preferences were distributed across several educational models, with Montessori and International Baccalaureate tied for the first position, STEM leading the second, and Montessori and dual language immersion tied for the third. This variation suggests interest in different instructional approaches rather than a clear preference for a single specialized program. |

| Key Finding | Supporting Evidence | Summary of Feedback |
|---|---|---|
| New School Construction | Sprecher Elementary: 10 support (37%).<br>Sprecher Elementary: 6 oppose (22%).<br>Sprecher Elementary: 11 neutral (41%).<br>Acacia Ridge Middle: 15 support (54%).<br>Acacia Ridge Middle: 4 oppose (14%).<br>Acacia Ridge Middle: 9 neutral (32%). | Acacia Ridge received greater support than Sprecher, although neutral responses represented a substantial share for both approaches. The results indicate less definitive preferences for new construction than those observed among larger respondent groups, particularly regarding Sprecher, where neutrality exceeded support. |
| Facility Repurposing | Support: 10 (38%).<br>Oppose: 7 (27%).<br>Neutral: 9 (35%). | Facility repurposing generated mixed responses, with support and neutrality representing similar shares. Written feedback reflected differing perspectives on specialized programming, neighborhood school preservation, and the allocation of educational resources, suggesting that respondents did not share a consistent preference for converting existing facilities. |
| Scenario Planning Goals | Boundary adjustments for new construction: 9 favorable (35%).<br>School utilization: 8 favorable (33%).<br>Facility repurposing: 8 favorable (31%). | Respondents provided relatively low favorable ratings across the planning goals, with boundary adjustments for new construction receiving the highest favorable assessment. School utilization and facility repurposing received similarly mixed evaluations, reflecting uncertainty and reservations about how the scenarios addressed district planning objectives. |

## Key Finding

The Key Finding column identifies the primary planning topic evaluated by each participant group. These findings are organized around student experience priorities, attendance area planning priorities, educational programming priorities, new school construction, facility repurposing, and scenario planning goals. This structure allows readers to compare how different participant groups evaluated the same planning considerations.

## Supporting Evidence

For ranking questions, 1st, 2nd, and 3rd identify the most frequently selected response option at each respective ranking position. For new school construction and facility repurposing, Support combines Strongly Support and Somewhat Support responses, Oppose combines Strongly Oppose and Somewhat Oppose responses, and Neutral represents Neutral / Undecided responses.

For the 5 Scenario Planning Goals, Favorable combines Extremely Well, Very Well, and Somewhat Well ratings. Less Favorable combines Slightly Well and Not Well at All ratings, while Insufficient Information represents respondents who indicated they did not have enough information to evaluate the goal. Percentages are calculated using valid responses to each question and may vary across measures.

## Summary of Feedback

The Summary of Feedback column provides additional interpretation of the quantitative findings and incorporates relevant written comments. These summaries identify recurring priorities, concerns, and differences in perspective among participant groups. They provide context for understanding why respondents may have supported or opposed particular approaches without treating individual comments as representative of an entire participant group.

# Themes by School/Building

Feedback across MMSD schools and buildings highlights differences in how respondents prioritized educational experiences, attendance area planning, and future facility investments. The analysis examines the most frequently selected priorities, levels of support for new school construction at Sprecher and Acacia Ridge, support for facility repurposing, and assessments of the 5 Scenario Planning Goals. These findings provide a more localized perspective on districtwide planning objectives, identifying where school communities expressed similar priorities and where concerns related to neighborhood access, student stability, demographic diversity, educational programming, and facility utilization differed.

Participation varied across schools and buildings, influencing the depth of analysis available for each location. The following table presents key quantitative findings alongside relevant written feedback, emphasizing the most frequently selected first-place priorities, support for proposed facility approaches, and the highest and lowest favorable Scenario Planning Goal ratings. Additional findings are highlighted where meaningful opposition, uncertainty, or school-specific concerns emerged. This approach provides consistent coverage of major planning considerations while focusing on the results most relevant to each location. Findings should be interpreted in relation to participation levels, as smaller response groups may produce substantial percentage differences without establishing broader community preferences.

For reporting purposes, schools and buildings are organized into 3 participation tiers based on the number of respondents identifying an affiliation with each location. High participation (red) includes 25 or more associated respondents, Moderate participation (orange) includes 15 to 24 respondents, and Limited participation (yellow) includes 1 to 14 respondents. These classifications reflect the volume of feedback available rather than the representativeness of each school community. Schools and buildings with no associated responses are excluded from the individual analysis due to insufficient data.

Themes by School/Building

| School or Building | Associated Respondents | Key Finding | Supporting Evidence | Summary of Feedback |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Van Hise Elementary | 82 | Feeder Continuity and Student Stability | Student experience: Closest assigned school 62 (79%)<br>Attendance planning: Proximity to home 47 (58%)<br>Programming: Focus on Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math 28 (36%)<br>Sprecher: support 49 (61%)<br>Acacia Ridge: support 54 (68%)<br>Repurposing: support 44 (56%)<br>Goals: highest favorable Maintain 75% to 85% utilization 48 (59%); lowest favorable Expanded programming through repurposing 31 (39%) | Van Hise feedback demonstrates how neighborhood school access, demographic diversity, and student continuity intersect within a community facing potential attendance area changes. Participants questioned the potential reassignment of students to Crestwood Elementary and Gillespie Middle, citing longer travel distances, major road crossings such as Whitney Way, and the separation of students from existing friendships and neighborhood support networks. |
| West High | 81 | Feeder Continuity and Student Stability | Student experience: Closest assigned school 48 (63%)<br>Attendance planning: Proximity to home 48 (63%)<br>Programming: Focus on Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math 20 (26%)<br>Sprecher: support 49 (62%)<br>Acacia Ridge: support 53 (67%)<br>Repurposing: support 40 (51%)<br>Goals: highest favorable Boundary adjustments for new construction 49 (65%); lowest favorable Expanded programming through repurposing 29 (38%) | West High feedback reveals a distinction between supporting districtwide capacity improvements and accepting changes to established school pathways. Open ended responses help explain this emphasis, particularly concerns about proposed changes affecting Section E and the Van Hise, Hamilton, and West feeder pathway. |

Themes by School/Building

| School or Building | Associated Respondents | Key Finding | Supporting Evidence | Summary of Feedback |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Hamilton Middle | 79 | School Planning Priorities | Student experience: Closest assigned school 53 (69%)<br>Attendance planning: Proximity to home 42 (55%)<br>Programming: Focus on Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math 25 (34%)<br>Sprecher: support 49 (64%)<br>Acacia Ridge: support 52 (68%)<br>Repurposing: support 40 (52%)<br>Goals: highest favorable Boundary adjustments for new construction 47 (62%); lowest favorable Expanded programming through repurposing 28 (37%) | The most consequential issue emerging from Hamilton's feedback concerns the cumulative effects of attendance area decisions across multiple grade levels. Proposed changes involving Section E generated concerns about redirecting students from the Van Hise, Hamilton, and West pathway toward Crestwood Elementary and Gillespie Middle. Participants described the potential separation of established peer groups and questioned how these changes would affect relationships formed during elementary school and maintained through subsequent transitions. |
| Thoreau Elementary | 79 | Enrollment and Facility Planning | Student experience: Closest assigned school 48 (70%)<br>Attendance planning: Proximity to home 31 (47%)<br>Programming: Focus on Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math 20 (32%)<br>Sprecher: support 31 (48%)<br>Acacia Ridge: support 33 (50%)<br>Repurposing: support 24 (35%), oppose 27 (39%)<br>Goals: highest favorable 4K classroom space 32 (51%); lowest favorable Expanded programming through repurposing 20 (33%) | A defining issue in Thoreau's feedback is whether reducing overcrowding would create new challenges involving enrollment sustainability and demographic diversity. Participants repeatedly questioned the proposed reassignment of Section T, including the potential movement of students to the Midvale and Lincoln schools. |

Themes by School/Building

| School or Building | Associated Respondents | Key Finding | Supporting Evidence | Summary of Feedback |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4K Early Care & Education Sites | 53 | Neighborhood School Access | Student experience: Closest assigned school 28 (56%)<br>Attendance planning: Proximity to home 26 (50%)<br>Programming: Focus on Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math 17 (33%)<br>Sprecher: support 38 (73%)<br>Acacia Ridge: support 40 (77%)<br>Repurposing: support 30 (58%)<br>Goals: highest favorable Boundary adjustments for new construction 34 (69%); lowest favorable Expanded programming through repurposing 20 (41%) | A central issue emerging from this group is whether expanding available classroom space would translate into meaningful improvements in early childhood educational access. Participant comments connected educational accessibility with family transportation, proximity to home, manageable classroom environments, and the availability of appropriate instructional supports. |
| Olson Elementary | 53 | Enrollment and Facility Planning | Student experience: Closest assigned school 35 (67%)<br>Attendance planning: Proximity to home 37 (79%)<br>Programming: Focus on Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math 23 (45%)<br>Sprecher: support 39 (74%)<br>Acacia Ridge: support 52 (98%)<br>Repurposing: support 44 (83%)<br>Goals: highest favorable Boundary adjustments for new construction 43 (88%); lowest favorable Expanded programming through repurposing 29 (59%) | For Olson families, the proposed Acacia Ridge middle school represents a potential solution to a longstanding geographic challenge rather than simply an expansion of district capacity. Several respondents indicated that the distance to middle school was influencing their consideration of neighboring districts, including Middleton and Verona, suggesting that secondary school accessibility may affect family decisions about remaining within MMSD. |
| Stephens Elementary | 46 | Educational Programming and Access | Student experience: Balanced school size 15 (33%)<br>Attendance planning: Proximity to home 20 (44%)<br>Programming: Focus on Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math 13 (29%)<br>Sprecher: support 35 (76%)<br>Acacia Ridge: support 36 (78%)<br>Repurposing: support 22 (48%), oppose 17 (37%)<br>Goals: highest favorable Boundary adjustments for new construction 41 (89%); lowest favorable Expanded programming through repurposing 21 (47%) | Stephens Elementary's responses reveal a concern about the consequences of redistributing enrollment without ensuring that existing schools remain educationally and operationally sustainable. |

Themes by School/Building

| School or Building | Associated Respondents | Key Finding | Supporting Evidence | Summary of Feedback |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Lincoln Elementary | 44 | Neighborhood School Access | Student experience: Closest assigned school 15 (35%) Attendance planning: Proximity to home 17 (40%) Programming: Additional Dual Language Immersion: Expanded language-immersion programs 15 (37%) Sprecher: support 32 (76%) Acacia Ridge: support 32 (76%) Repurposing: support 28 (67%) Goals: highest favorable Boundary adjustments for new construction 34 (81%); lowest favorable Expanded programming through repurposing 17 (40%) | Lincoln's responses demonstrate that the educational value of demographic integration cannot be separated from the practical experience of attending a paired school. Participants described the Midvale and Lincoln arrangement as an opportunity for students from different racial and socioeconomic backgrounds to learn together, particularly in a city where residential patterns can produce substantial differences between neighborhood schools. Some cautioned that emphasizing proximity without considering these patterns could weaken existing integration efforts, while others questioned the transportation requirements and school transitions associated with maintaining paired assignments. |

Themes by School/Building

| School or Building | Associated Respondents | Key Finding | Supporting Evidence | Summary of Feedback |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Other | 44 | Enrollment and Facility Planning | Student experience: Closest assigned school 16 (39%)<br>Attendance planning: Proximity to home 12 (29%)<br>Programming: Additional Dual Language Immersion: Expanded language-immersion programs 13 (33%)<br>Sprecher: support 34 (77%)<br>Acacia Ridge: support 34 (77%)<br>Repurposing: support 33 (75%)<br>Goals: highest favorable 4K classroom space 31 (72%); lowest favorable Expanded programming through repurposing 17 (40%) | A distinctive feature of this group's feedback was its attention to how enrollment changes influence the resources and educational conditions available within individual schools. Respondents questioned whether utilization targets adequately account for differences in student needs, particularly at schools serving greater concentrations of students requiring language assistance, special education, or additional instructional support. Some cautioned that substantial enrollment reductions could affect staffing allocations and make it more difficult to retain experienced educators or sustain specialized services. |
| Cherokee Middle | 37 | Neighborhood School Access | Student experience: Closest assigned school 20 (57%)<br>Attendance planning: Proximity to home 19 (56%)<br>Programming: Additional Dual Language Immersion: Expanded language-immersion programs / Focus on Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math (tie) 10 (29%)<br>Sprecher: support 20 (57%)<br>Acacia Ridge: support 22 (63%)<br>Repurposing: support 22 (61%)<br>Goals: highest favorable 4K classroom space 20 (57%); lowest favorable Expanded programming through repurposing 8 (23%) | Cherokee's responses bring attention to the relationship between demographic integration and the educational pathways connecting elementary and middle schools. Participants raised concerns about how proposed changes involving Thoreau, Midvale, and Lincoln could influence the racial and socioeconomic composition of students eventually attending Cherokee. Some emphasized that neighborhood based assignments can reinforce existing residential segregation, limiting opportunities for students from different backgrounds to learn together. |

Themes by School/Building

| School or Building | Associated Respondents | Key Finding | Supporting Evidence | Summary of Feedback |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Midvale Elementary | 35 | Neighborhood School Access | Student experience: Closest assigned school 14 (41%)<br>Attendance planning: Proximity to home 18 (55%)<br>Programming: Additional Dual Language Immersion: Expanded language-immersion programs 13 (38%)<br>Sprecher: support 25 (76%)<br>Acacia Ridge: support 25 (76%)<br>Repurposing: support 23 (70%)<br>Goals: highest favorable Boundary adjustments for new construction 24 (73%); lowest favorable Expanded programming through repurposing 15 (45%) | Midvale's responses illustrate a planning challenge that differs from communities primarily concerned with preserving a single neighborhood attendance area. The Midvale and Lincoln paired school model brings together students from neighborhoods with different demographic characteristics, creating opportunities for integrated educational experiences that may not emerge through proximity based assignments alone. |
| Elvehjem/Deer Elementary | 29 | Enrollment and Facility Planning | Student experience: Closest assigned school 22 (76%)<br>Attendance planning: Proximity to home 13 (46%)<br>Programming: Additional Dual Language Immersion: Expanded language-immersion programs / Montessori: Child-centered, self-directed, hands-on learning (tie) 8 (29%)<br>Sprecher: support 22 (76%)<br>Acacia Ridge: support 12 (41%), neutral 12 (41%)<br>Repurposing: support 19 (66%)<br>Goals: highest favorable 4K classroom space 22 (76%); lowest favorable Expanded programming through repurposing 14 (50%) | The most consequential concern emerging from Elvehjem/Deer feedback was whether proposed attendance area changes would address East Side overcrowding or simply transfer enrollment pressure between neighboring schools. Participants questioned scenarios that could reduce enrollment at Kennedy while increasing the number of students assigned to Ada Deer, particularly if the district did not construct a new school at Sprecher. Comments also referenced residential development along Milwaukee Street and the potential for additional students to place demands on existing classrooms and support services. |

Themes by School/Building

| School or Building | Associated Respondents | Key Finding | Supporting Evidence | Summary of Feedback |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Prefer not to respond | 28 | Neighborhood School Access | Student experience: Closest assigned school 13 (48%)<br>Attendance planning: Proximity to home 14 (56%)<br>Programming: Additional Dual Language Immersion: Expanded language-immersion programs / International Baccalaureate: Global framework focused on critical thinking and inquiry (tie) 6 (24%)<br>Sprecher: support 16 (59%)<br>Acacia Ridge: support 16 (59%), neutral 10 (37%)<br>Repurposing: support 8 (30%), oppose 13 (48%)<br>Goals: highest favorable Boundary adjustments for new construction 19 (76%); lowest favorable Expanded programming through repurposing 9 (38%) | The responses reveal a concern about whether proposed attendance area changes would distribute educational opportunities and transportation burdens equitably across Madison's neighborhoods. Comments questioned the effects of reassigning students from lower income neighborhoods, particularly where longer travel distances could create barriers for families without reliable transportation. |
| Memorial High | 25 | Enrollment and Facility Planning | Student experience: Closest assigned school 12 (48%)<br>Attendance planning: Proximity to home 12 (50%)<br>Programming: Focus on Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math / International Baccalaureate: Global framework focused on critical thinking and inquiry (tie) 7 (28%)<br>Sprecher: support 17 (68%)<br>Acacia Ridge: support 19 (76%)<br>Repurposing: support 15 (60%)<br>Goals: highest favorable Boundary adjustments for new construction 19 (76%); lowest favorable Expanded programming through repurposing 12 (50%) | Memorial's feedback highlights the importance of understanding secondary school capacity through the actual pathways students follow rather than enrollment projections alone. Participants raised questions about the distribution of students among Toki, Spring Harbor, and Gillespie middle schools, including whether projected enrollment at Toki adequately accounted for students attending alternative middle school assignments. Others pointed to residential development on the Far West Side as a potential source of sustained demand for additional secondary capacity. |

Themes by School/Building

| School or Building | Associated Respondents | Key Finding | Supporting Evidence | Summary of Feedback |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| La Follette High | 22 | Neighborhood School Access | Student experience: Closest assigned school 11 (52%)<br>Attendance planning: Proximity to home 7 (32%)<br>Programming: Additional Dual Language Immersion: Expanded language-immersion programs 7 (35%)<br>Sprecher: support 19 (86%)<br>Acacia Ridge: support 14 (67%)<br>Repurposing: support 16 (73%)<br>Goals: highest favorable Boundary adjustments for new construction 14 (70%); lowest favorable Expanded programming through repurposing 9 (45%) | A defining feature of La Follette's feedback was the tension between neighborhood school accessibility and the district's responsibility to address unequal educational conditions. Some participants described proximity as essential for families managing different work schedules, transportation limitations, and housing instability, emphasizing that longer travel distances can create barriers to consistent attendance. Others argued that preserving existing boundaries may reinforce racial and socioeconomic segregation, particularly when neighboring schools serve substantially different student populations. |

Themes by School/Building

| School or Building | Associated Respondents | Key Finding | Supporting Evidence | Summary of Feedback |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Franklin Elementary | 21 | Neighborhood School Access | Student experience: Closest assigned school 9 (43%)<br>Attendance planning: Proximity to home 10 (50%)<br>Programming: Additional Dual Language Immersion: Expanded language-immersion programs 6 (29%)<br>Sprecher: support 15 (75%)<br>Acacia Ridge: support 14 (70%)<br>Repurposing: support 13 (65%)<br>Goals: highest favorable 4K classroom space 12 (63%); lowest favorable Expanded programming through repurposing 8 (42%) | Franklin's feedback illustrates the tradeoffs families experience when educational integration requires attendance arrangements that extend beyond their immediate neighborhoods. Respondents described the Franklin and Randall paired school model as providing valuable opportunities for students to learn alongside peers from different racial and socioeconomic backgrounds, with some explicitly stating that the benefits of diversity justified additional travel. Others questioned whether maintaining multiple elementary buildings and grade transitions created avoidable challenges for working families, particularly those coordinating transportation, before and after school care, and schedules for children attending different locations. |

Themes by School/Building

| School or Building | Associated Respondents | Key Finding | Supporting Evidence | Summary of Feedback |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Gillespie Middle | 21 | Enrollment and Facility Planning | Student experience: Balanced school size 6 (29%)<br>Attendance planning: Proximity to home 9 (45%)<br>Programming: Focus on Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math 6 (29%)<br>Sprecher: support 15 (71%)<br>Acacia Ridge: support 17 (81%)<br>Repurposing: support 11 (52%), oppose 9 (43%)<br>Goals: highest favorable Maintain 75% to 85% utilization 15 (71%); lowest favorable Expanded programming through repurposing 8 (40%) | Gillespie's responses reveal a concern about the cumulative effects of enrollment redistribution on west side school communities, particularly where changes could alter both elementary assignments and subsequent middle school pathways. Several participants questioned the proposed treatment of Stephens Elementary, including the potential separation of Wexford Village and Valley Ridge from established school connections. One respondent noted that students from Stephens neighborhoods could be divided between Gillespie and Toki or Acacia Ridge, in addition to existing uncertainty associated with the Spring Harbor lottery. |
| Mendota Elementary | 21 | Enrollment and Facility Planning | Student experience: Closest assigned school 10 (53%)<br>Attendance planning: Proximity to home 7 (35%)<br>Programming: Additional Dual Language Immersion: Expanded language-immersion programs 8 (44%)<br>Sprecher: support 17 (85%)<br>Acacia Ridge: support 15 (79%)<br>Repurposing: support 10 (50%), oppose 8 (40%)<br>Goals: highest favorable 4K classroom space 11 (58%); lowest favorable Maintain 75% to 85% utilization 4 (21%) | Mendota's feedback challenges the assumption that improving utilization at one school necessarily produces a better outcome for the surrounding school system. Participants also raised concerns about proposed changes involving the Packers and Mendota communities, particularly where reassignment could substantially increase bus travel times or remove students from schools within walking distance of their homes. |

Themes by School/Building

| School or Building | Associated Respondents | Key Finding | Supporting Evidence | Summary of Feedback |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Emerson Elementary | 20 | Enrollment and Facility Planning | Student experience: Balanced school size 10 (50%)<br>Attendance planning: Proximity to home 7 (37%)<br>Programming: Additional Dual Language Immersion: Expanded language-immersion programs 9 (47%)<br>Sprecher: support 14 (70%)<br>Acacia Ridge: support 13 (65%)<br>Repurposing: support 11 (58%)<br>Goals: highest favorable Boundary adjustments for new construction 15 (79%); lowest favorable Expanded programming through repurposing 9 (47%) | Emerson's responses challenge the adequacy of using building utilization alone to evaluate the consequences of attendance area changes. Participants repeatedly questioned the proposal to assign Section H, including the Packers Avenue area, to Emerson while reducing enrollment at Mendota. |
| Sennett Middle | 20 | Enrollment and Facility Planning | Student experience: Closest assigned school 9 (47%)<br>Attendance planning: Proximity to home 8 (42%)<br>Programming: Montessori: Child-centered, self-directed, hands-on learning / Additional Dual Language Immersion: Expanded language-immersion programs (tie) 5 (28%)<br>Sprecher: support 15 (75%)<br>Acacia Ridge: support 10 (50%)<br>Repurposing: support 13 (65%)<br>Goals: highest favorable 4K classroom space 15 (75%); lowest favorable Expanded programming through repurposing 8 (40%) | A central issue in Sennett's feedback was whether changes to attendance boundaries would improve educational conditions for students or simply redistribute enrollment pressures between schools. Respondents expressed competing views about the relative importance of proximity and demographic diversity. Some emphasized that attending nearby schools allows children to maintain friendships, participate in neighborhood activities, and develop a stronger sense of belonging. |

Themes by School/Building

| School or Building | Associated Respondents | Key Finding | Supporting Evidence | Summary of Feedback |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Randall Elementary | 19 | Neighborhood School Access | Student experience: Balanced school size / Closest assigned school (tie) 6 (33%)<br>Attendance planning: Proximity to home 9 (53%)<br>Programming: International Baccalaureate: Global framework focused on critical thinking and inquiry 6 (33%)<br>Sprecher: support 12 (63%)<br>Acacia Ridge: support 13 (68%)<br>Repurposing: support 15 (79%)<br>Goals: highest favorable Maintain 75% to 85% utilization 13 (68%); lowest favorable Expanded programming through repurposing 7 (37%) | Randall's feedback illustrates how families can value neighborhood schools and demographic integration while remaining open to changes that improve educational opportunities. Participants described the Franklin and Randall paired arrangement as providing meaningful experiences for students from different backgrounds, with some emphasizing that the benefits of attending a diverse school justified an assignment farther from home. One respondent specifically described a positive experience at Franklin despite it not being the closest school, citing the school's diversity and inclusive environment. |
| Lake View Elementary | 18 | Enrollment and Facility Planning | Student experience: Closest assigned school 7 (39%)<br>Attendance planning: Proximity to home 9 (53%)<br>Programming: Focus on Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math / Additional Dual Language Immersion: Expanded language-immersion programs (tie) 5 (31%)<br>Sprecher: support 13 (72%)<br>Acacia Ridge: support 13 (72%)<br>Repurposing: support 10 (56%)<br>Goals: highest favorable Boundary adjustments for new construction 16 (94%); lowest favorable Expanded programming through repurposing 5 (31%) | Lake View's feedback identifies a potential weakness in evaluating enrollment redistribution primarily through building utilization percentages. Participants questioned proposals that could remove a substantial share of Lake View's students, particularly those living in the Oak Park neighborhood, while increasing enrollment at Gompers to approximately full capacity. Several argued that this would shift capacity pressure rather than resolve it, leaving Lake View with fewer students and reducing flexibility at the receiving school. |

Themes by School/Building

| School or Building | Associated Respondents | Key Finding | Supporting Evidence | Summary of Feedback |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Lapham Elementary | 18 | Enrollment and Facility Planning | Student experience: Closest assigned school 10 (56%)<br>Attendance planning: Proximity to home 8 (50%)<br>Programming: Montessori: Child-centered, self-directed, hands-on learning 5 (31%)<br>Sprecher: support 10 (56%)<br>Acacia Ridge: support 10 (56%)<br>Repurposing: support 5 (28%), oppose 13 (72%)<br>Goals: highest favorable 4K classroom space 12 (67%); lowest favorable Expanded programming through repurposing 4 (24%) | Preserving the Lapham and Marquette paired school arrangement emerged as the most consequential issue in this community's feedback. Participants described the model as providing educational benefits that extend beyond enrollment distribution, particularly through age appropriate learning environments and teaching teams with expertise in specific stages of child development. Several also emphasized the role of paired schools in supporting demographic integration across neighborhoods that differ in racial and socioeconomic composition. |
| Orchard Ridge Elementary | 18 | Neighborhood School Access | Student experience: Closest assigned school 6 (38%)<br>Attendance planning: Continuity 9 (53%)<br>Programming: International Baccalaureate: Global framework focused on critical thinking and inquiry 6 (38%)<br>Sprecher: support 12 (67%)<br>Acacia Ridge: support 11 (61%)<br>Repurposing: support 6 (33%), oppose 8 (44%)<br>Goals: highest favorable Maintain 75% to 85% utilization 12 (71%); lowest favorable Scenarios without boundary adjustments 8 (47%) | Orchard Ridge respondents raised specific concerns about proposed boundary adjustments that could change the school's geographic and community identity. Participants described Sections B and M as important parts of the existing neighborhood school population, particularly for families who depend on walking to school rather than reliable access to private transportation. Comments questioned the reassignment of nearby students to Huegel or Anana while introducing students from more distant areas, including Allied Drive. |

Themes by School/Building

| School or Building | Associated Respondents | Key Finding | Supporting Evidence | Summary of Feedback |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Kennedy Elementary | 17 | School Planning Priorities | Student experience: Closest assigned school 10 (62%)<br>Attendance planning: Utilization balance 10 (59%)<br>Programming: Focus on Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math 5 (31%)<br>Sprecher: support 15 (88%)<br>Acacia Ridge: support 10 (62%)<br>Repurposing: support 13 (81%)<br>Goals: highest favorable Boundary adjustments for new construction 14 (93%); lowest favorable Expanded programming through repurposing 10 (67%) | Kennedy's feedback identifies overcrowding as an immediate educational concern that extends beyond the number of students a building can accommodate. Respondents described the need for sufficient classrooms, appropriate student to teacher ratios, dedicated special education spaces, and rooms for individualized or small group instruction. Several connected these needs to the challenges of serving students with different academic, behavioral, and language support requirements within already crowded environments. |
| MSCR | 16 | Neighborhood School Access | Student experience: Closest assigned school 8 (53%)<br>Attendance planning: Proximity to home 7 (47%)<br>Programming: Additional Dual Language Immersion: Expanded language-immersion programs 5 (33%)<br>Sprecher: support 11 (69%)<br>Acacia Ridge: support 12 (75%)<br>Repurposing: support 8 (50%)<br>Goals: highest favorable 4K classroom space 14 (88%); lowest favorable Expanded programming through repurposing 7 (44%) | The MSCR responses illustrate how school access and educational opportunity can carry different meanings for families depending on their circumstances. Several participants described neighborhood schools as important places for developing friendships, participating in community activities, and maintaining connections beyond the school day. One respondent discussed the difficulty of coordinating children attending schools approximately 20 minutes apart with identical start times, illustrating how school assignments can create logistical challenges even when families value the educational opportunities available at both locations. |

Themes by School/Building

| School or Building | Associated Respondents | Key Finding | Supporting Evidence | Summary of Feedback |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| O'Keeffe Middle | 16 | Neighborhood School Access | Student experience: Closest assigned school 6 (40%)<br>Attendance planning: Proximity to home 8 (57%)<br>Programming: Additional Dual Language Immersion: Expanded language-immersion programs 4 (27%)<br>Sprecher: support 9 (56%)<br>Acacia Ridge: support 9 (56%)<br>Repurposing: support 6 (38%), oppose 7 (44%)<br>Goals: highest favorable 4K classroom space 8 (50%); lowest favorable Expanded programming through repurposing 3 (20%) | The most consequential issue in O'Keeffe's feedback was the possibility that facility repurposing could alter the role of Lapham, Marquette, and O'Keeffe as neighborhood schools. Participants explicitly requested that all 3 buildings remain open for their existing school communities, arguing that these institutions contribute to neighborhood identity, student relationships, and the accessibility of public education on Madison's Near East Side. Several questioned whether underutilization should justify conversion when existing buildings could instead be modernized or used to strengthen instructional offerings. |
| Schenk Elementary | 16 | Enrollment and Facility Planning | Student experience: Closest assigned school 9 (56%)<br>Attendance planning: Proximity to home 7 (44%)<br>Programming: Additional Dual Language Immersion: Expanded language-immersion programs 5 (31%)<br>Sprecher: support 13 (81%)<br>Acacia Ridge: support 11 (69%)<br>Repurposing: support 13 (81%)<br>Goals: highest favorable Boundary adjustments for new construction 12 (80%); lowest favorable Maintain 75% to 85% utilization 8 (53%) | Schenk's feedback places the educational consequences of overcrowding ahead of maintaining attendance boundaries for their own sake. Participants described crowded classrooms as limiting individualized attention, increasing demands on teachers, and placing pressure on shared spaces such as libraries, cafeterias, and rooms used by specialists. |

Themes by School/Building

| School or Building | Associated Respondents | Key Finding | Supporting Evidence | Summary of Feedback |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Crestwood Elementary | 14 | Enrollment and Facility Planning | Student experience: Closest assigned school 6 (46%)<br>Attendance planning: Proximity to home 7 (58%)<br>Programming: Additional Dual Language Immersion: Expanded language-immersion programs / Focus on Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math (tie) 4 (33%)<br>Sprecher: support 7 (54%)<br>Acacia Ridge: support 9 (69%)<br>Repurposing: support 10 (77%)<br>Goals: highest favorable Maintain 75% to 85% utilization 10 (77%); lowest favorable Expanded programming through repurposing 7 (54%) | Crestwood's responses offer a comparatively direct argument for making fuller use of existing school capacity before committing to additional construction. A respondent working at Crestwood and Chávez/Sánchez welcomed the proposed addition of students from Van Hise but questioned why Crestwood and Stephens would not receive more students when nearby Muir, Huegel, and Anana were projected to operate at higher utilization levels. The same participant suggested that redistributing enrollment more substantially could help schools with available space support students currently attending crowded buildings. |

Themes by School/Building

| School or Building | Associated Respondents | Key Finding | Supporting Evidence | Summary of Feedback |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| East High | 14 | Neighborhood School Access | Student experience: Closest assigned school / Short trip to school (tie) 4 (31%)<br>Attendance planning: Proximity to home 6 (50%)<br>Programming: Additional Dual Language Immersion: Expanded language-immersion programs / Other (Please add info) (tie) 3 (23%)<br>Sprecher: support 9 (64%)<br>Acacia Ridge: support 8 (57%)<br>Repurposing: support 7 (50%), oppose 5 (36%)<br>Goals: highest favorable Boundary adjustments for new construction 7 (54%); lowest favorable Expanded programming through repurposing 4 (31%) | East High's feedback places educational quality and equitable access at the center of the attendance area discussion. Respondents differed on whether neighborhood proximity or demographic integration should receive greater emphasis, but several questioned the assumption that school assignments alone could address disparities in student outcomes. Some argued that neighborhood schools support attendance, family involvement, and relationships among students from different backgrounds, while others cautioned that existing residential segregation can produce unequal educational environments if proximity becomes the dominant planning principle. |

Themes by School/Building

| School or Building | Associated Respondents | Key Finding | Supporting Evidence | Summary of Feedback |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Toki Middle | 14 | Enrollment and Facility Planning | Student experience: Balanced school size 6 (43%)<br>Attendance planning: Proximity to home 8 (57%)<br>Programming: Focus on Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math 5 (38%)<br>Sprecher: support 9 (64%), neutral 5 (36%)<br>Acacia Ridge: support 11 (79%)<br>Repurposing: support 7 (50%)<br>Goals: highest favorable Maintain 75% to 85% utilization 9 (64%); lowest favorable Expanded programming through repurposing 6 (43%) | Toki's feedback raises a fundamental question about whether future middle school construction is being evaluated against the appropriate enrollment baseline. Several participants challenged projections that appeared to count students living within Toki's attendance area as though they attended Toki, even when some were enrolled at Spring Harbor or Gillespie. Respondents argued that separating actual enrollment from attendance area residence would provide a more accurate understanding of current capacity and the need for additional facilities. |
| Doyle Administration Building | 13 | Neighborhood School Access | Student experience: Closest assigned school 8 (62%)<br>Attendance planning: Proximity to home 8 (62%)<br>Programming: International Baccalaureate: Global framework focused on critical thinking and inquiry / Additional Dual Language Immersion: Expanded language-immersion programs (tie) 3 (23%)<br>Sprecher: support 13 (100%)<br>Acacia Ridge: support 13 (100%)<br>Repurposing: support 12 (92%)<br>Goals: highest favorable 4K classroom space 13 (100%); lowest favorable Expanded programming through repurposing 7 (54%) | Doyle respondents offered a particularly useful perspective on the tradeoffs between neighborhood school access and the district's ability to create more integrated and appropriately sized schools. One participant argued that maintaining entire neighborhoods within the same attendance areas could restrict the district's ability to distribute students more equitably, suggesting that some additional travel might allow greater demographic integration and flexibility in future planning. |

| School or Building | Associated Respondents | Key Finding | Supporting Evidence | Summary of Feedback |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Lowell Elementary | 12 | Enrollment and Facility Planning | Student experience: Closest assigned school 4 (33%)<br>Attendance planning: Proximity to home 5 (45%)<br>Programming: Additional Dual Language Immersion: Expanded language-immersion programs 4 (33%)<br>Sprecher: support 9 (75%)<br>Acacia Ridge: support 8 (67%)<br>Repurposing: support 6 (50%)<br>Goals: highest favorable<br>Boundary adjustments for new construction 7 (58%); lowest favorable Expanded programming through repurposing 3 (25%) | Lowell's feedback introduces a more fundamental question about whether attendance area planning is adequately connected to differences in educational quality across MMSD schools. Several respondents argued that classroom conditions, instructional effectiveness, and the availability of student supports should carry greater weight than the physical capacity of buildings alone. One participant described larger classes and insufficient instructional space as contributing to teacher burnout and reduced opportunities for individualized attention, while also noting that enrollment changes can affect funding and services tied to student counts. |

Themes by School/Building

| School or Building | Associated Respondents | Key Finding | Supporting Evidence | Summary of Feedback |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Marquette Elementary | 11 | Neighborhood School Access | Student experience: Closest assigned school 5 (45%)<br>Attendance planning: Continuity 4 (44%)<br>Programming: Other (Please add info) 3 (38%)<br>Sprecher: support 4 (36%), oppose 4 (36%)<br>Acacia Ridge: support 5 (45%)<br>Repurposing: support 1 (9%), oppose 10 (91%)<br>Goals: highest favorable 4K classroom space 8 (73%); lowest favorable Expanded programming through repurposing 2 (20%) | Marquette's feedback provides a particularly strong defense of the educational structure and community relationships associated with the Lapham and Marquette paired school model. Participants described the arrangement as supporting developmentally appropriate instruction, with teachers at each building developing expertise in the specific age groups they serve. Others emphasized that the pairing brings together students from different neighborhoods and backgrounds, creating opportunities for demographic integration that might be weakened through a conventional neighborhood assignment model. |

Themes by School/Building

| School or Building | Associated Respondents | Key Finding | Supporting Evidence | Summary of Feedback |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Chavez/Sánchez Elementary | 10 | Educational Programming and Access | Student experience: Closest assigned school / Balanced school size (tie) 2 (20%) Attendance planning: Proximity to home 4 (44%) Programming: Focus on Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math 3 (30%) Sprecher: support 5 (56%) Acacia Ridge: support 6 (67%) Repurposing: support 6 (60%) Goals: highest favorable Boundary adjustments for new construction 9 (100%); lowest favorable Expanded programming through repurposing 5 (56%) | Chavez/Sánchez respondents raised a particularly important distinction between preserving access to established educational programs and improving the quality of instruction available to all students. One family emphasized that continuing dual language immersion was essential for its children, while another questioned how future attendance area changes would affect program selection and participation. However, a different parent whose children attended a school offering dual language immersion expressed dissatisfaction with the academic experience outside the specialized program, arguing that core instruction needed greater attention before additional resources were directed toward separate educational models. |

Themes by School/Building

| School or Building | Associated Respondents | Key Finding | Supporting Evidence | Summary of Feedback |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Nuestro Mundo Elementary | 10 | Enrollment and Facility Planning | Student experience: Specialized programming choice / Closest assigned school (tie) 3 (30%) Attendance planning: Proximity to home 7 (70%) Programming: International Baccalaureate: Global framework focused on critical thinking and inquiry / Additional Dual Language Immersion: Expanded language-immersion programs (tie) 3 (30%) Sprecher: support 7 (70%) Acacia Ridge: support 6 (60%) Repurposing: support 8 (80%) Goals: highest favorable Maintain 75% to 85% utilization 10 (100%); lowest favorable Expanded programming through repurposing 4 (40%) | Nuestro Mundo's feedback identifies a planning issue that may not be apparent when evaluating schools primarily through geographic attendance boundaries. Participants questioned how the proposed scenarios would affect Nuestro Mundo and other charter or specialized schools that draw students from multiple neighborhoods, particularly when those schools were not explicitly discussed in the presentations. One respondent emphasized that Nuestro Mundo's dual language model depends on maintaining an appropriate balance between native Spanish speakers and students learning Spanish, and questioned how boundary adjustments could influence enrollment demographics, transportation, and access to after school services. |
| Spring Harbor Middle | 10 | Enrollment and Facility Planning | Student experience: Closest assigned school 6 (60%) Attendance planning: Proximity to home 7 (70%) Programming: Focus on Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math 3 (30%) Sprecher: support 8 (80%) Acacia Ridge: support 9 (90%) Repurposing: support 9 (90%) Goals: highest favorable Boundary adjustments for new construction 7 (70%); lowest favorable Expanded programming through repurposing 5 (50%) | Spring Harbor's feedback demonstrates that future middle school planning must account for both the timing of residential growth and the educational conditions families expect from secondary schools. One participant argued that planning should consider Madison's projected population growth through 2050 and test attendance scenarios against different assumptions about housing development, household characteristics, and future enrollment. |

Themes by School/Building

| School or Building | Associated Respondents | Key Finding | Supporting Evidence | Summary of Feedback |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Muir Elementary | 9 | Enrollment and Facility Planning | Student experience: Balanced school size 3 (33%)<br>Attendance planning: Proximity to home 4 (44%)<br>Programming: Focus on Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math 3 (43%)<br>Sprecher: support 5 (62%), neutral 3 (38%)<br>Acacia Ridge: support 4 (50%), neutral 4 (50%)<br>Repurposing: support 4 (50%), neutral 3 (38%)<br>Goals: highest favorable Boundary adjustments for new construction 6 (75%); lowest favorable Expanded programming through repurposing 3 (38%) | Muir's feedback presents one of the more direct challenges to the district's proposed approach to demographic equity and enrollment redistribution. |
| Whitehorse Middle | 9 | Enrollment and Facility Planning | Student experience: Closest assigned school 4 (57%)<br>Attendance planning: Utilization balance / Proximity to home (tie) 3 (38%)<br>Programming: Montessori: Child-centered, self-directed, hands-on learning 3 (38%)<br>Sprecher: support 7 (78%)<br>Acacia Ridge: support 5 (62%), oppose 3 (38%)<br>Repurposing: support 6 (67%)<br>Goals: highest favorable 4K classroom space 7 (100%); lowest favorable Maintain 75% to 85% utilization 6 (86%) | Whitehorse's feedback places instructional capacity at the center of attendance area planning. Participants described overcrowded schools as environments where teachers may struggle to provide individualized attention, particularly when classrooms include students with substantial academic or behavioral needs. |

Themes by School/Building

| School or Building | Associated Respondents | Key Finding | Supporting Evidence | Summary of Feedback |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Henderson Elementary | 8 | Neighborhood School Access | Student experience: Diverse student populations 4 (50%)<br>Attendance planning: Diversity 3 (38%)<br>Programming: Focus on Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math / Additional Dual Language Immersion: Expanded language-immersion programs (tie) 2 (25%)<br>Sprecher: support 7 (88%)<br>Acacia Ridge: support 7 (88%)<br>Repurposing: support 6 (75%)<br>Goals: highest favorable 4K classroom space 6 (75%); lowest favorable Maintain 75% to 85% utilization 5 (62%) | Henderson's feedback places particular emphasis on whether future attendance area changes would preserve and strengthen demographic diversity rather than reinforce existing residential divisions. Participants described diverse classrooms as valuable for developing relationships across racial, linguistic, and socioeconomic backgrounds, with one respondent explicitly advocating more integrated learning environments even when that required reconsidering existing boundaries. |
| Huegel Elementary | 8 | Enrollment and Facility Planning | Student experience: Balanced school size / Closest assigned school (tie) 3 (38%)<br>Attendance planning: Proximity to home 4 (50%)<br>Programming: Additional Dual Language Immersion: Expanded language-immersion programs 3 (38%)<br>Sprecher: support 8 (100%)<br>Acacia Ridge: support 8 (100%)<br>Repurposing: support 6 (75%)<br>Goals: highest favorable Maintain 75% to 85% utilization 6 (86%); lowest favorable Expanded programming through repurposing 4 (50%) | Huegel's responses illustrate how neighborhood access and enrollment efficiency can be considered together rather than treated as opposing objectives. One participant described neighborhood schools as places where students maintain friendships beyond the classroom, interact with peers at parks and community activities, and develop a stronger sense of belonging. The same response connected shorter school trips with student well being, noting that long bus rides can leave children tired and increase transportation costs and environmental impacts. |

Themes by School/Building

| School or Building | Associated Respondents | Key Finding | Supporting Evidence | Summary of Feedback |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Anana Elementary | 7 | Educational Programming and Access | Student experience: Balanced school size 3 (43%)<br>Attendance planning: Utilization balance 3 (43%)<br>Programming: International Baccalaureate: Global framework focused on critical thinking and inquiry 3 (43%)<br>Sprecher: support 5 (71%)<br>Acacia Ridge: support 6 (86%)<br>Repurposing: support 5 (71%)<br>Goals: highest favorable Scenarios without boundary adjustments 4 (67%); lowest favorable Expanded programming through repurposing 3 (50%) | Anana's responses identify an equity concern within existing educational programming that is not fully captured by schoolwide enrollment measures. One participant described differences of as many as 10 students between ELI and DLI classrooms, alongside the additional instructional demands associated with students receiving individualized education services. The respondent questioned why DLI enrollment appeared to receive greater attention to classroom balance while ELI classes continued to experience larger student populations. |
| Hawthorne Elementary | 7 | Neighborhood School Access | Student experience: Closest assigned school 3 (50%)<br>Attendance planning: Proximity to home 4 (67%)<br>Programming: Focus on Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math / Additional Dual Language Immersion: Expanded language-immersion programs (tie) 2 (29%)<br>Sprecher: support 7 (100%)<br>Acacia Ridge: support 6 (86%)<br>Repurposing: support 5 (71%)<br>Goals: highest favorable Boundary adjustments for new construction 5 (71%); lowest favorable 4K classroom space 3 (43%) | Hawthorne's most distinctive concern involves the configuration of its attendance area and the consequences of separating neighborhoods that respondents consider geographically connected. One participant questioned why the proposed boundaries continued to isolate portions of the Far East Side and require children to cross Highway 51 to attend school. The same respondent advocated keeping the Glacier Hill and Ridgewood neighborhoods together, arguing that the existing configuration was difficult to justify without a clearer explanation of its educational or demographic purpose. |

Themes by School/Building

| School or Building | Associated Respondents | Key Finding | Supporting Evidence | Summary of Feedback |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Leopold Elementary | 7 | Neighborhood School Access | Student experience: Specialized programming choice 3 (43%)<br>Attendance planning: Proximity to home / Diversity (tie) 3 (43%)<br>Programming: Focus on Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math 3 (43%)<br>Sprecher: support 6 (86%)<br>Acacia Ridge: support 6 (86%)<br>Repurposing: support 5 (71%)<br>Goals: highest favorable 4K classroom space 3 (43%); lowest favorable Boundary adjustments for new construction 2 (29%) | Leopold's feedback illustrates how neighborhood accessibility and demographic diversity can reinforce one another when attendance boundaries are designed around students' educational and social experiences. One parent emphasized the importance of children seeing peers who share their racial and cultural backgrounds while also developing friendships with students living nearby. Another described neighborhood schools as essential community institutions, while a different respondent acknowledged that achieving greater diversity may require some families to travel farther. |
| Shorewood Elementary | 7 | Neighborhood School Access | Student experience: Closest assigned school 3 (43%)<br>Attendance planning: Proximity to home 4 (67%)<br>Programming: Focus on Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math / Additional Dual Language Immersion: Expanded language-immersion programs (tie) 2 (33%)<br>Sprecher: support 5 (83%)<br>Acacia Ridge: support 5 (83%)<br>Repurposing: support 5 (83%)<br>Goals: highest favorable Maintain 75% to 85% utilization 4 (67%); lowest favorable Expanded programming through repurposing 2 (33%) | Shorewood's feedback illustrates a fundamental disagreement about the role neighborhood proximity should play in creating equitable school communities. Several respondents described walking to school as an important part of family life, allowing children to develop friendships with nearby classmates and participate in neighborhood activities beyond the school day. One parent explained that access to a walkable elementary school had influenced their decision to purchase a home, while another questioned the transportation burdens associated with the Midvale and Lincoln paired school arrangement. |

Themes by School/Building

| School or Building | Associated Respondents | Key Finding | Supporting Evidence | Summary of Feedback |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Lori Mann Carey Elementary | 6 | Enrollment and Facility Planning | Student experience: Closest assigned school 4 (80%)<br>Attendance planning: Continuity / Proximity to home (tie) 2 (33%)<br>Programming: Focus on Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math / Focus on visual arts, music, drama, and performance (tie) 2 (33%)<br>Sprecher: support 6 (100%)<br>Acacia Ridge: support 6 (100%)<br>Repurposing: support 3 (50%)<br>Goals: 4K classroom space favorable 5 (83%) | The most notable distinction in Lori Mann Carey's results is the difference between strong support for new construction and a more balanced set of priorities regarding attendance area planning. This suggests that respondents were open to investments intended to address enrollment pressures without identifying a single principle that should determine how boundaries are adjusted. |
| Gompers Elementary | 5 | Enrollment and Facility Planning | Student experience: Closest assigned school 3 (60%)<br>Attendance planning: Proximity to home 4 (80%)<br>Programming: Focus on Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math 4 (80%)<br>Sprecher: support 5 (100%)<br>Acacia Ridge: support 5 (100%)<br>Repurposing: support 4 (80%)<br>Goals: highest favorable Maintain 75% to 85% utilization 5 (100%); lowest favorable Expanded programming through repurposing 3 (60%) | Gompers' feedback emphasizes the importance of considering how attendance area decisions affect families' daily experiences rather than evaluating proximity solely as a geographic measure. One working parent described wanting their child to travel independently and safely to school while maintaining access to strong educational opportunities. The respondent questioned why families should have to choose between manageable enrollment, reasonable travel distances, and educational quality when those conditions should be foundational to school planning. |

Themes by School/Building

| School or Building | Associated Respondents | Key Finding | Supporting Evidence | Summary of Feedback |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Lindbergh/Erlanger Elementary | 4 | Enrollment and Facility Planning | Student experience: Balanced school size 3 (75%)<br>Attendance planning: Utilization balance 3 (75%)<br>Programming: Additional Dual Language Immersion: Expanded language-immersion programs / Other (Please add info) (tie) 1 (25%)<br>Sprecher: support 3 (75%)<br>Acacia Ridge: support 3 (75%)<br>Repurposing: support 2 (50%), oppose 2 (50%)<br>Goals: highest favorable 4K classroom space 2 (67%); lowest favorable Scenarios without boundary adjustments 1 (33%) | The most consequential finding from Lindbergh/Erlanger concerns the distinction between improving building utilization and creating appropriate classroom conditions. One participant specifically advocated smaller class sizes in 4K through Grade 2, explaining that these conditions could reduce stress for students and staff, improve engagement, and establish stronger foundations for learning. |
| Sherman Middle | 4 | Educational Programming and Access | Student experience: Balanced school size 2 (50%)<br>Attendance planning: Proximity to home 3 (75%)<br>Programming: Additional Dual Language Immersion: Expanded language-immersion programs 2 (50%)<br>Sprecher: support 2 (50%), neutral 2 (50%)<br>Acacia Ridge: support 2 (50%), neutral 2 (50%)<br>Repurposing: support 1 (25%), neutral 2 (50%)<br>Goals: highest favorable 4K classroom space 3 (75%); lowest favorable Expanded programming through repurposing 1 (25%) | Sherman's feedback identifies a tension between maintaining accessible neighborhood schools and ensuring that schools enroll enough students to sustain effective educational programs. One respondent emphasized that children should be able to reach school without relying on a car and develop relationships with peers living nearby. Another prioritized avoiding overcrowded classrooms and maintaining access to educational opportunities. |

Themes by School/Building

| School or Building | Associated Respondents | Key Finding | Supporting Evidence | Summary of Feedback |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Wright Middle | 4 | Enrollment and Facility Planning | Student experience: Balanced school size 2 (67%)<br>Attendance planning: Utilization balance 2 (67%)<br>Programming: Additional Dual Language Immersion: Expanded language-immersion programs 2 (50%)<br>Sprecher: support 3 (75%)<br>Acacia Ridge: support 3 (75%)<br>Repurposing: support 3 (75%)<br>Goals: highest favorable Boundary adjustments for new construction 3 (75%); lowest favorable Expanded programming through repurposing 1 (25%) | Wright's feedback highlights the importance of evaluating enrollment balance through actual instructional conditions rather than building capacity alone. One respondent who identified as both a parent and MMSD employee described overcrowding as a significant concern, while acknowledging the importance of neighborhood schools, diversity, and reasonable travel times. The participant supported taking a long term approach to boundary planning, particularly given the length of time since the district's previous comprehensive boundary review. |
| Badger Rock Middle | 3 | School Planning Priorities | Student experience: Specialized programming choice / Diverse student populations (tie) 1 (33%)<br>Attendance planning: Diversity / Proximity to home (tie) 1 (33%)<br>Programming: Additional Dual Language Immersion: Expanded language-immersion programs 2 (67%)<br>Sprecher: support 3 (100%)<br>Acacia Ridge: support 3 (100%)<br>Repurposing: support 3 (100%)<br>Goals: highest favorable 4K classroom space 2 (67%); lowest favorable Maintain 75% to 85% utilization 0 (0%) | The most geographically specific feedback concerned the Cherokee and Hamilton middle school attendance areas. One respondent proposed using Midvale Boulevard as a clearer dividing line, assigning students east of the road to Cherokee and those west of it to Hamilton. The participant argued that this would improve utilization, reduce the need to cross a busy street, and allow students living near one another to attend the same school. |

Themes by School/Building

| School or Building | Associated Respondents | Key Finding | Supporting Evidence | Summary of Feedback |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Black Hawk Middle | 3 | Educational Programming and Access | Student experience: Closest assigned school / Balanced school size (tie) 1 (33%)<br>Attendance planning: Proximity to home 2 (67%)<br>Programming: Focus on Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math 2 (67%)<br>Sprecher: support 3 (100%)<br>Acacia Ridge: support 3 (100%)<br>Repurposing: support 1 (33%)<br>Goals: highest favorable 4K classroom space 3 (100%); lowest favorable Expanded programming through repurposing 1 (50%) | Black Hawk's feedback identifies competing perspectives on the relationship between neighborhood schools and equitable educational access. One respondent emphasized that attending school with nearby children helps students develop relationships extending beyond the classroom and argued that schools should have sufficient instructional resources to serve their existing communities. The same participant expressed concern that concentrating specialized programming at selected locations could create additional differences between students who participate in those programs and those remaining in general education. |

| School or Building | Associated Respondents | Key Finding | Supporting Evidence | Summary of Feedback |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Holtzman Administration Building | 3 | Enrollment and Facility Planning | Student experience: Closest assigned school / Balanced school size (tie) 1 (33%) Attendance planning: Proximity to home 2 (67%) Programming: Montessori: Child-centered, self-directed, hands-on learning 2 (67%) Sprecher: support 2 (67%) Acacia Ridge: support 3 (100%) Repurposing: support 2 (67%) Goals: highest favorable Boundary adjustments for new construction 2 (67%); lowest favorable 4K classroom space 1 (33%) | Holtzman's feedback raises specific concerns about whether proposed attendance area changes would improve educational access and enrollment conditions across neighboring schools. One respondent questioned assigning students living approximately half a block from Nuestro Mundo to Lori Mann Carey or potentially Henderson, arguing that children living within walking distance of a school should not be required to travel substantially farther without a clear justification. The same participant opposed a proposed reduction of approximately 100 students at Mendota, emphasizing the disruption to established school relationships and the importance of continuity for children. |

Themes by School/Building

| School or Building | Associated Respondents | Key Finding | Supporting Evidence | Summary of Feedback |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Sandburg Elementary | 3 | Neighborhood School Access | Student experience: Balanced school size / Short trip to school (tie) 1 (50%)<br>Attendance planning: Utilization balance / Proximity to home (tie) 1 (50%)<br>Programming: Additional Dual Language Immersion: Expanded language-immersion programs / Montessori: Child-centered, self-directed, hands-on learning (tie) 1 (33%)<br>Sprecher: support 3 (100%)<br>Acacia Ridge: support 2 (67%)<br>Repurposing: support 2 (67%)<br>Goals: highest favorable Boundary adjustments for new construction 3 (100%); lowest favorable 4K classroom space 2 (67%) | Sandburg's feedback provides a specific perspective on the relationship between neighborhood schools, attendance, and educational integration. One respondent described how their children benefited from attending a diverse neighborhood elementary school that offered dual language immersion, emphasizing that learning alongside students from different backgrounds contributed to their social development and understanding of others. The same participant argued that assigning students to nearby schools supports regular attendance, which is essential to learning regardless of building utilization. |
| Pflaum Administration Building | 2 | Facility Planning and Community Impacts | Student experience: Closest assigned school / Short trip to school (tie) 1 (50%)<br>Attendance planning: Continuity / Proximity to home (tie) 1 (50%)<br>Programming: Montessori: Child-centered, self-directed, hands-on learning / Focus on Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math (tie) 1 (50%)<br>Sprecher: support 2 (100%)<br>Acacia Ridge: support 2 (100%)<br>Repurposing: support 2 (100%)<br>Goals: 4K classroom space favorable 2 (100%) | Pflaum's findings are distinguished by the consistency of the scenario and approach evaluations despite differences in individual planning priorities. Both respondents favorably assessed all 5 scenario goals and supported all 3 facility approaches, suggesting that neither viewed construction and repurposing as mutually exclusive strategies. However, their rankings demonstrate different perspectives on how attendance boundaries should be evaluated. |

| School or Building | Associated Respondents | Key Finding | Supporting Evidence | Summary of Feedback |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Capital High | 1 | Educational Programming and Access | Student experience: Specialized programming choice 1 (100%)<br>Attendance planning: Continuity 1 (100%)<br>Programming: Additional Dual Language Immersion: Expanded language-immersion programs 1 (100%)<br>Sprecher: support 1 (100%)<br>Acacia Ridge: support 1 (100%)<br>Repurposing: support 0 (0%), neutral 1 (100%)<br>Goals: 4K classroom space favorable 1 (100%) | Capital High's results identify an individual preference for preserving attendance area continuity while maintaining access to specialized educational opportunities. The respondent ranked programming options first for student experience, but placed continuity ahead of proximity, utilization, and diversity when considering attendance area planning. This distinction suggests that educational choice and stable school assignments were both valued, although the results do not explain how the participant would resolve potential conflicts between those priorities. |
| Metro School Middle and High | 1 | Enrollment and Facility Planning | Student experience: Balanced school size 1 (100%)<br>Attendance planning: Proximity to home 1 (100%)<br>Programming: Focus on Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math 1 (100%)<br>Sprecher: support 1 (100%)<br>Acacia Ridge: support 1 (100%)<br>Repurposing: support 0 (0%), neutral 1 (100%)<br>Goals: 4K classroom space favorable 1 (100%) | The most consequential finding is the respondent's emphasis on instructional conditions rather than facility expansion as an objective in itself. Appropriately sized enrollment received the highest student experience ranking, while proximity and utilization occupied the first 2 attendance area planning positions. The written explanations reinforced this relationship, with the participant expressing a preference for the lowest feasible student to teacher ratio at a school located close to home. |

## School or Building

The School or Building column identifies the MMSD location associated with each group of responses. Schools and buildings are organized by participation level to help readers understand the amount of feedback available for individual locations. These associations reflect respondents' reported connections to each school or building rather than a representative sample of its broader community.

## Associated Respondents

The Associated Respondents column shows the total number of survey participants who identified a connection to each school or building. This includes respondents who selected the location as a school where they work or where their child attends. These totals reflect overall participation associated with each location and are not separated by participant type. Because not every participant answered every question, the number of responses used to calculate individual findings may vary.

## Key Finding

The Key Finding column identifies the primary planning consideration emerging from responses associated with each school or building. These findings reflect recurring concerns related to neighborhood school access, enrollment and facility planning, student stability, educational programming, and school planning priorities. The classifications highlight the most relevant issue for each location without suggesting that other planning considerations were unimportant.

## Supporting Evidence

For ranking questions, 1st, 2nd, and 3rd identify the most frequently selected response option at each respective ranking position. For new school construction and facility repurposing, Support combines Strongly Support and Somewhat Support responses, Oppose combines Strongly Oppose and Somewhat Oppose responses, and Neutral represents Neutral / Undecided responses.

For the 5 Scenario Planning Goals, Favorable combines Extremely Well, Very Well, and Somewhat Well ratings. Less Favorable combines Slightly Well and Not Well at All ratings, while Insufficient Information represents respondents who indicated they did not have enough information to evaluate the goal. Percentages are calculated using valid responses to each question and may vary across measures.

## Summary of Feedback

The Summary of Feedback column interprets the quantitative results alongside relevant written comments from respondents associated with each school or building. These summaries identify school specific concerns, explain how proposed changes may affect educational experiences, and highlight differences between broader planning objectives and local priorities. Findings from schools with limited participation should be interpreted cautiously, as individual responses may have a substantial influence on the results.

# Themes by Race/Ethnicity

Examining feedback by race and ethnicity provides additional insight into how respondents evaluated attendance area planning, educational programming, and proposed facility approaches. This analysis identifies areas of agreement and differences in priorities related to neighborhood access, demographic diversity, student stability, and resource allocation. Quantitative findings are considered alongside written feedback to provide context for how proposed changes may affect different communities.

A total of 726 respondents identified their race or ethnicity, resulting in 762 selections, as participants could select more than one category. Respondents who selected multiple categories are included in the findings for each applicable group. Results should be interpreted in relation to participation levels, particularly for groups with fewer responses, and should not be considered representative of broader racial or ethnic communities. Categories with no recorded responses are not analyzed due to insufficient data. These findings are intended to inform equitable scenario development while recognizing that perspectives may vary within each group.

| Response Options | Count | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 6 | 1% |
| Asian / Asian American | 29 | 4% |
| Black / African American | 19 | 3% |
| Hispanic/Latino/Latina/Latinx | 40 | 6% |
| Two or More Races/Multiracial | 28 | 4% |
| Pacific Islander or Native Hawaiian | 0 | 0% |
| White | 516 | 71% |
| Prefer not to respond | 124 | 17% |
| Total* | 726 | 100% |

*Race and ethnicity percentages are based only on respondents who answered the demographic question. Percentages throughout the remaining report may differ because not all respondents answered every survey question.

## American Indian or Alaska Native

A total of 6 respondents identified as American Indian or Alaska Native. Their feedback reflected varied priorities concerning neighborhood accessibility, student stability, educational programming, and facility investments. Given the small number of respondents, the results provide individual perspectives rather than evidence of broader community preferences.

| Key Finding | Supporting Evidence | Summary of Feedback |
|---|---|---|
| Student Experience Priorities | 1st (tied): Closest school, 2 (33%).<br>1st (tied): Access to programming options, 2 (33%).<br>2nd (tied): Closest school, 2 (33%).<br>2nd (tied): Short trip to school, 2 (33%).<br>3rd (tied): Diverse student populations, 3 (50%).<br>3rd (tied): Appropriately sized enrollment, 3 (50%). | Rankings were divided between neighborhood accessibility and educational programming. Diversity and appropriate enrollment levels shared the third position, indicating that the participating respondents considered multiple characteristics of the student experience rather than consistently emphasizing a single priority. |
| Attendance Area Planning Priorities | 1st (tied): Proximity, 2 (33%).<br>1st (tied): Continuity, 2 (33%).<br>2nd (tied): Diversity, 2 (33%).<br>2nd (tied): Utilization, 2 (33%).<br>3rd: Utilization, 3 (50%). | Respondents expressed varied preferences for preserving existing assignments and addressing enrollment distribution. Written comments connected these priorities to transportation accessibility, established student relationships, and the potential effects of boundary adjustments on families. |
| Educational Programming Priorities | 1st: STEM, 3 (50%).<br>2nd (tied): STEM, 2 (33%).<br>2nd (tied): Additional Dual Language Immersion, 2 (33%).<br>3rd: Montessori, 2 (33%). | STEM received the most first place selections, while STEM and dual language immersion tied for second. Written feedback emphasized the importance of preparing teachers to use new technology effectively and maintaining arts education alongside expanded academic programming. |

Themes by Race/Ethnicity

| Key Finding | Supporting Evidence | Summary of Feedback |
|---|---|---|
| New School Construction | Sprecher Elementary: 4 support (67%).<br>Sprecher Elementary: 1 oppose (17%).<br>Sprecher Elementary: 1 neutral (17%).<br>Acacia Ridge Middle: 5 support (83%).<br>Acacia Ridge Middle: 1 oppose (17%).<br>Acacia Ridge Middle: 0 neutral (0%). | Acacia Ridge received the strongest support among the proposed approaches. Written feedback emphasized accommodating growth in developing neighborhoods while continuing to modernize existing schools and maintain accessible educational opportunities. |
| Facility Repurposing | Support: 4 (67%).<br>Oppose: 1 (17%).<br>Neutral: 1 (17%). | Repurposing received more support than opposition, although written feedback raised questions about educational access, maintaining established programs, and the effects of changing existing facilities. |
| Scenario Planning Goals | Kindergarten classroom availability: 4 favorable (67%).<br>School utilization: 4 favorable (67%).<br>Boundary adjustments for new construction: 4 favorable (67%).<br>Facility repurposing: 4 favorable (67%). | Several planning goals received the same favorable rating, while utilization and boundary adjustments for new construction also received 33% unfavorable ratings. These mixed assessments suggest that respondents considered both potential facility improvements and the consequences of implementation. |

## Asian / Asian American

A total of 29 respondents identified as Asian or Asian American. Their feedback emphasized neighborhood accessibility, student stability, and educational programming, with additional concerns about demographic integration and culturally responsive learning opportunities. Respondents expressed varied perspectives on whether attendance area adjustments and facility repurposing would improve educational access.

| Key Finding | Supporting Evidence | Summary of Feedback |
|---|---|---|
| Student Experience Priorities | 1st: Closest school, 12 (44%).<br>2nd: Short trip to school, 8 (30%).<br>3rd: Diverse student populations, 11 (41%). | Respondents prioritized geographic accessibility and manageable travel times while also valuing diverse learning environments. Written feedback emphasized preserving established school relationships and evaluating how proposed assignments could affect neighborhood connections. |
| Attendance Area Planning Priorities | 1st: Proximity, 14 (54%).<br>2nd: Continuity, 10 (38%).<br>3rd: Utilization, 10 (38%). | Proximity and continuity led the first 2 positions, while enrollment utilization received the most third place selections. These findings suggest that respondents considered school accessibility and student stability alongside the district's responsibility to manage enrollment distribution. |
| Educational Programming Priorities | 1st (tied): Additional Dual Language Immersion, 7 (25%).<br>1st (tied): STEM, 7 (25%).<br>2nd: STEM, 8 (29%).<br>3rd (tied): Additional Dual Language Immersion, 8 (29%).<br>3rd (tied): Visual and performing arts, 8 (29%). | Respondents expressed interest in language immersion, STEM, and arts education. Written feedback also highlighted the importance of maintaining home languages, including Hmong, and ensuring that specialized programs remain accessible to students from different backgrounds. |

Themes by Race/Ethnicity

| Key Finding | Supporting Evidence | Summary of Feedback |
|---|---|---|
| New School Construction | Sprecher Elementary: 14 support (50%).<br>Sprecher Elementary: 5 oppose (17%).<br>Sprecher Elementary: 9 neutral (31%).<br>Acacia Ridge Middle: 16 support (57%).<br>Acacia Ridge Middle: 4 oppose (14%).<br>Acacia Ridge Middle: 8 neutral (28%). | Acacia Ridge received somewhat greater support than Sprecher, although both approaches generated substantial neutrality. Feedback reflected concerns about the effects of construction and boundary changes on existing schools, transportation, and neighborhood stability. |
| Facility Repurposing | Support: 16 (57%).<br>Oppose: 7 (24%).<br>Neutral: 5 (17%). | Repurposing received more support than opposition, but its scenario goal rating was less favorable. Respondents raised questions about whether specialized facilities would broaden educational opportunities or create additional barriers for families with limited school choice options. |
| Scenario Planning Goals | Kindergarten classroom availability: 19 favorable (70%).<br>School utilization: 18 favorable (67%).<br>Scenarios without boundary adjustments: 15 favorable (58%).<br>Boundary adjustments for new construction: 15 favorable (56%). | Kindergarten classroom availability and school utilization received the strongest favorable assessments. Ratings were more divided for boundary adjustments and facility repurposing, indicating reservations about how proposed changes could affect existing school communities. |

## Black / African American

A total of 19 respondents identified as Black or African American. Their responses emphasized neighborhood accessibility, continuity of existing attendance areas, and appropriate school enrollment. Educational programming preferences were distributed across several models, while both new school construction approaches received substantial support.

| Key Finding | Supporting Evidence | Summary of Feedback |
|---|---|---|
| Student Experience Priorities | 1st: Closest school, 9 (60%).<br>2nd: Short trip to school, 6 (40%).<br>3rd: Appropriately sized enrollment, 6 (40%). | Respondents prioritized nearby schools and shorter travel times while recognizing the importance of manageable enrollment. These findings connect neighborhood accessibility with the educational conditions students experience within individual schools. |
| Attendance Area Planning Priorities | 1st: Continuity, 7 (50%).<br>2nd: Proximity, 5 (36%).<br>3rd: Utilization, 5 (36%). | Continuity received the most first place selections, indicating interest in minimizing changes to existing attendance areas. Proximity and utilization followed, suggesting that respondents also considered geographic access and enrollment balance when evaluating potential adjustments. |
| Educational Programming Priorities | 1st (tied): Montessori, 3 (21%).<br>1st (tied): Visual and performing arts, 3 (21%).<br>1st (tied): International Baccalaureate, 3 (21%).<br>2nd (tied): Montessori, 4 (29%).<br>2nd (tied): STEM, 4 (29%).<br>3rd (tied): Additional Dual Language Immersion, 4 (29%).<br>3rd (tied): International Baccalaureate, 4 (29%). | Programming preferences were distributed across multiple educational models. Montessori, arts, and International Baccalaureate tied for first, while STEM and dual language immersion also appeared prominently at subsequent positions. No single programming approach established a clear preference within this group. |

Themes by Race/Ethnicity

| Key Finding | Supporting Evidence | Summary of Feedback |
|---|---|---|
| New School Construction | Sprecher Elementary: 14 support (78%).<br>Sprecher Elementary: 2 oppose (11%).<br>Sprecher Elementary: 2 neutral (11%).<br>Acacia Ridge Middle: 14 support (78%).<br>Acacia Ridge Middle: 3 oppose (17%).<br>Acacia Ridge Middle: 1 neutral (6%). | Both construction approaches received equal levels of support. These findings indicate receptiveness among respondents to expanding school capacity, although the small number of participants limits broader interpretation. |
| Facility Repurposing | Support: 12 (67%).<br>Oppose: 2 (11%).<br>Neutral: 4 (22%). | Repurposing received majority support but a lower favorable scenario goal rating than several other planning objectives. This distinction suggests that general support for exploring alternative facility uses did not necessarily indicate satisfaction with how repurposing was reflected in the scenarios. |
| Scenario Planning Goals | Kindergarten classroom availability: 14 favorable (82%).<br>School utilization: 13 favorable (76%).<br>Boundary adjustments for new construction: 12 favorable (71%).<br>Scenarios without boundary adjustments: 11 favorable (65%). | Respondents gave comparatively favorable assessments to kindergarten classroom availability, utilization, and boundary adjustments for new construction. Facility repurposing received a lower favorable rating, reflecting greater reservations about that objective. |

## Hispanic/Latino/Latina/Latinx

A total of 40 respondents identified as Hispanic/Latino/Latina/Latinx. Their feedback reflected interest in neighborhood accessibility, demographic diversity, and expanded educational programming, particularly additional dual language immersion. Respondents generally supported new school construction but expressed more divided assessments of facility repurposing.

| Key Finding | Supporting Evidence | Summary of Feedback |
|---|---|---|
| Student Experience Priorities | 1st: Closest school, 15 (38%).<br>2nd: Diverse student populations, 18 (45%).<br>3rd: Appropriately sized enrollment, 12 (30%). | Respondents prioritized neighborhood accessibility while placing considerable importance on diverse learning environments and manageable school enrollment. These findings indicate that geographic access, demographic composition, and classroom conditions were relevant considerations for participating families. |
| Attendance Area Planning Priorities | 1st: Proximity, 15 (41%).<br>2nd: Diversity, 16 (43%).<br>3rd (tied): Diversity, 10 (27%).<br>3rd (tied): Continuity, 10 (27%). | Proximity led the first position, while diversity received the most second place selections and tied with continuity for third. This pattern reflects the importance respondents placed on neighborhood accessibility alongside demographic integration and student stability. |
| Educational Programming Priorities | 1st: Additional Dual Language Immersion, 20 (50%).<br>2nd (tied): Montessori, 10 (25%).<br>2nd (tied): International Baccalaureate, 10 (25%).<br>3rd: STEM, 17 (43%). | Additional dual language immersion received the strongest first place programming interest. Montessori and International Baccalaureate tied for second, while STEM led third, demonstrating interest in language learning alongside broader academic and instructional opportunities. |

Themes by Race/Ethnicity

| Key Finding | Supporting Evidence | Summary of Feedback |
|---|---|---|
| New School Construction | Sprecher Elementary: 26 support (68%).<br>Sprecher Elementary: 3 oppose (8%).<br>Sprecher Elementary: 9 neutral (24%).<br>Acacia Ridge Middle: 26 support (68%).<br>Acacia Ridge Middle: 3 oppose (8%).<br>Acacia Ridge Middle: 9 neutral (24%). | Both construction approaches received identical response distributions. Respondents generally supported additional school capacity, although neutrality remained substantial and should not be interpreted as endorsement of specific boundary changes or implementation plans. |
| Facility Repurposing | Support: 23 (61%).<br>Oppose: 10 (26%).<br>Neutral: 5 (13%). | Repurposing received majority support, but respondents were evenly divided in their favorable and unfavorable assessments of how the goal was represented. This suggests that interest in expanded programming did not necessarily translate into satisfaction with the proposed facility approach. |
| Scenario Planning Goals | School utilization: 29 favorable (76%).<br>Kindergarten classroom availability: 26 favorable (68%).<br>Boundary adjustments for new construction: 24 favorable (62%).<br>Scenarios without boundary adjustments: 21 favorable (54%). | School utilization received the highest favorable rating, followed by kindergarten classroom availability. Repurposing generated more divided assessments, indicating that respondents distinguished between supporting broader planning objectives and evaluating how individual approaches were reflected in the scenarios. |

## Two or More Races/Multiracial

A total of 28 respondents identified as Two or More Races/Multiracial. Their responses emphasized neighborhood accessibility, attendance area continuity, and school utilization. While respondents expressed interest in expanded educational programming, support for the 3 proposed facility approaches was more divided than the districtwide results.

| Key Finding | Supporting Evidence | Summary of Feedback |
|---|---|---|
| Student Experience Priorities | 1st: Closest school, 19 (68%).<br>2nd: Short trip to school, 13 (46%).<br>3rd: Short trip to school, 9 (32%). | Geographic accessibility was prominent across the first 3 ranking positions, with the closest school leading first and shorter travel times leading both second and third. These findings emphasize the importance respondents placed on convenient school access and manageable transportation. |
| Attendance Area Planning Priorities | 1st: Proximity, 14 (52%).<br>2nd: Continuity, 16 (59%).<br>3rd: Utilization, 15 (56%). | Respondents prioritized nearby schools and preserving existing attendance areas while recognizing the importance of balancing enrollment. Continuity received a particularly high share of second place selections, indicating substantial emphasis on minimizing changes to established school assignments. |
| Educational Programming Priorities | 1st: Additional Dual Language Immersion, 8 (30%).<br>2nd: STEM, 10 (37%).<br>3rd: Visual and performing arts, 8 (30%). | Programming interests were distributed across language immersion, STEM, and visual and performing arts. These results demonstrate interest in multiple educational models without establishing a dominant preference across all ranking positions. |

| Key Finding | Supporting Evidence | Summary of Feedback |
|---|---|---|
| New School Construction | Sprecher Elementary: 13 support (46%).<br>Sprecher Elementary: 6 oppose (21%).<br>Sprecher Elementary: 9 neutral (32%).<br>Acacia Ridge Middle: 13 support (46%).<br>Acacia Ridge Middle: 7 oppose (25%).<br>Acacia Ridge Middle: 8 neutral (29%). | Both construction approaches received identical support levels below 50%, with substantial neutral responses. These results indicate more divided preferences than those observed districtwide, particularly regarding whether new construction would address existing enrollment and facility needs. |
| Facility Repurposing | Support: 13 (46%).<br>Oppose: 9 (32%).<br>Neutral: 6 (21%). | Repurposing received the same support level as both construction approaches but generated greater opposition. The findings suggest that respondents did not express a clear majority preference for any of the 3 facility strategies. |
| Scenario Planning Goals | School utilization: 17 favorable (65%).<br>Boundary adjustments for new construction: 15 favorable (56%).<br>Kindergarten classroom availability: 15 favorable (54%).<br>Facility repurposing: 13 favorable (48%). | School utilization received the highest favorable assessment, followed by boundary adjustments and kindergarten classroom availability. Repurposing received a lower favorable rating, reflecting more mixed evaluations of alternative facility uses. |

## Pacific Islander or Native Hawaiian

No respondents identified as Pacific Islander or Native Hawaiian during the second round of community engagement. As a result, there is insufficient data to evaluate this group's priorities, perspectives on the proposed facility approaches, or assessments of the scenario planning goals.

## White

A total of 516 respondents identified as White, representing the largest racial or ethnic respondent group. Their feedback emphasized neighborhood school access, attendance area continuity, and manageable enrollment while also reflecting interest in expanded educational programming. Respondents generally supported new school construction but expressed more divided preferences regarding facility repurposing.

| Key Finding | Supporting Evidence | Summary of Feedback |
|---|---|---|
| Student Experience Priorities | 1st: Closest school, 241 (52%).<br>2nd: Short trip to school, 149 (32%).<br>3rd: Appropriately sized enrollment, 134 (29%). | Respondents prioritized attending nearby schools and maintaining manageable travel times. Appropriately sized enrollment followed in the third position, indicating that neighborhood accessibility and school capacity were both relevant considerations when evaluating student experiences. |
| Attendance Area Planning Priorities | 1st: Proximity, 223 (50%).<br>2nd: Continuity, 128 (29%).<br>3rd: Continuity, 165 (37%). | Proximity received the most first place selections, while continuity led both the second and third positions. These results demonstrate emphasis on maintaining accessible schools and minimizing changes to existing attendance areas, although written feedback also recognized broader enrollment and equity considerations. |
| Educational Programming Priorities | 1st: STEM, 124 (28%).<br>2nd: STEM, 130 (29%).<br>3rd: Visual and performing arts, 117 (26%). | STEM received the most selections at both the first and second positions, while visual and performing arts led third. These findings indicate interest in expanding academic and enrichment opportunities, although programming preferences did not necessarily establish support for converting existing neighborhood schools. |

Themes by Race/Ethnicity

| Key Finding | Supporting Evidence | Summary of Feedback |
|---|---|---|
| New School Construction | Sprecher Elementary: 327 support (69%).<br>Sprecher Elementary: 44 oppose (9%).<br>Sprecher Elementary: 104 neutral (22%).<br>Acacia Ridge Middle: 324 support (68%).<br>Acacia Ridge Middle: 46 oppose (10%).<br>Acacia Ridge Middle: 105 neutral (22%). | Both construction approaches received substantial and nearly identical support. Respondents generally recognized the potential benefits of additional capacity while emphasizing the importance of evaluating enrollment projections, transportation, attendance boundaries, and effects on existing schools. |
| Facility Repurposing | Support: 265 (56%).<br>Oppose: 119 (25%).<br>Neutral: 91 (19%). | Repurposing generated more divided feedback than new construction. Although a majority supported exploring alternative facility uses, fewer respondents favorably assessed how the goal was represented, and a substantial share indicated insufficient information. |
| Scenario Planning Goals | Boundary adjustments for new construction: 323 favorable (68%).<br>Kindergarten classroom availability: 307 favorable (64%).<br>School utilization: 292 favorable (61%).<br>Scenarios without boundary adjustments: 276 favorable (59%). | Boundary adjustments for new construction received the highest favorable rating, followed by kindergarten classroom availability and school utilization. Repurposing received the lowest favorable assessment, reflecting greater uncertainty about the educational and operational consequences of converting existing facilities. |

## Prefer not to respond

A total of 124 respondents chose not to disclose their race or ethnicity. Their feedback reflected strong preferences for neighborhood accessibility and attendance area continuity, alongside more varied assessments of facility investments and scenario planning goals. This category represents respondents with undisclosed demographic information rather than a distinct racial or ethnic community.

| Key Finding | Supporting Evidence | Summary of Feedback |
|---|---|---|
| Student Experience Priorities | 1st: Closest school, 77 (66%).<br>2nd: Short trip to school, 49 (42%).<br>3rd: Appropriately sized enrollment, 33 (28%). | Respondents strongly emphasized neighborhood accessibility and shorter travel times, while appropriately sized enrollment followed in the third position. These findings suggest that geographic access and manageable school conditions were leading considerations for participating respondents. |
| Attendance Area Planning Priorities | 1st: Proximity, 77 (65%).<br>2nd: Continuity, 48 (41%).<br>3rd: Utilization, 42 (36%). | Proximity received the most first place selections, followed by continuity and utilization. Respondents emphasized maintaining accessible schools and minimizing disruption while recognizing the importance of balancing enrollment across district facilities. |
| Educational Programming Priorities | 1st: STEM, 32 (28%).<br>2nd: STEM, 27 (24%).<br>3rd: Additional Dual Language Immersion, 31 (27%). | STEM led the first and second positions, while additional dual language immersion received the most third place selections. These findings indicate interest in expanded academic and language programming, although preferences varied across educational models. |

| Key Finding | Supporting Evidence | Summary of Feedback |
|---|---|---|
| New School Construction | Sprecher Elementary: 60 support (50%).<br>Sprecher Elementary: 24 oppose (20%).<br>Sprecher Elementary: 35 neutral (29%).<br>Acacia Ridge Middle: 71 support (60%).<br>Acacia Ridge Middle: 21 oppose (18%).<br>Acacia Ridge Middle: 27 neutral (23%). | Acacia Ridge received greater support than Sprecher, although neutral responses remained substantial for both approaches. Respondents were less decisive about Sprecher construction, indicating varied perspectives on proposed capacity investments. |
| Facility Repurposing | Support: 56 (48%).<br>Oppose: 34 (29%).<br>Neutral: 27 (23%). | Repurposing generated divided feedback, with support below 50% and substantial opposition and neutrality. The low favorable scenario goal rating and high insufficient information response suggest that respondents had reservations about how the approach was represented. |
| Scenario Planning Goals | Boundary adjustments for new construction: 60 favorable (52%).<br>School utilization: 56 favorable (48%).<br>Kindergarten classroom availability: 51 favorable (43%).<br>Scenarios without boundary adjustments: 44 favorable (38%). | Boundary adjustments for new construction received the highest favorable rating, although the remaining planning goals generated more mixed assessments. Facility repurposing received the lowest favorable rating at 29%, reflecting uncertainty and reservations about alternative facility uses. |

## Key Finding

The Key Finding column identifies the planning topic evaluated within each racial or ethnic respondent group. Findings are organized consistently across student experience priorities, attendance area planning priorities, educational programming priorities, new school construction, facility repurposing, and scenario planning goals. This approach supports comparisons across demographic groups while recognizing that respondents within the same category may hold different perspectives.

## Supporting Evidence

For ranking questions, 1st, 2nd, and 3rd identify the most frequently selected response option at each respective ranking position. For new school construction and facility repurposing, Support combines Strongly Support and Somewhat Support responses, Oppose combines Strongly Oppose and Somewhat Oppose responses, and Neutral represents Neutral / Undecided responses.

For the 5 Scenario Planning Goals, Favorable combines Extremely Well, Very Well, and Somewhat Well ratings. Less Favorable combines Slightly Well and Not Well at All ratings, while Insufficient Information represents respondents who indicated they did not have enough information to evaluate the goal. Percentages are calculated using valid responses to each question and may vary across measures.

## Summary of Feedback

The Summary of Feedback column provides interpretation of the quantitative results and incorporates relevant written comments to identify recurring priorities and concerns. These summaries highlight differences in how respondents evaluated neighborhood accessibility, demographic diversity, educational programming, facility investments, and student stability. Findings should be interpreted in relation to participation levels and should not be considered representative of the broader racial or ethnic communities described.

# Conclusion

The second round of community engagement provided Madison Metropolitan School District (MMSD) with additional insight into how participants evaluated proposed attendance area scenarios, new school construction, facility repurposing, and future educational programming opportunities. The findings demonstrate broad support for exploring new school construction, particularly at Acacia Ridge and Sprecher, while revealing more varied perspectives on repurposing existing facilities. Across the responses, participants emphasized that successful facility planning should consider educational quality, neighborhood accessibility, student stability, demographic diversity, and the long term sustainability of district resources. These priorities reinforce the importance of evaluating proposed approaches through both districtwide objectives and their potential effects on individual school communities.

The priority rankings highlighted the importance of proximity to home, continuity of educational experiences, and access to specialized programming. While respondents frequently prioritized neighborhood accessibility, they also recognized the need to address enrollment imbalances, classroom capacity, and differences in educational opportunities across schools. Written feedback further demonstrated that changes intended to improve facility utilization may introduce concerns related to transportation, staffing, demographic composition, and program continuity. These findings suggest that attendance area planning should consider how proposed changes affect students and school communities rather than relying exclusively on enrollment projections or building capacity targets.

An important distinction emerged between support for proposed facility approaches and assessments of how well the scenarios addressed specific planning goals. Although new construction and facility repurposing received more support than opposition, favorable ratings for the Scenario Planning Goals varied, particularly regarding expanded programming through repurposing. These measures reflect different aspects of community feedback and should not be interpreted interchangeably. Support for repurposing does not necessarily indicate that respondents believe the scenarios adequately demonstrate how existing facilities would provide expanded educational opportunities. This distinction highlights the importance of clearly communicating the intended educational benefits, implementation considerations, and potential impacts of each approach.

Analysis by participant type, school affiliation, and race and ethnicity identified additional differences in planning priorities and potential impacts. School-level findings demonstrated that support for districtwide approaches may coexist with concerns about attendance area adjustments, neighborhood continuity, enrollment distribution, and the future use of individual buildings. Similarly, demographic findings highlighted varying perspectives on multilingual education, accessibility, and equitable resource distribution. These results should be interpreted in relation to participation levels and should not be considered representative of every school community or demographic group. Nevertheless, they provide useful insight into issues that may warrant additional examination as MMSD refines its scenarios.

Overall, the findings provide a foundation for the next stage of scenario development by identifying areas of community agreement, competing priorities, and questions requiring further consideration. Future planning should continue examining the relationships among enrollment projections, facility utilization, transportation, educational programming, and equity while communicating how proposed approaches address these interconnected objectives. Incorporating both the quantitative findings and written feedback will help MMSD evaluate potential tradeoffs, strengthen the clarity of future proposals, and support informed decisions that reflect districtwide needs and the experiences of individual school communities.

# Appendix: Free Responses

## Do you have any additional thoughts or information to share?

| |
|---|
| The less students in each school the better. |
| Nothing I can think of at this time. |
| Please ensure allocation adjusts to the number/needs of students in the schools once boundaries are shift. |
| Timeline. After tonight's presentation, I feel concerned about where my Kindergartener will attend for 27/28. I was under the impression that decisions would be made and ready to go fall of 27 |
| It seems like middle schools have capacity for more students gernerally. Could they take on 5th graders to free up room for 4K at schools that don't currently have them? Other districts have middle schools that start at 5th grade, why not Madison? |
| As stated previously, I am concerned by the lack of clarity on the implementation plan or timeline. I believe that students who are currently enrolled in their elementary schools should be grandfathered in or be able to choose to remain at their school site for the remainder of their elementary career. Taking them from their home/local school would cause unnecessary stress and tumult to families who then have to accommodate these changes. It could hinder students learning and social emotional development. The lack of timeline on implementation as a part of these discussions is deeply discouraging and enraging. I do not want my children, who currently attend Ada Deer, to lose access to their home, walkable neighborhood school. I would have more support for these changes if we were to implement them for new enrollment, grandfather in current students and communicate that clearly to the public.<br><br>The lack of conversation or addressing of DLI or charter schools (ie Nuestro Mundo) when discussing enrollment data is also confusing. We know that many of the students in these different enrollment areas are choosing to attend DLI or charter schools, yet it is unclear if this is reflected in our data and counts and projections.<br><br>The focus on providing and expanding 5 day 4K at all sites is also deeply concerning. I understand that this is a great goal to have in the future, but it was clearly communicated that 4 elementary school sites currently don't have the capacity to even host their current 4K classes. Ada Deer is at capacity this and last year because they took Kennedy's 4K classes into their building. If those classes were moved back to Kennedy, then there would be room for the students in the proposed K and J areas to attend their home school. |
| Magnet and charter schools take resources away from schools that needed. |
| Please allow families in the zones being moved to choose between their current school or the proposed school. |
| Is so frustrating how segregated Madison is. It seems impossible to have diverse schools and neighborhood schools. The city needs to build affordable housing for working people,<br>not fancy apartments |
| Keeping elementary cohorts together in MS and then into HS. |
| I'm probably an outlier here, but if Stephen's utilization gets critically low, and there isn't enough interest in special programming, I'm not entirely opposed to closing it. If only it were as easy as moving the building to a new location... |

| |
|---|
| I have reservations about the carving out of section E on the west side plan. I do not feel like there was representation from that block/area of residents. I also worry that carving it out de-diversifies Van Hise given the projections. I would personally prioritize Van Hise's diversity over housing a 4-k program on site. |
| Given that MMSD already owns land in both areas with the highest elementary capacities (east side) and projected growth (west side) and could build new schools there it seems like the correct solution to some of the issues that this review is trying to address. Additionally as those new schools would obviously be new buildings suited to the way schools are used now (and would have air conditioning!) they could be attractive draws for families to attend mmsd. |
| SÁnchez non contiguous needs to be given to Leopold. Steven's should be repurposed and their non contiguous given to the closest school. Thoreau is never going to pull white families out of private schools so it might as well be repurposed as well. |
| I'm a bit concerned that these drafts make Van Hise and Thoreau more White and affluent than they already are. I am curious whether there are any planned affordable housing developments that would potentially change those projections, and how those might be considered in the planning process. I realize that it is not possible to know what future residents racial or ethnic background might be, so hard to project. But I hope MMSD is considering ensuring that planned affordable developments are zoned for schools that do not concentrate low income students. |
| Try to consider the start and stop times of students. Are we sending them in too early? Is the school year long enough? Student to teacher ratios. |
| It is important to reduce any school moves for families that are low income and already deal with a lot of uncertainty in their lives. |
| How did the district come up with orchard ridge being the neighborhood school for Allied neighborhood? Thoreau is just as close and it happened to be the neighborhood school before the neighborhood was split into 2 schools because of Leopolds overcrowding, they pushed Allied kids out of Thoreau and and further west. Orchard ridge already has a neighborhood with meadows neighborhood so allied would then have to go into "their" neighborhood and really orchard ridge would not be a neighborhood school for Allied. Thoreau would make much more sense to be a neighborhood school for allied, allied would not have to share a neighborhood school with another neighborhood or another low income neighborhood |
| Do a better job connecting to communities who are traditionally under represented. Find ways to meet with more families to see what they want and more community stakeholders. |
| MMSD should consider the emotional and psychological well-being of students when making changes to school attendance boundaries. Moving children to a different school can be a very difficult and stressful experience, especially for students who have already experienced bullying or negative experiences at the proposed school. In my daughter's case, being moved to a school where she previously experienced bullying could seriously affect her emotional well-being, sense of safety, and ability to feel comfortable at school. I respectfully ask MMSD to consider each child's individual circumstances and prioritize stability, safety, and mental and emotional well-being before making such significant changes. |
| The underutilized schools on The Isthmus sound be combined and repurposed. |
| Continue to prioritize neighborhood schools and walkability. |
| Please consider strain on families (especially single parent households) with kids going to two different elementary schools in the sister school set up |
| Strongly opposed to repurposing schools to charter schools but support magnet schools. |
| I appreciate that you took parent input into consideration after the first draft scenarios. Our neighborhood (Brentwood Villiage) was going to be moved to a new elementary school. I'm glad to see that the current plan has us staying at Emerson. |

| |
|---|
| I appreciate that the feedback we had for the first draft was considered in this round of drafts. |
| As a VHE parent close to Whitney Way, I would likely pull my kid out of MMSD if the boundary was changed to put us in the Midvale-Lincoln attendance area. It would be impossible for our family, with two parents who work full-time (>40 hrs/wk), to be involved in school activities at Lincoln. Please remember that the vast majority of students no longer have a stay-at-home parent and haven't in decades, which is why focusing on neighborhood schools is crucial if you want families to be involved in schools. |
| You keep bringing up people wanting magnet schools but I am not seeing that reflected in the data. Anecdotally I know many families who opted for private school over MMSD, not because MMSD isn't offering an art school, but because they perceive MMSD is not being rigorous enough and having disruptive classrooms. Address these issues first before launching these expensive magnet school experiments. |
| Lookingbat the proposal for Van Hise, wouldnt it make more sense to re zone the area south of odana and north of the beltline? That area alreadybhas a big transport need, so disruption wouldnt be as big as the area near Sheboygan ave. Please try to minimize existing student changes |
| Aligning support for low income students and families with their population (more social work allocation, for example, in those buildings). |
| The East HS feeder elementaries have capacity, why wouldn't you create scenarios moving kids from Schenk and Kennedy to Lowell and Hawthorne. That seems more fiscally responsible than building another school. Also there is already another school Allis/Nuestro Mundo in that overcrowded area. If there are underutilized buildings, why can't that be relocated to an underutilized to build eastside capacity. Seems like there may actually be options that aren't building brand new.<br><br>The community needs to understand how the shifts will roll out, especially for families who have young elementary students, sibling groups, et . What will the policy around grandfathering? This is essential. If I have a 3 or 4 year old and I don't know what school they'll go to or if they'll have to move midway through elementary school. I'm going to look at other school options so I know for sure what my next few years will look like. |
| I like the idea of having some type of legacy option. It sounds like you can apply for internal transfers but it wasn't clarified if those would always be possible/guaranteed. I live in an area where I would have a child impacted if a new school is not able to be built. That change would be disruptive to them and our household as a whole (start times, distance/bussing, afterschool option, etc). If we knew they could be guaranteed to finish out at their current school, then that scenario would be more palatable. |
| The first goal should be to minimize busing. Remove all split schools and non-contiguous boundaries should be the first priority. All kids who live within a mile and a half of a school should be allowed to attend it. Schools should be adjusted to fit that. Parking and drop off set ups should be designed to reduce the amount of parents driving kids. |
| Looking at the student demographics of schools after the proposed changes, it seems like schools become significantly more segregated racially and economically. How are you using that information to adjust boundaries? |
| Anana is already over-utilized. I can understand the rationale for adding the Olson enrollment area that is being added, but then the boundary redraw is pushing Anana to max capacity, so it seems like some of the Anana enrollment area immediately adjacent to Olson should be moved to Olson |
| MMSD should consider the anticipated demographics and household characteristics of the approximately 100,000 new residents Madison expects by 2050.<br><br>The district should also consider how new school construction, boundary changes, and neighborhood |

| |
|---|
| development may affect where families choose to live. These factors could cause enrollment and building utilization to shift in ways that differ from today's projections. Testing each scenario against multiple long-term demographic and development assumptions would help ensure the final boundaries remain practical as Madison continues to grow and change. |
| I think you all are doing a good job being as thoughtful and intentional with these drafts. I also appreciate the transparency given along with the process. I am very invested in this, and have remained active at each step. |
| I am really surprised by the number of schools that really aren't affected in terms of utilization with the latest round of drafts. It seemed like plenty of schools are still being underutilized and a few are being over-utilized. I know no boundary adjustments are going to make each each hit that ideal utilization, but I thought more of them would be better utilized before considering building more. I also saw that some schools have very high populations of economically disadvantaged students - maybe it's outside the scope of this survey, but what will be done to support those schools? Have resources for behavior and such been taken into account when deciding utilization because we know that even on a class-to-class basis, a room with 10 high behavioral and emotional needs can feel more crowded than a class with 25 students with less of those needs. That feeling is then amplified if those needs are school wide and you've increased the utilization. |
| We are in Van Hise district currently and we strongly oppose the change. We specifically bought our house to be in walking distance of the schools. Our value of our home will plummet as well as our childrens education |
| Good job in dealing with non-contiguous attendance areas!<br>Please do not break up neighborhoods. |
| Presentations or a special presentation on charter school could include for example Nuestro Mundo. There is no mention how these changes will impact the school, even though they will. Specially in regards to transportation and the demographics MMSD is considering (Students with IEPs, Racial diversity, English learners, Low-income students) This is specially important when Nuestro Mundo DL model focuses on half native spanish speaker and half non native speaker. How is MMSD developing the plan for Nuestro Mundo and the impacts it will have on utilization, capacity, transportation and after school support for that school and its students. |
| How does this rezoning impact families living with Madison addresses that are zoned to attend schools in communities surrounding MMSD, but not MMSD? Are we able to welcome those families back to MMSD?<br><br>Which families are benefiting most from the changes? I know equity is considered, and I'm lifting it up again to stress its importance. |
| The kids walk to school with their friends, and I'm concerned about moving the boundary off Whitney Way and through neighborhood blocks, separating nearby families and disrupting those connections. |
| It has to keep neighborhoods intact. |
| I think moving the Hillfarms pool area out of Hillfarms school would disrupt the community. People enjoy seeing friends at the pool and in the neighborhood. With this change people would no longer have that connection. I also think people like that they can walk to school. People also moved to this specific area for these schools. I think moving elementary schools is one thing, but moving all three schools seems unnecessary and unfair. I also think moving families who live in apartments out of this district seems unjust and to meet the needs of single family homes only. |
| Mendota has built a strong support system of resources with the Packer townhouses in mind. |
| Lake View's community is unparalleled and it would be devastating to lose nearly half of it just to send them to a school that would then be at over 100% utilization despite new build |

| |
|---|
| Streamlining Elementary schools to attend the same middle school should be a priority. |
| Parks that are baseball parks or actual parks with lakes and ducks, should not be counted as being in a school's "attendance area" especially when it means that it makes a map look disingenuously like there's an "island" of attendance area. |
| Our vulnerable populations. We need their voice and they are not here. Community schools. How does it impact? |
| Many of Lake View's families live at the Northport Apartments. Of these families, many are from Afghanistan. These families tend to be large and have many children. Most families do not plan on living at Lake View long-term. It is important for the population projections to take the future movement of this population into account. Our enrollment became drastically lower several years ago when many of our Hmong families moved out of Lake View and the average family size at Northport decreased. I'm worried that Lake View will become unsustainably small if the current attendance boundary changes are enacted and our Afghan families move out of Northport over time. To me, this current plan looks like it is putting Lake View on the path to barely staying alive as a neighborhood school. |
| 1. Does MMSD have plans to go knock on doors at Packers Townhouses to get the families' feedback? Online forms are not the best methods to receive feedback from those families. Let us know the date and times you plan on going and we can share that in our newsletters. Mendota staff are also happy to accompany district staff to do this.<br><br>2. What new developments (beyond the one on the hill) are planned for Mendota that will offset this low utilization percentage? Are there concrete timelines on these? Or is the district basing this on the hopes of northside development?<br><br>3. How would this affect our community schools funding - not just staff but funds for things like pantry, gas cards, clothing, etc.<br><br>4. Why does the map show Warner park as Emerson? It's a park with no houses and Cherokee Marsh is not colored in like Warner Park is. If that was recolored the packers area wouldn't come across as an island.<br><br>5. What would class sizes look like? We need to know information about staffing allocations to determine if class sizes and pupil per teacher ratio would actually create a successful scenario.<br><br>6. Is flipping part of our attendance area to Emerson really a great idea if they will then be at 94% capacity while at the same time gaining students with very high needs?<br><br>7. IF they bring up potentially having Lindbergh become a part of Mendota...if this is really being suggested, why isn't it reflected in the current mapping proposal?<br><br>8. It seems that the moving of students to Emerson doesn't align with several of the "guiding principles" you identified (under-enrollment, neighborhood schools, far transportation, etc). How is it possible that these are guiding principles of this process but they don't seem to be honored and applied to Mendota students?<br><br>9. What was the thinking behind moving the Brentwood/Sheridan neighborhood back to Emerson after the first draft? Was this directly related to parents showing up to share their dissatisfaction? |

| |
|---|
| Be honest and over inform. Transparency around what's being done and how it's being done would serve to ease much of the pain people will endure with the forthcoming changes. |
| Kids with behaviors that cause disruptions in classrooms and problems throughout school have outsized impacts on every other kids education in that classroom and elementary school. Strategies and balance of these kids and families is very important so other neighborhood families don't back out and look to other schools and districts |
| Please reevaluate the school pairing between Midvale and Lincoln elementary schools. The two assignment areas are not contiguous, and this creates a transportation burden that is bad for kids, for families, and costly to the district. There is a more natural pairing that could be made between Thoreau and Lincoln. |
| Provide the public with clear financial impacts and alternatives relating to full time 4K<br><br>Provide the public with clarity of what alternative were considered and trade offs weighed when making decisions especially that fragment a neighborhood or change a feeder pattern<br><br>Provide public with alternatives to building new building for handling middle school capacity<br><br>Provide maps and capacity projections in advance so the community can engage in meetings from an informed place. |
| MMSD should consider which populations are a part of fulfilling our DLI/DBE programming. For instance, if you take away Allied from Stephensâ€¦ will they still have the Spanish speaking population to support their bilingual programming? |
| Putting the burden of creating capacity at Van Hise on the lowest income and most diverse kids - forcing them to cross high-injury network Whitney Way and dodge speeders and right-turners on Old Middleton to go to Crestwood - is unacceptable |
| We dont need to worry about utilization |
| Think about how this affects staff, stop being vague at this point in the game |
| Realistic generational change of neighborhoods. |
| Please don't change Stephen's and repurpose. The school and staff are amazing! |
| Allied isn't listed in the current or draft Stephens. This makes the diversity stay the same but if allied goes to orchard ridge Stephens diversity will decrease substantially |
| Guaranteeing staffing for the schools with high proportion of students with low SES. Adverse childhood events are more common in poverty, and translate to high levels of behavioral disruption in the classroom. These disruptions are negatively affecting the learning of all the other students in these classrooms. |
| Like Stephens in Draft 2 |
| Increase utilization by making schools not so broken up like the current Stephen's area. |
| Have you considered a scenario for increased utilization for Stephens? |
| There needs to be a happy medium between the far west impacts on Stephens/Crestwood/Muir/Van Hise to better even out the distribution and utilization regardless ofcyrrrnt boundaries and independent of MS/HS zones to best use existing facilities. |

| |
|---|
| Don't redistribute a district that changes ALL THREE of their original school options. District E is egregious in how much it affects the families therein. You MUST provide an option to allow kids to stay with the original boundaries. |
| Please reevaluate the school pairing between Midvale and Lincoln elementary schools. The two assignment areas are not contiguous, and this creates a transportation burden that is bad for kids, for families, and costly to the district. There is a more natural pairing that could be made between Thoreau and Lincoln. |
| Please reevaluate the school pairing between Midvale and Lincoln elementary schools. The two assignment areas are not contiguous, and this creates a transportation burden that is bad for kids, for families, and costly to the district. There is a more natural pairing that could be made between Thoreau and Lincoln. |
| Ability for students effected by potential boundary changes to legacy at their original site to minimize disruption to them if desired. |
| Don't destroy the gem schools you have and the neighborhoods that support them through this plan. |
| I am supportive of the idea of building new schools at Acacia Ridge and Sprecher to ease congestion, but do not think another property tax referendum is likely to pass in Madison. Therefore, I most support the boundary scenario without the new schools, since I think that is a more realistic option. |
| Families settle into neighborhoods because of schools. If the district moves those families into other schools outside of the neighborhood those families chose, it defeats the purpose of attending MMSD. Re-balancing is necessary but it should not come at the expense of families and children.<br>Any impacted families of a rebalance should be offered legacy attendance to their original neighborhood schools. To kick families out of schools and not offer legacy choice is cruel, nor does it achieve the goals of this effort to strengthen and balance Madison area schools.<br><br>Parents and families in the impacted zones are anxious and watching closely.<br><br>We are a family that lives in an impacted zone and will be significantly negatively impacted by the drafted changes if they are implemented the way they stand now. |
| I hope MMSD is deeply considering the impact splitting up current elementary school communities would have on the neighborhoods and broader community in each area. I strongly encourage MMSD to consider "grandfathering in" upper-grade elementary students who will have been at their current elementary school for several years, to ease the neighborhood/community transitions that will be inevitable with redistricting. To be clear: I support the redistricting efforts and understand the necessity. But in my specific scenario, my son is currently a 2nd grader at Mendota who would be redistricted (Emerson). It would make a meaningful impact on our family - and our son's sense of community and belonging - to allow him and his peers to complete the upper grades (3-5) at their current elementary school, rather than being made to switch mid-career. |
| Quickly and clearly state that there will be a legacy program for kids to finish out their current school (or even path!). This would assuage so much public pushback about this. Also, what if the changes were optional at first? You might get enough families opting into the lower-capacity school that you wouldn't have to *make* anyone switch. (and if no one wants to switch, that tells you something about how bad the plan was) |
| I live in an area that is proposed to be reassigned from Thoreau Elementary to Lincoln and Midvale. I understand that boundary changes are complex and that MMSD is balancing many factors.<br><br>My concern with this particular proposal is that it appears to divide â€‹multiple established neighborhoodâ€‹s and communities while also creating additionalâ€‹, complex transportation needs. |

| |
|---|
| Depending on the route, students from this area could travel past â€‹at least two other elementary schools to reach Lincoln.<br><br>Has MMSD analyzed alternative combinations of the Franklin/Randall and Midvale/Lincoln boundaries, particularly a scenario such as Midvale/Randall and Franklin/Lincoln? From a geographic and transportation perspective, I would be interested in understanding how that configuration compares with the current draft proposal, as well as how each option would affect school capacity, neighborhood cohesion, and transportation.<br><br>â€‹Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback! |
| Consideration of existing students and their younger siblings who may not be enrolled yet. Families bought houses with specific schools influence and even as we make these long term changes, we should support the original choices of those families. |
| How much variance is accounted for in the projections? |
| We were happy to see that the Wexford neighbor was able to stay at Stephens Elementary School. Stephens is a wonderful school! I would recommend adding more areas since Stephens is still at a low utilization.<br><br>We would also like to maintain the diversity at Gillespie and Memorial. |
| I would like to see the opt Cherokee/hamilton boundary change to Cherokee on the east side of Midvale Blvd, and the west side of Midvale Blvd to Hamilton. That helps utilization, and the busy street is a natural boundary so kids can be with other students they live by going to the same schools and keeping away from the busy road |
| Help Kennedy Elementary with space! |
| Plan for need-based allocations! A new Sprecher school is definitely needed, but as the parent of a Kennedy family, I know that the needs in a new Sprecher school will be great, and we need to plan accordingly. |
| I currently live in a middle school choice area for Hamilton and Cherokee. I support removing the choice and having all of the neighborhood kids kept together at Cherokee, again prioritizing keeping kids in their community school. |
| Leaving Schenk at 117% capacity when neighboring schools are at 60% feels like a failure. Relying on a major capital project (new school) feels optimistic and risks negative impacts on children. |
| It would be nice for kids who attend the same elementary school to attend the same middle school. Right now Midvale-Lincoln kids are split between Hamilton and Cherokee. |
| Spreading out low income students needs to be a much bigger priority when coming up with these drafts. The current draft for the west side doesn't solve this at all. There are some schools with 10% low income students that are less than 2 miles from other schools with 65% low income students. Instead of solving this by shifting students around, current schools that already benefit from less low income students are losing students and losing their diversity. There seem to be much simpler solutions that are not being considered and as a parent to a student in a struggling school, it's extremely disheartening to see that no short term solutions are showing up in these drafted maps and information. |
| Don't move families right away - grandfather families in to their current schools, or give the option. |
| I am interested in learning more about how various attendance area drafts might impact selection and participation in the DLI program. |
| Families chose where they want to live based on schools. Allow impacted families to stay on current path. |

| |
|---|
| Regarding moving section E from Van Hise/Hamilton to Crestwood/Gillespie, MMSD should take into account that this new boundary cuts directly through the middle of a neighborhood where kids currently go to school with and play with other kids in the neighborhood and isolates section E, and consider alternative options. The eastern part of Hill Farm has natural boundaries on Whitney Way (busy truck route), University/Old Middleton, Mineral Point, and Segoe, whereas Regent St runs through the middle of the neighborhood right by the park and despite how it appears on a map, is a quiet street where kids and families cross regularly. In fact, there are â€œwalking bus routesâ€ that come along these routes to the schools currently.<br><br>The proposed bounary changes will destory the "neighborhood school" experience for kids and families in area E - and to some extent, for the entire neighborhood. School is such a significant part of the social fabric of our kids' lives and kids who used to go to school together and play together after school in the same neighorhood will now be isolated. The new schools will NOT be walkable. Kids in section E will have to cross multiple busy streets - including Whitney Way, which is a busy truck route with very few pedestrian crossings and frequent issues with speeding vehicles.<br><br>I strongly urge MMSD to consider the impacts of this boundary change on the lives of kids and families in the Hill Farms neighborhood and consider alternative options. |
| There needs to be a dialogue about what will happen at schools like Stephens, for example. Either scenario so far will strip this great school of its diverse student population and leave the community with only confusion on what's to come. This creates instability with the teachers and staff at the school and isn't fair to folks living in the neighborhoods that feed into it. In both of the round 2 map scenarios, students from Stephens neighborhoods would be divided for middle school between Gillespie & either Toki/AR, on top of the "lottery" for Spring Harbor already. It seems targeted to eliminate this school, and there needs to be transparency in why this is happening and what will happen to the great teachers at this school. |
| Please let us know ASAP what the plan is for existing students and whether they will be grandfathered in and allowed to stay at their current schools. |
| Why are some schools like Lincoln Midvale and Franklin Randall split elementary schools and not accommodating neighbors for the full K-5? |
| I've already covered most of this in other comments but I strongly disagree with the current plans for Schenk elementary. Schenk is being overcrowded because they want to bus areas north of Milwaukee St. and east of hwy 51 into Schenk. I think the boundary for Schenk should be Milwaukee St. to hwy 51 to cottage grove rd to atwood to fair oaks. Sandburg and Hawthorne are contiguous with areas north of Milwaukee St that are bussed to schenk. These schools are under utilized so the areas north of Milwaukee St should go there instead. The fact that these areas change from Lafollette to East is not a good enough reason to overcrowd Schenk and kennedy. I had a baby in 2025 and there are many other babies in eastmorland neighborhood. I think Schenk will only continue to get more overcrowded with this proposal and I don't want to send my child to an overcrowded school. I would like to be able to send my child to 4k at Schenk but I don't see how that's possible with this current proposal (how would there be room?). I don't think we should build any new schools. I think you can shift some of Kennedy's area to the school just to the south of them (Henderson? Can't remember the name for sure). You could also send parts of Kennedy to Sandburg. I think we should prioritize shifting boundaries so that no schools are at 95% or above capacity and if that means middle and high school feeder patterns change then so be it. |
| Please allow students currently at their schools to have the option to stay and be grandfathered in despite the new maps. |

| |
|---|
| Strong walkable neighborhood schools for all! As little discontinuity between home location and school attendance as possible, for the sake of parents, kids, transportation safety, fossil fuels, and resources. |
| Walkability!!! Bike-ability! Let people go to school in their neighborhoods, and make neighborhoods livable and accessible to all. Also be less opaque re: what is meant by some of these terms and ideas so that people who have not attended previous meanings can still have a working understanding of what the district thinking is on these matters. |
| Once passed by the school board, can families in affected areas have options (grandfather clause for 4 more years) to stay at their current school for up to 4 more years, or choose to leave and attend their new school? For areas like Thoreau's changed map, the sections absorbed by midvale and Leopold also share a border with Thoreau, and the small changed areas would likely be just 1-2 extra bus pickups. Kids could â€œfinish up to grade 5â€ at Thoreau, or exit to their new districted school and still have bussing. Less disruption for families who already have kids at Thoreau. Incoming kindergartners would not have this option and the grandfather clause with the extra bus route stops could end in 4 years. |
| In the case of redistributing, where siblings attended and families have existing relationships with school staff/ teachers a family legacy or guaranteed voucher should be offered to families. A similar voucher should be offered to families who would be impacted by this change with children who have higher needs, to lessen the impact of change and stability in their education setting. |
| MMSD needs to consider the neighborhoods that are being directed to different schools than they are currently pointed to. Most of the neighborhoods on the north side are the lowest-income areas that will be bussed to different schools. Why are we shipping our most vulnerable students to new schools where, if they miss the bus, they will not be able to make it to school at all? We need to consider this very real scenario and keep those particular populations at their current schools and have more affluent families' kids get bussed to a different school. |
| Will there continue to be shared schools i.e., Mid vale Lincoln? |
| Walkability, in short:<br>- The draft (moving Section E): elementary walks get worse, and middle school walks get worse.<br>- The alternative (moving blocks closer to Midvale, or the already-bused area near Hy-Vee): elementary walks get better, and middle school walks get worse.<br>So the alternative is better for walkability.<br><br>I support full-day 4K. My concern is how the draft makes room for it at Van Hise. Please model other ways to free seats at Van Hise, not only moving Section E. Every home in Section E is closer to Van Hise than to any other elementary school. Two areas to compare on the same numbers:<br>- the southern blocks of the Van Hise area that are closer to Midvale than to Van Hise (Midvale has room, 68% in the draft);<br>- the area near Hy-Vee whose students are already bused, so moving them adds no new bus riders.<br>Census data suggests these areas hold at least as many students as Section E.<br><br>We heard that moving families to Midvale would add busing. Moving Section E adds busing too: its middle schoolers would ride a bus 2.3â€“2.9 miles to Gillespie instead of walking to Hamilton. The difference is elementary school. Section E's younger kids would lose the walk to their closest school. For many families Crestwood is about twice as far, across Whitney Way, and it's inside the 1.5-mile limit, so there's no bus and families would drive. Families closer to Midvale would get a shorter walk. Walkability is one of the district's own goals, so please compare walkers, bus riders and each school's demographics for every option. |
| Van Hise's attendance area should not be cut off at Reneabom park. The city is planning on adding five new apartment complexes in the retail space between old Middleton and university. Those new |

| |
|---|
| apartments and the apartments on the Red Cross side of Sheboygan avenue should be rezoned for crestwood. The apartments along Sheboygan that house lots of international families should be zoned for van hise. If those apartments and house behind them near renebohom park left the van hise attendance zone the diversity of the school would drastically change. |
| Lake View is one of the most diverse elementary schools in MMSD, and the staff there have worked hard to turn the narrative around surrounding it. Their hard work is reflected in their school report card, and in the day to day operations. Taking away such a large chunk of their student population would in turn break up a team of staff who have teamed together to make this school great. In addition, we have worked hard to get to know and understand the specific communities we serve and have deep relationships with the families in them already. We don't want to lose any of our school community, not when we are doing such great work and making such great progress! Especially if shifting the Oak Park neighborhood to Gompers would put them at 100% utilization anyway, it doesn't make sense to just shift the problem to Gompers. Instead, it makes sense to remodel and expand Lake View so we can continue to grow our amazing team, keep grade level teams together, offer 4K, and expand our Hmong bilingual program. I really hope this option is considered! Thank you for listening. |
| New middle school on the west side is key |
| There are so many new homes and neighborhoods near Acacia ridge that a new Acacia ridge middle school would help retain families in MMSD through middle school and beyond. |
| I'm particularly curious about Stephens still having a lot of noncontiguous areas. I'm also concerned about the east side division of attendance areas between Kennedy and Ada Deer and potentially a Sprecher elementary school. Additionally, it seems like the east side neighborhood around the Grandview Commons area is really getting divided up. |
| Allowing kids to continue to stay in their current assigned school to maintain community built. |
| Consideration of retention of families from elementary to middle school, particularly in the far west region. If we're able to maintain a neighborhood middle school (Acacia Ridge) following our access to a neighborhood elementary school (Olson), we would stay in the district. If forced to travel to a non-neighborhood middle school we will consider relocating to another district. |
| Far west sided here, we are close in proximity to Middleton, Verona address but Madison schools. A middle school in our area is of great interest to us |
| Please adjust boundaries so there are safe walking/biking routes that don't involve crossing dangerous roads like Hwy 51 or East Wash (unless a convenient bridge or safe tunnel). Stop splitting elementary schools to two separate middle schools. |
| I live in the Grandview Commons neighborhood and I would like for our entire neighborhood to attend the same elementary and middle school. |
| I'd be interested to understand if the overall resource and budget impacts for some of these draft proposals. That is difficult to predict, but I think would help contextualize what other long term impacts these changes might cause. |
| More k-5 schools. Smaller class sizes. No iPad in elementary schools. |
| The west side would greatly benefit from a middle school. The current options would be far and long commutes and have overcrowded classrooms. |
| Keep paired schools together! Communities and identities are deeply rooted in these relationships. Furthermore, having a k-2 school and a 3-5 school means each of the staff at the respective sites is a collective deep well of expertise in a specific age group and phase of child development. For the places that already have this unique arrangement, keep it in place! It benefits staff and students in the buildings, and it benefits families and communities beyond the walls of the schools. |

| |
|---|
| The numbers In the first draft meeting where Brentwood came to Mendota made a lot of sense and we were in The Sweet spot. Now in the second draft that Brentwood switched to Emerson. The numbers for both Emerson and Mendota are awful! It sure doesn't seem like a good switch and it makes us nervous at Mendota for a lot of the special programming and funding we have for our population. I hope second draft Northside gets some tweaks before it is finalized so that the numbers actually make sense |
| I can understand why some Van Hise families are upset that the NW portion of their area may move to Crestwood when they're within walking distance of Van Hise. I think that school needs to look into different options. |
| How will transportation costs be factored into these decisions? |
| We live on northside in a neighborhood that would change from Mendota to emerson. This makes me sad. It seemed like lots of neighborhoods were added to Emerson and taken away from mendota and Emerson is overutilized and mendota is under. What if you assigned that neighborhood back to mendota and then to Blackhawk middle? Emerson is further from our house than mendota. Also Sherman middle attendance area is bisected by okeffe middle. Why is that? I think that should be revised. |
| Emerson and Mendota school boundaries need to be relooked at. Phase 2 has Emerson's capacity and student ratios very high while Mendota's goes down |
| MMSD is losing Olson families at a dramatic rate. They leave around grade 4. They leave not because of anything related to Olson, nor anything related to Memorial. They leave because of the long drive and the difficult learning conditions at Toki. Building a new middle school near Olson is a strategic imperative for a district that wants to be seen as a destination. |
| I think parents and teachers deserve true discussion sessions. Have maps up, but just open the floor to Q and A. There are so many unanswered questions and unheard view points. |
| Take Ada Deer Elementary back to how it was before we got the kids from Kenedy and MBlock. You need to build the school on Spreacher where will all the kids that are going to live in the apartments next to Amazon on Milwaukee going to go? Build now while the supplies is cheaper don't make the mistake they made with the porchlight budget. |
| For Emerson specifically, MMSD should consider that these boundary changes will have an immense impact on teachers and students. Teachers will not be able to adequately handle the influx of new students with these demographics. If these boundaries go forward it should only be with a plan to substantially increase the resources of the school to accommodate the new children. Otherwise the education of new and existing students will suffer, and it will not be of any benefit to anyone. |
| My kid is in 3rd grade and I don't want him having to change schools just for 4 and 5. That's not fair to take away all his friends. |
| Many people purchase their homes based on the schools they are assigned to. MMSD should include a plan that allows families who already have children enrolled in elementary school to choose to stay at their current school even if their new boundary assigns them to a different school. This would minimize a lot of worry and confusion for current families with students facing big potential changes. |
| Please take into account our Spanish speaking families who have been involved in the DLI programs across the district. This opportunity should be used to include more Spanish speakers into the DLI program to make it more universally available to the population it was designed for. |
| Families should be able to stay in their current enrollment area if kids have already started in that building. Also if a family has kids in a school, their younger kids should have the option to stay in that school even if maps are adjusted. I understand that these changes must happen at sometime, but allowing this will ease transition for the families impacted. |
| In specific reference to Thoreau, the drop from 113% to 74% is significant, and with the restriction of the neighborhoods considering house prices, I expect utilization to drop further in the next 5-10 years. When |

| |
|---|
| reviewing attendance areas, please consider a good mixture of single family homes and multi-family homes (apartments, duplexes, etc.) for good economic mixture at the schools. |
| Retain Cherokee/Hamilton Middle School Choice Zone. We purchased our home with this as a major factor and would like the choice zone to remain. |
| Our number one priority should be the teacher-to-student ratio, as it directly impacts scholar performance and our staff culture.<br><br>We also need greater accountability for positions that fall outside our core operating hours of 8:00 AMâ€“4:00 PM. Every wage dollar should first support the hours when scholars are in our buildings. By streamlining recovery and reducing spending outside core hours, we can redirect resources toward increasing staffing when scholars are present.<br><br>Our custodian wage range is competitive with the starting salary of a second- to third-year journeyman electrician, yet three supervisors are responsible for more than 50 sites. We are still having to assemble internal custodial teams to support underperforming locations. We need to move beyond a â€œbailoutâ€ model and focus on developing, training, and strengthening our teams so they can operate independently.<br><br>Finally, with ongoing frontline staffing shortages, we need to place greater emphasis on recruitment. When we identify a qualified candidate, the time between extending an offer and bringing that individual onboard is too long. We need to streamline this process so we can fill critical positions faster and reduce the impact of staffing shortages. When we have tenured staff starting to feel the effects of retiring in place due to increasing pressures of the position we need to develop a system that can place them in a less demanding position so we can honor the time spent with us at the tail end of their career. |
| I'm really counting on the Acacia Ridge Middle School to be built sooner than later. I hear rumors that some families are planning to go into debt to move and get into Verona or Middleton school districts BECAUSE of the school proximity and performance are pretty good/not as complex as it is for MMSD far west side residents. This could, of course, have many negative ripple effects.<br><br>What can we as parents/constituents do to help move this plan along? What city approvals do we need? Can this school be somewhat privately funded (I don't know if that is allowed) and should we be going out to ask for such funding? Some parent networks stretch very far! Can this school be built and ready to accept students by Fall of 2029? |
| Again - it is crucial to provide a path for existing students and families to remain in their current schools regardless of boundary changes. Being sent away from our current school would be devastating for our child. |
| Include information on which schools provide all day 4k. how does the all day 4k program change with the different boundaries. Include information on what the utilization looks like if the two new schools proposed are built? How does that impact who has access to 4k? Why would we build a new school if current schools would sit empty? What are the costs of further transportation versus building a new school? Why would we need a new middle school if all of the schools currently are under utilized for middle school? What numbers are justifying that need? |
| Eliminating the Hamilton/Cherokee choice zone means that Midvale students in that zone will not be able to follow their peers to middle school. This seems short-sighted and limited reasoning has been given for this decision. |

| |
|---|
| This is our first year in MMSD with our foster kid. He has impressed everyone with how well his transition to Public school has gone - he has a great friend group and many of his teachers have noted how well he is becoming a member of the community. The current proposal would show that he would move schools to one 4 times farther away, and most of his friends would be staying at the current school. It would be a massive disappointment for us if we had to go through yet another school transition and we would no longer be able to walk or bike to school due to distance. |
| I strongly believe you need to look at legacy options for students who have built community and could potentially be pulled from friendships and family ties that have been cultivated over the years. I understand the need to balance schools and programming; however, this should not be done at the expense of kids and their connections. |
| As a parent and Board member of Nuestro Mundo Community School, I am concerned about the lack of transparency related to DLI programs in MMSD's future growth plans. We respectfully ask the district to provide more transparency around specialized educational programs, like DLI. We feel that the district could benefit from rethinking its current model for DLI programming as a whole. And, we stand ready and committed to partner with the district to identify a solution that maximizes the access and benefits of DLI education to all families who want this important educational option. |
| The proposed changed to the Thoreau region involving Gregory Street is completely illogical. I strongly recommend that you reconsider, because busing kids to Lincoln does not make sense when they could walk to Thoreau. There is no need to increase a commute by 10-15 minutes by vehicle Just to â€œCreate Cleaner boundaries.â€ |
| Dejar a los niÃ±os terminar su ciclo elementary en la misma escuela donde estan asistiendo actualmente para no causar un impacto negativo al tener un cambio drÁstico y volver a empezar desde cero. |
| Please build the Acadia Middle School! My kids would have to be on the bus for an HOUR to get to Toki. That's ridiculous |
| Continuity for students who are in the schools with changes. If we can hold students in the school they are currently attending and enact changes to the boundaries starting with students newly incoming, I think it will help maintain stability as the transition happens. |
| A new middle school on the west side is desperately needed especially as the west side continues to grow the way it has. Currently considering open enrolling into Middleton because the elementary and middle schools would be closer but if a new middle school opens in Acacia, we probably wouldn't open enroll. |
| Build it for the long term with a good plan. You can easily pull portions of attendance out of Crestwood and Muir and have all continuous areas if desired. Or to take some of Van Hise's area near Odana road. I am confused why those aren't on the table as there are options to make everyone continuous. I think MMSD has some fear of wealthy parents and pushback and should create boundaries that make sense, with anyone walking distance of a particular school (<1/2 mile) being clearly aligned to that school. |
| Es obvio que donde estÁ creciendo una comunidad se establezcan la escuelas y las construirÁn con la tecnologÃa pero tambiÃ©n es obvio que hay que actualizar las que ya estÁn . |
| Making use of Acacia Ridve space as middle school or charter school |
| I would have loved to see some of the scenarios where some of the schools are repurposed. Specifically, I don't understand Stephens assignment especially given the low utilization or why Lapham and Marquette continue to be two separate schools when there is such low utilization and Lowell has additional space as well which could have some of the Marquette based families. I'm not as familiar with the far east schools but Mendota is another building that feels as though it could be repurposed.<br><br>I also understand the commitment to diversity but am curious if that could be obtained without the K-2/3- |

| |
|---|
| 5 splits. It makes the neighborhood school feel much harder to obtain and is really challenging for students to transition schools every 3-4 years for their entire time when other kids get to stay in one building for 6 years with 4K-5. |
| Lake View is having a lot of success so removing our students and staff is not in the best interests of our school or the district. |
| Please don't keep putting 5 day full day 4k on the pedestal of encouraging enrollment without some serious and careful looking at the 5 day pilot programs. Some current models do not allow<br>Staff to do quality planning and prep nor does the model provide truly developmentally appropriate early learning experiences. It's turning what was a quality program into basic childcare. |
| While Madison's total population is projected to grow substantially by 2050, I believe MMSD is erroneously projecting student population growth that will not occur. In our experience in our community and networks, families with children are already leaving Madison to attend schools in neighboring communities - I.e. Middleton, Verona, Sun Prairie, Waunakee, etc. as their children reach schooling age due to better perceived quality, value for (tax) money, and facilities. Madison's focus on building housing predominantly attracts single individuals and couples living in apartment buildings; there is considerably less family housing being constructed. I challenge the district to address the valid issues raised in this attendance area review (utilization, diversity, etc.) through utilizing current school buildings, not asking for additional tax levies for new buildings. There is growing resentment with MMSD tax levels, making it even more likely families will be forced/choose to leave the district as they are unable/unwilling to continue to pay very high tax levels. Already, following the most recent referendums, there is widespread concerns about taxation levels. The district needs to live within its budget, as the rest of us must do. That will necessitate trade-offs and hard choices. New buildings based on projected growth that seem dubious, is not the way forward. |
| There needs to be a legacy option for families whose children attend schools that may be outside of new boundaries. Moving schools, especially when it's not the families decision, is jarring. Families need a say in whether their kids remain at their current school or move schools.<br><br>The community they've built at the current school, along with teacher and staff relationships, isn't something that can be ignored. Many teachers have known the students and their families since 4k, and to force families into a new school would just be mean. Forcing students to a new school, away from their friends and community isn't acceptable.<br><br>I'm astounded that a legacy program for all current students isn't a given. |
| The projected impact to Thoreau is not acceptable. We need our diversity. We also need to keep students where they are thriving. There is no reason for moving the Glenway to Knickerbocker section to Midvale. All of those kids happily attend Thoreau and Thoreau is closer than Midvale and significantly closer than Lincoln. I thought the idea was more walkable schools, these kids are getting a raw deal. |
| I am very concerned about the proposal for Thoreau Elementary to lose 1/3 of its students, from 490 to 325 students. I strongly oppose the boundary changes for Thoreau, especially the loss of the area south of the Beltline. While the table says the school is overutilized, I do not believe that is a concern at the school. Are we hiring outside consultants to create new problems to solve?<br><br>This is a severe overcorrection for any potential crowding that may be caused by adding 4K. Given that the proposed new Thoreau boundary is mostly single family homes, and has recently become quite expensive, and the projections also show a decline, Thoreau will rapidly become too small and risk becoming underutilized in the future. Thoreau is a close community and has worked hard to support the diversity of its students. I would hate for the community to lose so many students and therefore teachers. |

| |
|---|
| The proposal to remove so many students from south of the Beltline will reduce the diversity of the school from 54% to 40% racial diversity. While those students would attend a school closer to their home, I suspect from talking to other parents that Thoreau provides a stronger education for those students than Leopold would. Leopold would go from 580 to about 680 students which is very large especially for what I hear is an under-resourced school. I encourage you to balance housing types, such as apartments and single family homes among schools for better economic diversity.<br><br>How are parents in the neighborhood south of the Beltline shifting from Thoreau to Leopold reacting? That would be very important to know. How do you plan to find out? Even as someone who reads all the MMSD emails and stays pretty involved in the community, I had no idea until a couple of days ago that these changes were proposed for Thoreau. The local impacts of this were not explained. All parents should have received an email that included the changes to our school boundaries and a summary of the changes for our school including proposed changes in enrollment and diversity, rather than me having to watch the video, find slides 26-28, and text and email friends to find out what is going on.<br><br>In short, please reconsider the boundary for Thoreau to maintain a larger, thriving, and diverse school. Thank you! |
| The shifts seem to make sense on a systemic level, but I think it's really important to honor the individuals being impacted given how challenging housing is in Madison. On a personal level, I was relieved to see that the attendance areas for my kids did not change, but would probably not be able to move if I was (for whatever reason) unhappy with the new designated school.<br>As someone who works in education, I worry about attendance/engagement for families whose pathway is being changed. In the last two years, I've seen many students stop coming to school or switch districts because a new address (very close by) redirects them to different school. Our internal transfer, open enrollment, and transportation systems need to offer some flexibility in the transition period or we are going to lose students in the process.<br>Also - school size is another big concern that does not seem to be accounted for. There are very few options in this district for students who would/could benefit from a smaller, more specialized school. Creating "ideal" school enrollment scenarios with as many students as was presented is asking to "lose" the students that we are most concerned about. |
| There are 3 more main considerations that parents have when choosing a school that cause out of district enrollment -- a clear and consistent Advanced Learning plan, access to in school wraparound care, and safety. The first two MMSD has been historically poor at. And I think the middle school situation could benefit from keeping the middle schools smaller. |
| I have reviewed the proposed boundary changes that have been put forth by the district and I support the inclusion of the block in Westmoreland that is Glenway, Glen and Fern Court to be absorbed by Midvale Lincoln. This block is the only block that is zoned for throw and does not make sense. I think Westmoreland should be in the same attendance area. I also believe that the choice area within Westmoreland should be removed. |
| Gregory St students should stay at Thoreau Elementary |
| Traffic patterns. Before and after school options. Logistical challenges related to having multiple children at schools that are far apart.due to age. |
| I'm sure this as been a conversation amongst the team, but I firmly believe that the more important thing to do is keep student to teacher ratio low. That benefits teachers so they don't burnout as fast, makes students feel more seen and valued, which in turn makes families feel better. I feel very strongly about adding the elementary school on the east side and the middle school on the far west side to ensure |

| |
|---|
| schools are not exceeding capacity. Everyone deserves to have high quality education experience, all students, staff, families, and communities. |
| I strongly disagree with moving 4K to a five day a week program! In my opinion, it is not developmentally appropriate for our youngest learners to be making so many transitions during a day. Four days a week is already long enough and while I understand families needing care, our educators are not babysitters. I believe the better option would be wrapped around care provided Tuesday through Friday. The amount of planning and preparation the teachers need is met best with Monday. Planning time to meet the diverse needs of our youngest learners. |
| please keep kids that have started in their current schools where they are (grandfathered in). We have had such a bumpy start with middle school it would be awful to have to start over somewhere new for 7th grade. I would also like to see the optional Hamilton/Cherokee area maintained as is. Midvale/Lincoln kids will continue going to both middle schools and it would be nice for kids to choose which one they go to to maintain friendships or stay with DLI |
| Thoreau Elementary School is currently a thriving school with a strong sense of community and a diverse student population. The proposed changes would significantly reduce that diversity, which is one of the qualities many families value most about the school. I am concerned that this shift could lead more families in the Nakoma neighborhood to consider private school options, as diversity is a key factor in their decision to enroll at Thoreau. |
| Minimal impact to current students. Grandfathering students in needs to be considered. |
| We are in the area of westmorland that routes to Midvale then Hamilton today. Routing us to Cherokee heights is honestly super disappointing given how it ranks compared to Hamilton, and will be the deciding factor if we stay with MMSD or leave it. We were ok with the idea of Midvale but not ok with Midvale then Cherokee heights. Most of our neighborhood has opted out of MMSD and we were excited to invest in the community but not with this proposed change. If it happens we will leave. |
| At all costs students should remain at their school unless there is an egregious over capacity situation. Additionally, the choice to change maps should not be based solely on parent input-that is not a fair fight and families most at risk will not be heard, while white middle class families with outspoken voices will receive potentially preferential treatment. |
| It doesn't make sense to get rid of an 'attendance island' on the Northside/Eastside, only to make a new 'attendance island'. Also, these kiddos need the most consistency, don't move them if possible. |
| Not making kids move schools if they don't want to; giving families options as needed. Increasing STEM and advanced learning opportunities across the district; more dual language immersion. |
| Minimizing disruption to current students -- there needs to be a transition plan that allows families with currently enrolled students to be guaranteed a spot at their original school assignment without needing to go through the internal transfer process. This guarantee should also apply to younger siblings of existing students who themselves are not yet in kindergarten. |
| non-contiguous zones not only affect those with long commutes, but all students who now have friends that are very far away and can't have a shared childhood with then in a neighborhood space. In particular in the Crestwood, Stephens, Muir area where we have kids across the street from each other in three separate schools. would be great to have the whole area around one of those schools together and maybe use one of the other buildings for a new type of school |
| Scenarios to eliminate paired K-2 and 3-5 schools. |
| I really do not understand why my neighborhood has been cut into three different schools. The north end goes to one school, the middle will need to DRIVE PAST two other schools to get there, and the south end goes to another school. If a goal is "Work to maintain neighborhood<br>schools, maximize proximity to home/walkability (e.g., not having to |

| |
|---|
| cross busy streets, railroad tracks, and consider natural boundaries), and work towards limiting the time spent on a bus." then why is the current proposal switching me from walking to driving on the beltline past other schools? It makes zero sense and is very contradictory. |
| Allow grandfathering for students who have already started school. |
| As a resident of section E - these changes will have a large and negative impact on our family. Section E is a short 10 minute walk from our home on 5114 Regent street.<br><br>Please consider how dangerus the walk to Crestwood elementray would be from Section E.<br><br>Please consider how disruptive it will be to no longer be able to send our children to a shcool that is a short few blocks from our home to a school that is miles away from our home.<br><br>Please consider how disruptive it will be to cut the neighborhood in half, removing many lower income and immigrant families away from Van Hise - making them feel like they're not good enough to attend their local school which is a few short minutes away and must be driven or bussed to schools far away from their roots and their neighborhood. |
| Definitely busy streets and kids who need to walk vs ride a bus. |
| I am glad that some of the glaring issues with attendance areas will be addressed through this process. However, there needs to be a plan in place to minimize harm and disruption on current students impacted by any changes. A legacy policy needs to be in place prior to any changes so that current families can finish out at their current schools if desired. Also, the portion of Dudgeon Monroe should remain in the Thoreau attendance area to allow students to go to their neighborhood school. Moving them to Midvale means that they would no longer go to the same school as many of their neighbors. |
| While I do want to maintain neighborhood schools, I also recognize the unintentional segregation that happens within my students' DLI school. I wonder if there could be an opportunity to make neighborhood schools into full DLI (50/50 English/Spanish or other language) schools. It would make more opportunities for people in the neighborhood to take advantage of the program and hopefully include more racial diversity within the DLI program. |
| Whatever plan is made, set a date to look and see if it's working. Don't wait 50 years again. |
| Families buy homes based on school attendance zones. Significant measures should be made to allow families to remain at their current schools if they desire. This could be guaranteed internal transfers, grandfathering for households, or delaying the implementation such that current students can age out of their schools to minimize impact. |
| We need to take advantage of this opportunity to improve our middle school programming. Families often leave the district because of middle school, especially for some of us on the East and North sides of Madison. Our students deserve well-rounded and high-quality instructional spaces. |
| Allowing families currently enrolled in special programs to continue the track for that program (e.g. DLI). |
| STRONGLY encourage a more thoughtful legacy policy. That helps people think in the long term of this change for the city - verses the very short term (what about my child next year) - and allows MMSD to get to a broader vision. |
| Thoreau is currently considered over-utilized, yet with the current proposed boundary changes, it may become under-utilized. I'm not sure why the small areas near/including Monroe Street would change to a different school area since they are close in proximity to Thoreau. I also am concerned about a decrease in enrollment/utilization affecting staffing and if cuts would be made if the school has a lower student population. |

| |
|---|
| I think this is a lot of work and work-up for something that might not even happen for our kids. Please lead with WHEN you will be doing this work before you start showing the map--- for example, the middle school redistricting of Gillespie and Toki will apply to my kid (currently in 3rd grade) but a new building Acacia Ridge won't because you won't begin building until 2032 when they are in high school. When people realize that the impacts won't actually affect them and their students, it might calm people down. |
| Mmsd should not approve any plans that put any of the schools below 75% utilization. |
| I am disappointed to see that nothing substantial is being considered for the Leopold attendance area. There should be consideration about breaking up the attendance area to improve outcomes for the school. We live in the far southern region of Leopold attendance area. It is almost 3 miles to the school. Both Verona & Oregon have elementary schools that are shorter drive times. I also wonder if MMSD has done a deep dive into how many students are being lost in this attendance area due to the lack of achievement at Leopold. All of my neighbors either open enroll to other districts or send their kids to private schools. It seems that this area could also use a new elementary school to alleviate crowding at Lori Mann Carey and also attract people in this southern part of Leopold attendance zone back to MMSD. |
| I think the presentation.noted population data was from Fall 2025. But a huge new apartment development went up near Oscar Mayer which needs to be taken into account. |
| Please do not change the boundaries to the schools that have ideal utilization and rip children from their current schools. In some instances the maps drawn significantly decrease the diversity. |
| The current proposal involves moving my child (in Dudgeon-Monroe) to a scenario where their elementary school class would be divided into two middle schools, I am not sure how common this is across the district, but it does not seem ideal. |
| Could some classroom space that is now Whitehorse be used for more space at Schenk??? Whitehorse appears to be under utilized and Schenk is over in all scenarios. |
| Are the demographic projects for a potential new school at Sprecher balanced? If not, how will MMSD ensure this school is set up for success?<br><br>In both the Sprecher & no Sprecher school scenarios, Lori Mann Carey see a 9 point jump in students who are economically disadvantaged.. and an increase in all key demographics tied to student needs. How will these changes be accounted for in staffing and resource allocation?<br><br>Community feedback clearly identified needs-based resource allocation as a major community concern, but currently we don't have a plan for how this priority will translate into practice. Will there be opportunities to give feedback from families and staff during implementation after specific scenarios are decided by the school board?<br><br>A new Sprecher road school is several years don't the line. It's the districts responsibility to ensure student outcomes are improving now at Kennedy. A change in leadership alone is not a plan. Families and staff deserve to know what specific steps the district is taking now to improve student outcomes at Kennedy. The district should take care of its existing schools before asking the community to support new schools. |
| In my previous responses, I emphasized the importance of expanding the Hmong Dual Language Immersion (DLI) program to include 4K. I also want to emphasize that I strongly value exposing our students to a diverse range of peers, school staff, and community members. These experiences are essential to building a strong, collaborative, and considerate community here in Madison.<br><br>Madison often presents itself as a community that values diversity and embraces people who are different from one another. However, there can be a gap between valuing diversity in principle and |

| |
|---|
| practicing inclusion in everyday life. As a Hmong parent raising my son here, I have experienced moments that remind me that implicit bias and social exclusion are still very real in our community.<br><br>Recently, I was at a neighborhood park with my son when a white family was hosting a birthday party. The family approached other white parents and invited them to help themselves to the leftover food. When they came to me, they smiled but did not extend the same invitation. It was a small interaction, but it left me feeling excluded. Similarly, when my son and I walk through our neighborhood, I sometimes get the impression that others assume we do not live here. These experiences may seem insignificant to someone who has never experienced them, but repeated moments like these can shape whether families feel welcomed, accepted, and truly part of their own community.<br><br>I am not naive enough to believe that schools alone can eliminate implicit bias or prevent every instance of exclusion. However, I do believe MMSD has a meaningful opportunity to help shape a different future through its decisions about school boundaries, enrollment, programming, and the composition of school communities. When children have meaningful opportunities to learn and build relationships with people from different backgrounds, they can develop greater understanding, empathy, and respect for one another.<br><br>I believe we can both preserve and celebrate students' cultural and linguistic identities while ensuring they have meaningful opportunities to learn alongside people whose experiences differ from their own. My hope is that MMSD will make decisions that support both goals, helping build a Madison where diversity is not simply something we say we value, but something people genuinely experience in their daily lives. |
| I do not like the idea of sending kids from one elementary school to different middle schools. Middle school is tough and if you loose your friends that can make it harder. |
| As a parent, Madison home owner, and staff member, I am glad the district is taking on this work. I understand the change will be difficult for some, but hopefully it can solve some problems in a long term way. I very much support the new buildings and see a need for them. I would like more information on the funding plan (referendum or other - would support either way). I would also like to see a timeline. There was not much info on repurposing buildings in the session. It would be nice to see potential scenarios. |
| Ideally connect days off between schools (elementary, middle, high) so that families don't have to use up PTO to account for the different days off between schools within same area |
| I think voices of the folks most impacted by changes should have the most weight in your decisions. |
| Please consider the following:<br>Separating the Grandview/North Star neighborhood into two different elementary schools means that a contiguous neighborhood has kids who are neighbors and attend two different schools throughout elementary and middle school. This is challenging for neighborhood community and peer relationships. Move the small portion assigned to Kennedy to Ada Deer finally.<br>Also consider that highways, interstates, etc. are naturally non-contiguous boundaries. Don't prioritize â€œcontiguousâ€ when an interstate separates neighborhoods. |
| We want a school district that is predictable. |
| Good luck |
| I think people gotta suck it up in a transition period. No one is going to be happy about moving schools but it's more important to use limited school resources as effectively as possible. People will complain for a few years and then it will be the new normal. |
| Safety of kids to get there and using all schools that currently exist for utilization |

| |
|---|
| Please focus on maintaining neighborhood schools busing kids should be avoided as much as possible. We should be paying attention to busy arterial streets, and when possible, using those as a dividing line, promoting walkability. |
| Please, please, do not turn Madison into the choice mess that Chicago and Milwaukee have. Keep the focus being on creating strong schools for all students, with better allocation formulas outside of core for all levels - elementary, middle, and high. Keep students close to home to build strong communities that support and take pride in their school, lessen transportation needs, and not create more. Do not create new shiny objects, but invest in expanding programming in current schools. I do support creating the new elementary and middle school. |
| as long as students can be grandfathered into their current schools, residents are going to have to come to terms with adjusted boundary lines even though no one likes change to impact them |
| I am concerned about my neighborhood, Gregory Street at Pickford, changing from Thoreau to Midvale Lincoln. It would mean bussing when there is a neighborhood school we can walk, bike or short drive to. I hope this can be reconsidered. |
| Consider how attendance areas might affect staffing changes at schools. Staff will need significant notice before any significant staffing shifts. |
| I am only completing this section as my other response was sent before I was ready. I would like to see you gather some input from parents in the next section in a couple of areas: 1) Ask parents that if their child were chosen to attend a different school, what transition activities would best support their transition. 2) Ask what it looks like if MMSD has done an excellent job in adjusting boundary areas?<br>Also, I am waiting to understand when recommendations will be made to address the very small schools on the East Side. Lapham and Marquette can easily be combined. What about Erlinger? A one section school is not sustainable or the most desirable for students.<br>Also, how are you working with the Board to help them make difficult decisions? It will be quite disappointing if all of this work is completed and no changes are made. Boundary changes have not been done in the past because Board has not wanted to make difficult decisions. Also, closing a school should be considered as a possibility rather than repurposing a school. MMSD has leased out Lapham and Spring Harbor in the past for about a decade. I believe there was one other school, too. |
| This is a tough job. Thank you for doing it thoughtfully. |
| I am concerned about the boundary area changes impacting Thoreau Elementary. The chart that the district put out says that Thoreau is over capacity, but the school does not seem overcrowded. I know the district wants to make room for all day 4k, but the proposed boundaries remove over 150 students from the school. The 4k kids don't need that much room! And the students who will be sent to Lincoln Midvale are our friends and neighbors, and one of the best things about Thoreau is that it is small enough to have a strong, diverse community with parents, teachers, and students all connected and working towards the same goal. Please reconsider allowing sections S, T, R, Q, and O to remain as Thoreau attendance areas instead of Midvale-Lincoln.<br><br>I live in boundary area T and would like to strongly recommend that it stay as Thoreau attendance. Children from our neighborhood walk and bike to school. If our neighborhood changes to Midvale-Lincoln, our children will have a longer walk to Midvale and a very long bus ride to Lincoln. This directly goes against one of the stated goals that the district has of keeping the time on the bus short and keeping students close to neighborhood schools.<br><br>Additionally, the reasoning given on the map for moving our section T from Thoreau to Midvale-Lincoln is that it creates cleaner boundaries, but clearly the people who made the map have never actually been in our neighborhood! The boundaries that look cleaner on the map are actually the Arboretum (no trees |

| |
|---|
| going to school there!), the golf course (no golf balls either!), the cemetery (again, not heading to Midvale-Lincoln because, you know...). While it might look like section T borders the Midvale attendance area, we don't border any people who are actually going to Midvale/Lincoln. The only attendance area we border is Franklin-Randall, and for some unknown reason from years past, that cuts a third of the way through our neighborhood. So please don't send our kids to Midvale-Lincoln just because it makes the map look better!<br><br>Additionally, no matter what happens with the boundaries, the district absolutely should enact a legacy attendance policy. If a student begins at a particular school, they should be allowed to finish there, whether they are in first grade or fifth grade when the boundaries change. People bought their houses based on what they knew about the boundaries, and moved to neighborhoods for specific schools, and it is not fair to take kids away from their friends and community because the district needs to balance the numbers. Let the change be gradual.<br><br>Also, side note. It is so dumb for the boundary between Franklin-Randall and Thoreau to be down the middle of Knickerbocker Street. How silly. Have the boundary be between the back yards, not down the middle of the street where one side goes to one elementary and middle school and the other side goes to completely different schools until high school. That makes no sense.<br><br>Thanks for listening! I hope you hear from lots of other people in our neighborhood, because we really love Thoreau as our neighborhood school and we really want to keep it that way! |
| Is the old Frank Allis now Nuestro Mundo available to take some elementary students in regular classes? |
| Splitting elementary schools into different MS feeders, seems like an unnecessary complication that splits friend and neighborhood groups. When possible, I would direct all of an elementary to the the same Middle School |
| My family lives in the Cherokee/Hamilton option area. This area is proposed to lose its option and be part of the Cherokee MS attendance area. We strongly oppose removing the option. The midvale- lincoln elementary school feeds into 2 middle schools. Our son is currently in 4k, but we are already stressed by the knowledge that he will undoubtedly make close friendships with kids that will be split up at middle school. This is not at all ideal. At least having the option for him to choose which middle school he attends based on relationships, location, or programming provides some consolation. If you are set on removing option zones, sending our zone to Hamilton makes more sense as kids in the option zone are more a part of the neighborhood assigned to Hamilton than the neighborhood on the other side of the arboretum assigned to cherokee. |
| The historically paired schools (Lincoln-Midvale and Franklin-Randall) for desegregation purposes have been extremely successful and should be supported. Madison housing is very segregated by race and income and this reality contributes to patterns of prejudiced thinking. While MMSD cannot change housing patterns, crafting attendance area scenarios that create school populations that vary by income, race and ethnicity will help children to understand each other more fully. |
| If the community is not asking for repurposing low enrollment schools for other uses, why is that a consideration? |
| I'd like more info on the plan for staffing. |
| I'm filling this out again because I didn't realize I wouldn't have an opportunity to comment more. Please share to survey team this feedback, it's an easy fix and then you won't be sorting thru additional bogus surveys when parents realize their only opportunity to comment was back back back.<br><br>> I watched the presentation but cannot locate the spreadsheets with the current and proposed |

| |
|---|
| attendance, diversity, IEPs, etc by each school. Please advise - kmbremer@gmail.com<br><br>> No proposed plan would be complete without the adjacent proposed staffing plan. I understand that you would use the final plan to create a staffing plan, but without understanding the methodology there, I don't have confidence that the staffing would adequately handle the uptick in enrollment at some schools.<br>Emerson specifically looks to increase enrollment significantly. If I'm not mistaken, we had an uptick in enrollment at Emerson this year but did not see commensurate staff #s added. I'm unenthusiastic about the lack of staffing transparency. We had significant issues at Emerson already this year because we do not have enough staff for the Kindergarten classrooms. We need to understand staffing plans. How is MMSD planning to support Emerson through the shift from, what, 60% to 95%???<br>That's insane information to provide without providing staffing info. Did I miss something? Again..please advise. kmbremer@gmail.com |
| I would like you to consider the impact of paired schools on families and what scenarios would look like if those were phased out so families could go to schools in their neighborhoods and all siblings could be at the same school building for their entire elementary school experience. |
| The proposed changes to the Thoreau attendance area will decrease the diversity of the student population pretty significantly. By removing the neighborhoods by Leopold south of the Beltline, I am worried that it will create more isolation for lower income students coming from the remaining area south of the beltline. Thoreau doesn't feel overly crowded currently, and based on the housing in the proposed new attendance area, the student population in Nakoma isn't likely to grow over time. |
| No split K-2 3-5 buildings. Keep little kids in systems for a longer time to adjust to school. |
| These new properties are in the middle of nowhere, driving is the only way to get there. I don't see the harms of that taken into account anywhere.<br><br>Instead of re-allocating the students, I'd like to see a scenario where we re-allocate the bloated administration budget back into teachers and other student-facing roles. |
| I am concerned about the Section E change with Van Hise, Hamilton, and West.<br>The draft plan for Section E works against several of the district's own stated principles in Building for the Future, especially maximizing walkability/bikability and neighborhood schools. At present, Rennebohm Park and VHE are central meeting point for many community events, gatherings, and more where the residents of Section E and the area south of Regent (which would remain in the VHE/Hamilton/West area) gather, run into one another, etc. The walkability to VHE and bus access to the university/hospital area from the Section E apartments to VHE is optimal, allowing many of us to be without a car. Shifting to Crestwood would making owning a vehicle almost necessary, or foregoing the abilty to be present at evening/summer events at the school. There would be less natural interaction with the other families in the same attendance area. The walk/bike is also much more dangerous with busy street crossings.<br><br>The proposed change also shifts the middle school (same issues as above-- Hamilton is currently ideally located for this area, easily walkable/bikeable) and high school, reducing continuity for our neighborhood between the friends we have where we live and the friends at school. |
| KEEP PAIRED ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS!!! DO NOT COMBINE INTO K-5!!!! |
| As the parent of a 4th-grade student at Van Hise Elementary, I am deeply concerned and disappointed by the draft scenarios that reassign our neighborhood away from Van Hise. We live at 4801 Sheboygan Avenue, which is less than a 10-minute walk from the school. Moving elementary students away from their established teachers, friends, and support systems causes unnecessary academic and social disruption. I urge MMSD to uphold its guiding principle to 'minimize impact' by keeping our area at Van |

| |
|---|
| Hise. At a minimum, MMSD should establish a clear grandfathering policy that permits all current students to finish elementary school at Van Hise and seamlessly transition to Hamilton Middle School with their cohort. |
| For Lapham/Marquette families, our schools are still underutilized in the draft scenario, and with the discussion of "repurposing" schools, no one from leadership has engaged our community about this as a possibility. Why not? This would have a huge impact on families living on the near east side. You have engaged with families living in other zones where the boundary review impacts their attendance area. Closing a neighborhood school would be devastating. |
| Consulting groups like MGT overcharge for recommendations school districts can generate themselves. The perception of an unbiased plan is not worth the price tag. |
| *Property taxes needs to be address in this city! They are way too high! Something else needs to be done. I am generally pro education; however, I don't feel i can continue to support referendums until property tax rates and values are much better overall addressed. |
| Focus not just on making attendance areas contiguous, but rather calculate the time it takes to walk from each address in an attendance area to the elementary school. You can then compare the distribution of these times. For example how does the average time differ by school. We moved to the lapham/Marquette attendance area from the north side of emerson attendance area because the commute to school would have been so long. How can the school district partner with the city to improve potential transportation? How can we encourage family centered development where we already have the schools built?<br><br>Consider those who don't send their kids to mmsd and what could be done to bring them in. Are they responding to this survey?<br><br>Magnet schools are fine, but more needs to be done to help people in this city who have the means to move or send their kids elsewhere that the neighborhood schools are doing great things. We need to proactively build a positive perception. |
| I am an educator at Orchard Ridge Elementary writing to share my thoughts about the proposed boundary line changes. I have serious concerns about the potential impact on our students and families.<br><br>Orchard Ridge is a neighborhood school. Many of our students, particularly those in Sections B and M, come from lower-income families. These students are more likely to face challenges getting to school consistently and on time. Having a school in their immediate neighborhood gives them the option for their children to walk to school. This is not simply a convenience. It is an essential part of having access to school for families who do not have reliable access to a car or who are balancing work and other financial challenges.<br><br>Our school has worked hard to build a strong walking school bus program that helps students get to school safely and on time. This has been especially important because our school has historically struggled with attendance and tardiness.Our walking school bus provides a safe and dependable way for students to get to school without requiring a parent or caregiver to drive them. Increasing the distance that students would need to walk could create another barrier for those who are already struggling with attendance. This is especially concerning in Section M, where some students can literally see Orchard Ridge from their homes. These are low-income students that currently have a very convenient way to get to school.<br><br>In contrast, students in Section U are already bused to Stephens or Crestwood Elementary. If they remain at Stephens or Crestwood, they would continue to have access to transportation, so the change would |

| |
|---|
| have less of an impact on their ability to get to school. Reassigning Section U to Orchard Ridge Elementary offers no real benefit, as these children will rely on busing regardless. Meanwhile, displacing our families in Sections B and M, would make getting to school more difficult. The potential drawbacks of this proposal significantly outweigh any perceived advantages.<br><br>While there are certainly many factors that influence boundary decisions, I hope the district will carefully reconsider the equity implications of the proposed changes. For some of our students, removing access to a walkable neighborhood school and the walking school bus is not just about convenienceâ€”it is about removing a significant barrier to consistent school attendance. I believe the proposed changes would disproportionately affect our lower-income families and the students who rely most on the accessibility of Orchard Ridge Elementary. |
| It looks like the area of Westmorland that changed from Thoreau to hamilton , close to letter T, did not change for middle school and is listed for the wrong middle school. It should become an area of choice like the other part of westmorland that borders it, so students can pick Cherokee or hamilton |
| I am concerned about the boundary change to section T. I would like to advocate that MMSD keeps area â€œTâ€ as Thoreau or enacts a legacy enrollment policy. This would keep students in their neighborhood school, minimize the impact on students, and keep schools walkable. I am a grandma of current Thoreau students and I also live in area T. I help with drop off and pick up and I wouldn't be able to do so if they change schools. Thank you for your consideration.Â |
| Please do NOT move the neighborhood on South Thompson (between Buckeye and Vondron) to Hendersen. Keep this neighborhood with Ada Deer!! I think it's section K and J on the map with no new Sprecher scho being built. Across the city, once new boundaries take place, please allow 4th and 5th grade students to be â€˜grand fathered in' and stay with their current school community. Separating them from their peers and teachers right before middle school would be detrimental to learning and social emotional well being. |
| After school care (wrap around care) for 4K and 5K students! There is not enough support right now for these populations and I worry that adding more 4K will make this even tougher. I was not able to enroll my child at a 4K school site last year b/c they didn't have after school care. This is an equity issue - parents who can pick up a child at 2:30 are probably not the ones who have two parents working full time. So who is it really serving? |
| Continuity, continuity, continuity |
| I am concerned about the boundary change to Thoreau Elementary school. I would like to advocate that the Thoreau boundaries remain intact, keeping the diversity of the school and allowing neighborhoods to go to school together. This would keep students in their neighborhood school, minimize the impact on students, and keep schools walkable. I would also request that MMSD enact a legacy enrollment policy so that kids who have started attending Thoreau can remain at their school. |
| Increasing the number of students attending a school needs to come with an increase in student support services and resources. When looking at the boundary changes specifically for Ada Deer/Elvehjem it looks as though their attendance will increase significantly especially with the high rise apartments on Milwaukee St. and Kennedy's attendance will decrease significantly. Considering Kennedy is a currently a community school and Ada Deer is not, my question is will resources shift to Ada Deer including increase in staffing (nurse, social workers, SEA's, EA's, special ed teachers, etc.) and resources to help population change?? Will class sizes reflect optimal learning environments because currently the district continues to increase class sizes at Ada Deer compared to other east side schools. For example, at 3rd grade they currently have 27-28 students in their classes while other schools have only 15-18 in their 3rd grade classes. |

| |
|---|
| With the proposed boundary changes, Ada Deer/Elvehjem appears likely to see a significant increase in enrollment, especially with the high-rise apartments on Milwaukee Street, while Kennedy's enrollment may decrease significantly. How will the district ensure that Ada Deer/Elvehjem receives the additional resources and staffing needed to support this growth? Will there be increases in nurses, social workers, SEAs, EAs, and special education teachers to meet students' needs? Since Kennedy is currently a community school and Ada Deer/Elvehjem is not, how will the district ensure students continue to receive the support and services they need? I am also concerned about class sizes. Ada Deer/Elvehjem currently has third-grade classes of approximately 27â€“28 students, while some other East Side schools have classes of only 15â€“18 students. How will the district address this disparity and ensure class sizes remain manageable and supportive of student learning as enrollment increases? |
| Would you consider closing a middle school on the east side? Or repurposing to an elementary school? It seemed like a lot of them were under capacity. Also you're slamming Gompers with a disproportionate amount of minority populations. I know they'll have a new building but that's not fair to that community/school. |
| My children attend Thoreau Elementary. I do NOT support the map changes that are currently being proposed. These changes would significantly impact our student population and the diversity of that student population. With less students/less utilization I do not foresee these changes translating to smaller classrooms. It will likely means staff cuts and less resources for the school. Or, could it potentially become a charter school as the survey discussed? I understand that converting schools into a different type of building for dual-language programs, STEM programs, etc, can be appealing, but not at the expense of a school where children have a safe, caring, and inclusive learning environment for a core curriculum.<br>Some of the mapping changes for Thoreau also don't make a lot of sense. For example, Zone T. Students in that area are currently walking to school, with the changes, they would have to be bussed to school where they may know one other person their age from that neighborhood. Going along with that, existing students and families should be able to remain in their current schools.<br>Finally, I just learned about these potential mapping changes last week. These spring surveys that were out there and the community forums that took place were not well advertised. I'm guessing they were in one of the many MMSD emails that we get that cover many different stories. Were there fliers or mailers sent out specifically to areas that will be affected by these changes? |
| The fact that enrollment in Madison schools continues to drop. |
| I am concerned about the boundary change to Thoreau Elementary. I would like to advocate that MMSD keeps the Thoreau boundaries intact, keeping the diversity of the school and allowing neighborhoods to go to school together. This would keep students in their neighborhood school, minimize the impact on students, and keep schools walkable. I want our school to be at the target number of students, not 74.4% - Thoreau boundaries are not going to see large population growth. It is also essential that MMSD enact a legacy enrollment policy so that kids who have started attending Thoreau can remain there. Thank you for your consideration. |
| How their changes to capacity will change staffing and resources to designated schools. |
| I am concerned about the boundary change to section T. I would like to advocate that MMSD (keeps area â€œTâ€ as Thoreau / changes area â€œTâ€ to a choice area / enacts a legacy enrollment policy). This would keep students in their neighborhood school, minimize the impact on students, and keep schools walkable. Thank you for your consideration. |
| I am perplexed by the model being used for Thoreau and the portion of that enrollment area that will be relocated away from Thoreau. There is clear obfuscation in calling out green spaces which lack any habitant to create an apparent contiguous zone. What is missed with the current representation is that the "contiguous area" is actually separated by a lake, arboretum and golf course from the rest of the |

| |
|---|
| enrollment area. When diving in deeper to look at the Franklin Randall district lines one is confronted with a skinny extension on Gregory Street which would otherwise be part of the Thoreau district. I am not sure why that segment of incredibly artificial boundary drawing is not part of the effort to "create more contiguous and cleaner borders" for the enrollment areas. |
| In an effort to reallocate enrollment so you can free up buildings for other uses, you are going to formalize biased (and possibly racist) boundaries. As a parent in the Thoreau /Cherokee district, I am aware that there are many primary Spanish speaking families who feel they are being pushed into Dual Language programming. That smacks of bigotry and redlining based on language. It also will erode diversity. Which will be more pronounced when more of our neighbors elect to leave MMSD in favor of Edgewood, Blessed Sacrament and Eagle. We are sticking in MMSD because we believe in the importance of public education and the value of diversity. However, our trust is eroding as the planned district maps don't make sense for Thoreau. |
| I am concerned about the boundary change to section T. I would like to advocate that MMSD keeps area â€œTâ€ as Thoreau, changes area â€œTâ€ to a choice area or enacts a legacy enrollment policy. This would keep students in their neighborhood school, minimize the impact on students, and keep schools walkable. I think it would be highly unfair to force students to attend new schools, leaving friends and communities they have already established, through no fault of their own or their family's. Thank you for your consideration. |
| stop making changes for no reason its extremely disruptive |
| We are looking forward to a 4K option at Van Hise |
| Do the draft scenario utilization numbers take into account the changes in utilization for schools that are being renovated/rebuilt? |
| The idea of changing section E for Van Hise is troublingâ€¦ acknowledge that it is overcapacity for 4K but this proposal of moving students is troubling. And the idea that they move to Crestwood which is not even adjacent and changes feeder pattern makes no sense! This move leads to transportation issues for parents because it isn't over the bus 1.5 mile requirement and too far to walk.. so there will be more cars. Van Hise is true neighborhood schoolâ€¦ the disruption to current and future families who relocated to this neighborhood thinking that they would be able to walk to school for k-8 is very problematic. Further the proposed area would cut the diversity at Van Hise which seems to oppose your own desire. Please reconsider this proposal. |
| Build Acacia Ridge MS ASAP |
| Unsure of where to add this - but I saw the small neighborhood at the SW end of Monroe near Nakoma is getting reassigned to schools further away. This seems totally illogical - these kids should stay at Thoreau, which is in a contiguous neighborhood and walkable! Their new school assignments are way across big parks (Arboretum/Lake Wingra, golf course/cemetery) so they won't be in school with their neighbors |
| Definitely relook at the Northside/East area.<br>So many unnecessary changes. Feels like you're moving people just to move people. If you are trying to take take away an â€˜attendance island' don't do it by making a new â€˜attendance island'. Don't take advantage of most vulnerable families. |
| Sharing data around the K-2/3-5 school pairings would be helpful. What does changing these pairings do to student population, utilization, etc.? |
| The plan removes areas where parents have the option choose a school and I understand those make it in theory harder to model future growthâ€¦ but like it or not parents have the option to send kids to mmsd or private school so for the foreseeable future choice exists and we want them to choose mmsd so it can |

| |
|---|
| remain strong. Parents know their children and life situations best. Perhaps a move is in the near future? Consider expanding options not force your parents to look at options outside mmsd |
| Continuity and neighborhood schools are so important. People move to neighborhoods considering the schools. If schools are changed considerably (especially moving feeders) then I would not be surprised if this has the opposite impact of people moving out of district or open enrolling. Because what does it matter anymore if it feels like MMSD does not value our kids experiences and this impact.<br><br>Please keep feeders the same. I understand the need to switch some elementary/middle school boundaries, but stay within the feeders. The current feeder system seems to maximize the balance of neighborhood schools and diversity. Changing feeder patterns is disruptive for all. |
| Make sure you get in front of ALL of the community members, not just parents |
| Trying to combine the goal of all day 4K everywhere with optimizing class size and attendance is a really illogical plan. My assumption is that it entirely has to do with money and not what's best for kids. We would be reducing physical space and teaching resources at the same time we claim to be trying to optimize those for better class sizes and improved elementary and middle school resources. I have zero faith that would happen. Classes are strained to their limits already and the push for 4K should be openly explained as a funding need so that conversations can be much more honest than they are being now. |
| The latest version of the plan runs counter to the priorities established at the first meeting. Specifically,<br>(1) Neighborhood Schools and Walkability remain the top priority â€“ the plan for VHE and Hamilton disrupt neighborhood schools and eliminate walkability by re-assigning students to Crestwood and Gillespie which will result in more traffic (parents driving children to Crestwood) and increased busing cost to Gillespie.<br>(2) Balance Neighborhood schools with diversity and equity â€“ the plan for VHE and Hamilton remove families living in the apartments along Sheboygan which will in turn dilute diversity within both schools as many families are affiliated with UW Madison<br>(3) Preserve Student Stability through transition provisions and choice â€“ this plan removes student stability by â€œforcingâ€ a move to a non-neighborhood school and eliminate parental choice<br>(4) Transportation and Commute Time are Major Concerns â€“ this plan will increase commute times for families by requiring many to drive their children to school versus walk and have a direct impact on the transportation infrastructure (e.g., more cars on the road)<br>(5) Equity requires needs based resource allocation â€“ needs for who. Certainly not the families. I wonder if the consulting firm who probably received a huge contract has ever talked directly with parents outside of these â€œopen forumsâ€. This is certainly not how you conduct community engaged research. |
| Make schools as neighborhood based as possible. Invest in walking school buses, bike education, sidewalk infrastructure etc not busing! Kids learn better after active transportation! |
| MMSD seems like it's on a path chasing trends instead of focusing on core values of the community: listen to families instead of taking a top down approach. It seems those in charge at MMSD have a pre baked agenda to get rid of neighborhood schools and are setting themselves up for success instead of listening to families. This isn't equity in action. |
| I think there absolutely needs to be a Legacy plan in place for students that are currently enrolled in schools that would have new boundaries. These students need to have the option to stay at their current school or choose to move to the new school within their boundary. We are a family that would be effected by the change in the new boundaries and we 100% DO NOT want our children to have to attend a different school. There needs to be a legacy plan in available. If there was a plan available, then it would give the district ample time for the adjustments with this shift of boundaries.<br>I DO NOT want my children to have to attend a different school as our kids and us as their parents have |

| |
|---|
| built trusted relationships with the families at the school they currently attend. There have been numerous occasions were I have asked my son's best friends parents to pick up my kids because I am caught in Beltline traffic. If my kids were to move to a new school, there would be no one there that I could trust to pick up my kids. The friendship and relationships I've built with these families in an integral part of our lives. Our kids do not want to have to build new friendships against their will and we as their parents don't want those friendships broken.<br>We've also built relationships with the teachers and staff at the school we currently attend. Our kids get excited to see if they'll have the same teachers as their older sibling when they move up in grades and we are excited for them as we've built relationships with these teachers.<br><br>The community we are currently part of is incredibly important to us and we do not want that broken.<br><br>The new boundaries account for students to not have to cross busy roads to get to school. However there are already accommodations made to aid the students that do need to cross the busy roads. Crossing guards have been hired to help students and parents cross the road, the flashing lights for crossing are available, the community and teachers have a walking school bus for the kids as well. To shift the boundaries so that students don't have to cross a road, is a minimal argument when taking into consideration the accommodations that have been made.<br><br>I will say it again, there needs to be a legacy plan in place for students currently enrolled in the schools and live in areas that are affected by these boundary changes. |
| Ninguna. |
| Walking or biking to school without crossing should be a priority |
| Eliminate open enrollment within the district. |
| Avoid children's and parents to make them drive to school instead of walking! |
| do not break up neighborhoods!! For example, why is a chunk of Grandview Commons (east side of Madison) going to LVM and the other portion going to Kennedy? Use Cottage Grove road as a boundary line. It would be easier for families to develop community/supports (like carpool, team sports, etc.) if our neighborhood was kept together. Plus, because our neighborhood is currently chopped up, some families have decided to open enroll to Sun Prairie and Monona Grove. Please fix the boundary for Grandview Commons so we can have a community. |
| Emerson's current utilization rate in version 2 is around 90%, while Mendota's is around 50%. This makes no sense. Mendota has worked incredibly hard to build lasting relationships with the Packers community; please don't take them away. Also, there are 5 current staff members in the Sherman neighborhood who work at Mendota (as do their kids). Mendota is a community school in the truest sense of the word. |
| Equity of resources, capacity of schools, building conditions and space: some building may appear on paper to be able to accomodate students but their actual condition should be evaluated (an older schools conditions does not compare to a newer schools conditions.) Staffing considerations to be able to support the students, maxing out a school doesn't mean students get a quality education. Smaller class sizes matter, supports for high student needs matter, economic makeup of an area should be considered and taken into account, access to resources and opportunities matters. Central air really affects learning and many of the older schools have no air, it is very hard on staff and students to function.<br><br>Emerson school should not take on Packers ave. Emerson is already close to max. It should go with |

| |
|---|
| Mendota for the above reasons and the fact that it is a community school with community supports. Community schools should remain community schools. |
| MMSD is making a massive mistake with these attendance changes. We are hearing from families that they strongly oppose these changes. Many of the families that attend our school are extremely upset and are threatening to leave the district. You are completely dismantling years and years of dedication from schools and staffs to connect with their communities. Please reconsider! |
| If these changes go through, Thoreau would become this under utilized bubble of mostly white students. There would be far less diversity (a top 5 value), walkable areas would turn into students who need to bus to their proposed school (another top 5 value), and the space would be under utilized compared to schools around it. The families in this area who choose Thoreau over surrounding private schools do so because diversity is important to them. |
| I think kids should stay in the same path that they are in and if needing to change something, to minimize it - such as only changing elementary and keeping middle and high school. I also think keeping kids who can walk to school in that school is very important. Minimizing busses, time at bus stops, gas, and inability to walk to school. I also think keeping the community strong is important |
| I think that neighborhood schools and walkability should remain a top priority. In addition, the importance of diversity in schools cannot be understated. Last, feeder program changes should be considered. The change to section E would go against these things.<br><br>The section E |
| I do not think you should revise Door St and surrounding areas to a different elementary school.<br>-keep that area in van hise due to walkability<br>-keep the community strong by not moving the pool/park out of the school schools<br>- it's not fair to kick all of the apartments out of the school and create a greater barrier to them for getting to school |
| We'd greatly appreciate for our neighborhood (Wexford Village) to continue to be assigned to Stephens Elementary given our neighborhood's long history and strong connections to the Stephens school, staff, and community. We were extremely relieved that the Fall 2026 boundaries show Wexford Village being assigned to Stephens, and we very much hope this will become the final decision.<br>Even if Stephens Elementary is projected to have less than the goal utilization rate, we would not want to be reassigned to another school, especially Crestwood Elementary. We have no desire to attend Crestwood Elementary due to its location on a very busy street and minimal parking/drop off options; there are no side streets with easy access/parking for pickup and drop off and for school events. If an elementary school on the West side needs to be repurposed, we greatly hope the school district would seriously consider parking and traffic logistics when making the decision on which school to repurpose. |
| Neighborhood and a sense of community is important |
| At the virtual session I attended, all of my questions were not answered, despite there being time left in the zoom meeting to answer them. When making your next survey, please consider how you can re-frame questions so people have more space to offer their own opinions, rather than selecting/ordering options that already align with MMSD's current priorities. |
| Thanks for your careful consideration. This issue is extremely important. Redistricting does not happen often and to the best of our ability, we have to get it right.<br><br>-Staffing at school and the institution/creation of Community Schools should be more at the forefront of communicationÂ and planning. This struck me at the meeting and I have heard similar concerns from the community at large and educators. Planning for student needs is very much at the core of national conversations as well. Listening to this episode of Code Switch cemented this for me. Neighborhood |

| |
|---|
| schools. Planned for. Staffed. Hyper localized community needs met.<br><br>-Orchard Ridge is currently a walking school. Adding buses here seems a major consideration here as it shifts the culture and puts very different demands on the current model.<br><br>-Having lived in this community a long time and been someone always attuned to what is happening in education here as this is foundational to our community, I must say I was surprised to not hearÂ discussion of building a school in Allied. Historically, this is what this community has asked for. A quick google news search supports this wish.Â<br>2020 referenda articleDEC 2017 new school constructionMadison West HS Allied Neighborhood Article<br><br>-I attended the Boys & Girls Club Allied presentation. Attendance was extremely low. What other ways are you engaging the community soÂ that their input is heard? Given attendance this night, the community has not been heard in this format. As indicated, survey response was low. So, what ways are you reaching communities who we are not yet reaching? This is a must.Â<br><br>-A "neighborhood school" is not the same as a "contiguous boundary" and these terms were used somewhat interchangeably throughout the presentation. There are important differences.Â<br><br>-Are K-2 and 3-5 schools going to be split and returned to the K-5 model? |
| The current version of proposed boundaries is not changed for Muir Elementary, which has one of the highest proportions of low income students. I'm very discouraged with the lack of proposed changes. We are being impacted now by the lack of resources available to our higher needs students and the current map perpetuates inequities that we are seeing at our school and in MMSD. Surrounding schools also have almost zero changes to their boundaries, and will remain with low income populations of 15-25%, compared to Muir which is more than 60%. This is not equitable. Balancing school populations is really important to evenly distribute resources and allow all students to get the attention that they deserve to have a successful experience.  Muir is also at the 95% utilization rate, which is also not helped by the current proposed boundaries. |
| I am very concerned with the proposed plan for Emerson. The suggestion that the "H" island should come to Emerson to keep the area continuous seems based on the map coloring Warner Park purple. If it was colored yellow for Mendota, that area would be continuous for Mendota as well. You originally suggested Brentwood going to Mendota and Packers coming to Emerson - that made sense. You now have both coming to Emerson which does not make sense. Did you take into account the HUGE influx we are getting from new construction on Huxley? And those buildings aren't even full yet. Plus many of the students who have moved in aren't attending Emerson yet - over the years we will get many more students from these buildings. We are already over capacity in terms of the needs of students - even if we're not over capacity based on numbers. And your projection puts us at 90-95% capacity - this is too much. While Mendota will go down to 50% capacity - this makes no sense. And then we have east side schools like Marquette at 50% capacity and extremely different demographic make-up. This is not equitable and is not a good plan for Emerson. I hope that you will reconsider. |
| We will resist. Expect more bad press. Expect your school board to get voted out. Expect lawsuits. This won't be your crowning career achievement, superintendent, it will be your albatross. |
| I am concerned about the boundary change to Thoreau Elementary. I would like to advocate that MMSD keeps the Thoreau boundaries intact, keeping the diversity of the school and allowing neighborhoods to go to school together. This would keep students in their neighborhood school, minimize the impact on students, and keep schools walkable. I want our school to be at the target number of students, not 100 |

| |
|---|
| students below it! I would also request that MMSD enact a legacy enrollment policy so that kids who have started attending Thoreau can remain at our school. Thank you for your consideration. |
| Rezoning the T area for Thoreau would negatively impact ESL students, Thoreau diversity, and the staffing related to this student population. Not only would it negatively affect my family, it would negatively impact the continuity and stability of these students as well. |
| Pay teachers more; reduce the size of the classes; get rid of leadership staff that are causing teachers to leave. |
| Reasonable and balanced class sizes |
| You absolutely must, without exception, allow any kid who has currently begun school to stay in the current map they currently have available.<br><br>Anyone who would go to a school before the change MUST be able to choose to attend that school. Friendships, family, and where people intentionally bought property already absolutely demand it. |
| I don't like the boundary changes for section T. Please keep T as Thoreau. This would keep students in their neighborhood school and keep things walkable. |
| I am considered about the boundary change to section T. I would advocate that MMSD (keeps are T as Thoreau/ changes area T to a choice area/ enacts a legacy enrollment policy) This would keep students in their neighborhood school, minimize impact on students, and keep schools walkable. Thank you for your consideration. |
| There's no need for any new schools to be built when many schools are under capacity. I acknowledge do not have as much insight or expertise as you all do, and respect many of the decisions you make to help move as few boundaries/impact as few areas as possible. However, looking at the current and draft maps, it looks like there are many other solutions to help balance over/under capacity schools better. It will be difficult in the beginning, but so helpful in a few years/the long run so we don't have to do another redistricting within less than a 10 year span (as MMSD's last redistricting was less than 10 years ago). Please help balance the numbers so no school is over 95%, and no lower than 70%. |
| I live a few blocks away from Schenk. I like the idea of sending my kids to the neighborhood school but it concerns me that Schenk is the most crowded school in 5 to 10 years from now in both scenarios. I don't want to build a new school because our taxes have already gone up so much for the schools. It seems silly to have to pay more taxes for a new school when we have schools that are below ideal capacity. When I look at the scenario without Sprecher, it seems like Sandburg which is in the red zone by 2035 should take some of the students who are now zoned for Schenk and Kennedy so that Schenk and Kennedy are not so crowded. |
| I am concerned about the boundary change to section T. I would like to advocate that MMSD keep area T as Thoreau. This would keep students in their neighborhood school, minimize the impacts on students, and keep schools walkable. Please do not move section T to Midvale. Thank you for your consideration. |
| I'm concerned about the boundary change to section T. I would like to advocate that MMSD keep area T as Thoreau. This would keep students in their neighborhood school, minimize the impact on students, and keep schools walkable. |
| I would like to advocate that MMSD keeps area T as Thoreau because this would keep students in their neighborhood school, minimize impact on students, and keep the school walkable. Thank you. |
| Don't build new schools. The population projection is showing a decrease in attendance. Make use of what you have. |
| Switching existing boundaries from what is established is problematic, especially when kids may have to travel unsafe routes (e.g. Whitney Way) to walk farther to school when they are already in a school with their friends and neighbors. I just heard about the plan to move kids north of regent to Crestwood and strongly oppose this. Communication has not been clear about what planning is going on. |

| |
|---|
| Warner Park was colored purple (Emerson's color) making H (Packers) contiguous with Emerson. That makes Emerson's percent above 90. No one lives in Warner Park. If it was green (Mendota's color), H would be contiguous with Mendota and they would not drop to 59%. |
| I currently reside in section T of the proposed change and I have concerns about the boundary change. I would advocate that area T remain as Thoreau or at least remains a choice area. I am specifically concerned about attending Lincoln, which would require long travel times on roads that are known to be hazardous during morning and afternoon drop off/pick up times. I would have to drive past my preferred schools in order to keep driving to a non preferred school. It becomes more arduous to engage with the school and its programs. It would also require my children to be headed in opposite directions as one would be attending midvale and another Lincoln. I strongly oppose the decision to assign section T to midvale/lincoln. |
| Start naming new schools numbers or places so they don't have to be renamed in the future to the tune of $100,000 a piece stop wasting my money |
| Name schools after geographic areas not people so we don't have to spend all that money changing names - such a waste. We need to concentrate more on SAFETY - we need SROs!!! |
| Please consider continuity for our kids and provide an option (and enough lead time) for parents to elect for children to start kindergarten in the school/path they will end in. |
| I am concerned about the boundary changes to section T.  I want to see MMSD keeps area "T" as Thoreau. It would keep kids in their neighborhood schools. |
| We need students and staff in safe buildings. Students need air conditioning. Students need clean buildings. MMSD cannot continue to overpopulate some buildings while underpopulating others. |
| Keep students in their neighborhood schools!  Keep area "T" as Thoreau. |
| I hope that the option to remain in the currently enrolled school is offered to students, especially those in the later grades since they have built much of their lives in the school. I've seen research on moving people out of their homes and the mental challenges it can pose. People's homes become parts of a person and to change requires a rebuilding of the home-person system. A school becomes part of the child's mind in the same way and I'm sure that there's research to show that any transitions (from K-5 to middle school, or a cross-city move, or any similar movement) cause problems. I know they did for me as a child. (But I also acknowledge that the challenge can build resilience.)<br><br>We are lucky that our child is now able to bike on his own to school this year and we've seen him take a big leap in responsibility and maturity just because of that. Moving away from that and taking that away from him for just one year (he's currently in 4th grade) feels a bit cruel.<br><br>We're in a part of town that attends Thoreau and I believe the number of students that would be affected (and thus would be offered the choice to stay or switch) is quite small. But you know the numbers better than I do! |
| I am concerned about the boundary change to section T. I would like to advocate that MMSD keep the area "T" as Thoreau. If it changes, MMSD should enact a legacy enrollment policy to minimize disruptions to current students. This would keep students in their neighborhood school, minimize the impact on students, and keep schools walkable. Thank you for your consideration. |
| The Sprecher Rd. location should be sold to fund other capital projects. The Meadlowands and Harmony apts. (or future residential projects in that area) are not close enough to receive free busing so the families who need it most, would still face transportation barriers for high attendance and engagement rates. The far west side location is reasonable because Olson is bursting and there are many other residential zones that will be going up in that area of Madison. And even though your rhetoric/marketing pitch for MMSD to become a destination option for neighboring communities (which will never happen |

| |
|---|
| commensurate to the capital investment you desire), the west side location is the only one that would potentially position you for such an opportunity because of how Verona and Middleton boundaries are, compared to the Cottage Grove/Burke/Sun Prairie boundaries are on the far east location. Also, Whitehorse, Elvjehem and Kennedy both have enough land to build an addition if needed in the future. You don't need to spend more for a new fancy building. Invest in your current schools, consolidate/repurpose/sell. |
| Regardless of boundary changes, I think that MMSD should enact a legacy enrollment policy that students could continue in the school that they are currently enrolled in, unless parents select otherwise. (Ex: If a student is in 1st grade at Thoreau they could continue through 5th grade.) |
| Specifically in the Thoreau maps (where my family attends), I would like region T to remain with Thoreau or at least provide families the choice. Currently that map separates a small area of students from a walkable school and shifts them to Midvale where none of their neighborhood peers are attending (and families would have to drive). The areas in general being removed from Thoreau attendance would decrease the school population, and I imagine decrease staffing and support. I want a strong neighborhood school, not a smaller one or one that will get replaced by any other type of school (charter, etc). If you are changing boundaries, let families choose or have a legacy policy so they can finish where they started. |
| We should maintain neighborhood schools where students can safely walk to school which is a top priority. |
| Thanks for asking! Please keep doing that. |
| Improve the schools as they exist. Invest in the communities as much as you ask from those taxpayers. |
| The Thoreau community and I are strongly opposed to the draft boundary map that reassigns areas S, T, R, Q, and O from Thoreau Elementary. A significant number of our low-income families, students of color, and English Language Learners reside in those areas and it would completely change the demographics of our student population to the point where it is almost unrecognizable. |
| Grandfather families into their current school pipelines. |
| I am concerned about the boundary change to Thoreau Elementary. I would advocate that MMSD keeps the Thoreau boundaries intact, keeping the diversity of the school, and allowing neighborhoods to go to school together. I would also request that MMSD enact a legacy enrollment policy so that kids who have started attending Thoreau can remain at our school. Thank you for your consideration. |
| Make parents more accountable |
| Break up low income high schools and wealthy schools and make it more even |
| Why is the Hawthorne attendance area not fixed in the new draft maps? I don't understand why the boundary is drawn so oddly and neighborhood on the far East Side is so isolated and kids expected to cross Hwy 51 to get to school. If it's for balancing diversity it may be worth it, but no one has explained as such to date so it's hard to justify without that information. It seems much more appropriate to group the entire Glacier Hill / Ridgewood neighborhood and kids together. |
| I received messaging regarding a possible boundary change for Thoreau Elementary school. The possibility of this concerns me. I'm not sure how this will affect my child and if that means she would move elementary schools. I care greatly about Thoreau and its deep diversity. This change would not only impact the students on an individual level, but would also have lasting effects on enrollment levels, walkability and busing, along with the neighborhood as a whole. I would ask that if this were to take place that legacy enrollment be considered. I would also ask consideration to not change the boundary lines. Thank you. |
| none |

| |
|---|
| I am quite concerned about the map that shows many students who currently attend Mendota going somewhere else without any replacement students. |
| I see no reason to change them. Seems like a waste of time and money. |
| Transportation must be a priority along with any attendance or boundary changes. A long bus ride or car ride impacts a family's ability to engage with a school |
| You're focusing on the wrong thing. Your education sucks. Your teachers suck. Fix that problem first. |
| Families already living in the areas should be able to attend their original schools, if they choose. |
| Increase educational opportunities and improved school lunches are high on my priority list. |
| Students should not have to change schools once enrolled. They should have the choice to change schools or be able to finish their elementary/middle/high school years where they began. |
| Be proud of the schools we have, don't capitulate to whiny rich parents who are worried their kids aren't getting enough gold stars. |
| Choice. Families need to be given the choice as to whether or not to send their kid(s) to a different school. |
| Take into account the amount of impact for the schools compared to the amount of impact for the families and students. Again, for area E, families and students would be impacted to a much larger extent than the schools who would lose/gain 1 or 2 children per grade level. |
| MÁs estricto |
| Adequate options for advanced learners |
| This proposal should do as little damage as possible to existing attendance areas and maintain as much continuity as possible for existing students who have built relationships and support networks at their schools' |
| '-Keep this survey open and be available at all school buildings during parent teacher conferences. Come with all of the maps and point directly to your proposed changes.<br>-Change how you are measuring the diversity percentage - it is faulty and misses important nuances.<br>-Take away non-contiguous portions of the boundary map<br>-Carefully consider housing complexes that are currently "transitional" and not forever homes for families. These are currently being used to measure utilization yet, they are not stable measures.<br>-Get into our most needed areas and do presentations i.e. Oak Park Terrace on 113, Leopold, Rimrock, etc.<br>-I attended a listening session. I am both a MMSD employee and a parent in the district. I was disheartened to not have physical maps for the entire district at my session. The maps also need to be accompanied by statements of the major changes they are depicting. |
| I think moving the BLW neighborhood out of the Henderson attendance area would be detrimental to the school community, as well as destroying its existing DLI program. I am very frustrated that the BLW neighborhood is shown behind the key on the maps, and that very little outreach has happened in that neighborhood. Generations of families from the BLW neighborhood have been Glendale/Henderson students and they have the right to know that they would be changing schools. |
| Class sizes and space for students. |
| Continuing to force home taxes to shoulder the burden of the budget is untenable and disproportionately impacts those most vulnerable |
| Invest in buildings - you will need them. UPGRADE existing infrastructure. Get A/C NOW - no one can learn at 99 degrees. Stop reinventing the wheel and INVEST in what you have. |

| |
|---|
| I cannot select Henderson on the school association list, which seems like a huge omission considering that is one of the schools that could be vastly altered. |
| Please do not raise property taxes. They are quickly becoming a serious burden to homeowners. |
| Make sure "utilization " assessments actually take into consideration the quality of the classroom. Do not put any teachers on carts. |
| I don't think magnet schools are a good idea if that means decreasing the offerings for electives, especially the arts, at some of the schools. There are already schools in this district, like Spring Harbor and Blackhawk, which aren't fully supporting their arts programing because of the size. This has long term effects on whether those students access the prerequisites for them to participate in the arts at the high school level. |
| Consider closing either Crestwood, John Muir, or Stephens elementary. The close proximity of these schools, and, in particular, the non-contiguous boundaries for Stephens makes no sense. This also contributes to each school being under utilized. |
| Fix the gerrymandering, but leave schools alone, otherwise. Improve our classic architecture buildings, but don't demolish them and rebuild. Just modernize them. (Btw, that does not mean more tech! Less tech please!) |
| Declining Student Enrollment. MMSD Tax Increases are not sustainable. |
| Expanding middle school options that are further west. |
| I am concerned about the boundary change to section T. I would like to advocate that MMSD keeps area â€œTâ€ as Thoreau or enacts a legacy enrollment policy. This would keep students in their existing school communities and minimize the impact on students. Thank you for your consideration.Â |
| Small class size. More staff. Better trained staffed. More social workers and mental health providers in thr building |
| We oppose removing section E from Van Hise/Hamilton/West and want the boundary kept at N Whitney Way. |
| Please prioritize scenarios that keep Lapham, Marquette and O'Keeffe open as neighborhood schools. Evaluate the impact on neighborhood continuity, travel times and existing school communities alongside enrollment and building utilization. Clearly explain what each scenario would mean for these three schools, and show alternatives that preserve them before considering closure or repurposing. |
| We love Thoreau and don't want to split up our little neighborhood! We'd like to keep our attendance areas, if possible. If our area and others for Thoreau HAVE to move, we'd ask that we be grandfathered in to Thoreau, with the option to change. Thoreau doesn't feel overcrowded to us, and we love it there. We like going to school with others in our neighborhood, but also in our community. Thanks for reading. |
| I strongly oppose removing section E from van hise/hamilton/west. I believe there are scenarios that keep the feeder schools consistent, keep kids in school with their neighbors, and decrease amount of bussing needed. |
| Local wraparound care options: location and scheduling - align with elementary schools as much as possible. |
| The number of families who do not provide documentation to open enroll at a non neighborhood school. Families openly speak about how they did not have to provide documents to send their child to a school they are not assigned to. |
| There should be flexibility built into the redistricting plan so things can change more easily as populations in Madison change and flow. And we do not need to go through such an arduous process |
| Just let the existing students finish their time there. Switching schools is a pain in the ass. |
| You should give people a choice |

| |
|---|
| I think moving section E to Crestwood is the only â€˜error' I see in the plan. This block is clearly a part of of the Van Hise community, and is walking distance from VHE. I don't think this is the block to move to Crestwood. |
| Being sensitive to families in areas with new attendance pathways, e.g, attendance area E. Annexing this area to the Crestwood district vs Van Hise doesn't improve VHE diversity and seems to cross the natural divide of Min Pt Rd and split families who share enjoyment and use of Rennebohm Park. I understand that moving boundaries is easier than building a new addition to VHE, but if the change to area E has to happen can it be phased in only for new kindergartners so that existing students aren't moved mid-stream? |
| I oppose removing Section E from Van Hise/Hamilton/West and want the boundary kept at N. Whitney Way. |
| Busing. Start times. It's so hard to get my six year old up and out the door by 6.45. |
| What options will have the least impact on raising taxes |
| Don't swap overcrowding at one school to put it at another. If we cannot approve building the new schools, the proposed boundary changes need to be refined to better balance attendance and utilization across ALL schools. Support neighborhood schools and promote safe/stable environment for learning by not overtaxing available teachers, space, and resources. Too many kids in one classroom is not the way to go. |
| I oppose removing section E from the Van Hise/Hamilton/West area and support keeping the boundary between West and Memorial at N. Whitney Way. First, the single family homes in Section E are part of the Hill Farms neighborhood, which currently attends Van Hise or Stephens. Adding a third school fragments our neighborhood. Second, the multifamily units in Section E provide significant economic, racial, and cultural diversity to both Van Hise and Hamilton. Many of these families have chosen to live in the area because of Van Hise and Hamilton. I would at least hope that the school district has reached out to these families, who are often new to Madison, before imposing an arbitrary decision on families who for various reasons have a smaller voice in our community. |
| Can we please split Franklin-Randall? Would be nice if kiddos close to Randall didn't have to travel far across town to Franklin |
| I am completing this survey because I want to advocate for students in section E that wish to walk to their neighborhood school instead of being redistricted to a school further from their neighborhood. |
| Please do not remove Section E from Van Hise/Hamilton/West High School. These students are an essential part of the diversity of the school community. These students deserve to walk to the schools that are closest to their homes. This is more important than adding a 4K location. |
| DLI strands are sub optimal, and need to be reconsidered but with transportation provided to kids who are historically marginalized |
| Current teaching teams and school climate. The erasure of diversity.<br><br>I am concerned about the boundary change to Thoreau Elementary. I would like to advocate that MMSD keeps the Thoreau boundaries intact, keeping the diversity of the school and allowing neighborhoods to go to school together. This would keep students in their neighborhood school, minimize the impact on students, and keep schools walkable. I want our school to be at the target number of students, not 100 students below it! I would also request that MMSD enact a legacy enrollment policy so that kids who have started attending Thoreau can remain at our school. Thank you for your consideration. |
| I am a Madison resident who lives in Section E of the proposed new school boundaries (north of Regent St between N. Whitney Way and Segoe Rd). I'm asking the district to keep the Van Hise boundary at N. |

| |
|---|
| Whitney Way and leave Section E with Van Hise, Hamilton, and West.<br>The draft plan for Section E works against several of the district's own stated principles in Building for the Future:<br><br>Maximizing walkability: The draft increases distances and adds dangerous pedestrian crossings, especially at Whitney Way. It makes it unrealistic and unsafe for children in Section E to walk to Crestwood Elementary, and impossible to walk to Gillespie Middle School. Hamilton is about half a mile from Section E. Gillespie is about 2.5 miles away by road.<br><br>Maintaining diversity: The Building for the future Future presentation outlines a decline for VHE in racial diversity, economically disadvantaged, and English learner students. Students with lower incomes and fewer transportation options will lose access to their walkable neighborhood school. Diversity at VHE and Hamilton will decline.<br><br>Avoiding busy crossings: The draft adds several busy crossings, especially Whitney Way, which widens to six lanes at Old Sauk Road. Whitney Way has made sense as a school boundary for good reason. It isn't safe to ask children to cross it regularly.<br><br>Keeping feeder patterns: The draft doesn't keep feeder patterns in place. It replaces both the middle school and the high school for children in Section E and separates them from their friends and neighbors.<br><br>Please keep the boundary at Whitney Way and allow our children to continue attending their neighborhood schools. |
| Find out sources of funding if possible. So as to not keep increase property taxes. |
| Until state policies around how schools are funded changes, districting considerations should also include equitable funding to each school based partially on the property tax base |
| Staff allocations- at schools with significantly reduced utilization, you will have big impacts to staff allocations. You will lose good staff members who do not want to be split between schools. Think about what this will do to the quality of our teaching staff and how that will impact student outcomes. |
| Ironic that the process has been trying to gut and confuse the Stephens attendance area. Especially since it was building number 11 that didn't get any referendum money and is in poor condition. And then, after these meetings are done, two other west side schools that already were getting money for remodels are switched to full rebuilds. Still 0 dollars allocated to Stephens. It looks bad. It looks obvious what the district is doing. The staff and students deserve transparency. |
| We bought our house in large part due to the schools we would send our children to. We looked for years. Now we are in our home, and a main reason why we live here is being threatened. Provide options to people who want to send their children to the schools (middle and high school) that they planned on sending them to when they bought their home in this incredibly expensive city! |
| Ability for kids of all ages to get to school by biking and walking is paramount. For HS, you can add Madison Metro. This is important to foster independence, lower burden on parents, promote physical activity, and lower costs for MMSD. School bussing is a direct measure of the failure of school placement and city growth patterns.<br><br>Please consider smaller high schools. This would reduce transportstion burden, foster less violent and tighter nit schools. |
| force fitchburg to build a high school |

| |
|---|
| I am concerned about the boundary change to section T. I would like to advocate that MMSD keeps area "T" as Thoreau and enacts a legacy enrollment policy for current students/families. This would keep students in their neighborhood school, minimize the impact on current students, and keep schools walkable. Thank you for your consideration. |
| I am most specifically concerned about the proposed boundary change at section T. I would like to advocate that MMSD keeps area â€œTâ€ as Thoreau / changes area â€œTâ€ to a choice area / enacts a legacy enrollment policy. As boundary changes are discussed, keeping the T area as Thoreau would emphasize neighborhood schools, minimize disruption to students and families, and maximize walkability, Thank you for your consideration. |
| Supporting Nuestro Mundo transportation. You have such a good school on your hands its a bummer you don't support them enough. I would love to have my students attend the school but unfortunately transportation is a huge problem. |
| Use other former schools, e.g. Hoyt, to supplement new space.<br>People have allegiances and expectations towards schools; it shows their allegiance when they buy homes in the school's district. It TEARS apart emotions to be transferred to non-allegiance schools. In the Hill Farms, send the apartment people to anywhere because they are transient and untethered, but leave the home owner kids to the school where they are. |
| I oppose removing Section E from the Van Hise/Hamilton/West attendance area and support keeping Whitney Way as the boundary. |
| Agan escuelas seguras que los estudiantes se sientan seguros |
| MMSD should consider how best to support and develop individuals for the world we want to live in, instead of preparing them to fit into the existing paradigm. |
| MMSD should also consider petitioning the court to expand school district to include areas that Madison is annexing in the future.<br><br>Ideally all future Madison residents would go to MMSD schools which is important when it comes to feeling like they are apart of the Madison community.<br><br>For example, Madison will be annexing apart of April Hills neighborhood and their argument is (besides taxes) that they feel like they are more associated with McFarland than Madison because their children will continue to go to McFarland schools. These children as well as any other Madison resident should switch over to the MMSD school attendance area. |
| Some schools have to have a certian number enrolled inorder to recieve funding and food programs. Taking that away could result in poor quality teaching environments. Over enrollment can hurt others that want to learn and teach. Lack of support for the teachers is happening way too much. |
| There is a proposal to move the Dudgeon Monroe area from the Thoreau to the Midvale district. Midvale is a lower performing district based on state test scores and Zillow ratings. My kids went to Madison schools and if we were redistricted like this, we would have moved. This is true even if our kids could stay in the same school because we know real-estate prices correlate with school quality. If Madison keeps expanding lower performing districts rather than fixing the cause for the lower performance, people will keep moving out and property values will be lower and tax revenue will be affected. Low performing schools leads to a slow economic downward spiral that I've seen over the years in three other cities that I lived in. |
| The plan notes significant new construction growth in certain areas, but doesn't say whether those new buildings are likely to house families and children. Much of Madison's high-profile growth has been family-unfriendly buildings (e.g. luxury high-rises on East Wash), and I hope MMSD is weighing those factors when forecasting where enrollment is likely to increase. |

| |
|---|
| Second, it's unclear how age/condition of existing facilities might play a part. For instance, which buildings lack air conditioning? Are we adding students to those? Can we afford to renovate them?<br><br>Also, it seems notable to me that the new plans don't touch Lapham/Marquette, Franklin/Randall, Shorewood, or Lowell - is that because those are the bougie areas where parents are most likely to complain if their kids are redistricted? I'm not mad that Lowell isn't going to get more crowded, but it does seem odd that Lapham, at 50something% capacity, isn't getting more students added to its area.<br><br>Finally, proper full-day 4k requires qualified ECE staff (different skill set from K-12 education!) and wraparound care. I hope the district is actually planning to staff for these needs, since otherwise 4k is too inconvenient for working parents to actually use! |
| I think it should be taken into consideration that there are a lot of great community 4K sites in Madison and that this partnership works (both of my kids attended a 4K MMSD community partner site). Instead of bending over backwards to try and have enough space for multiple new 4K classrooms at schools, I think you should prioritize a full day classroom at school sites (for families that really need full day care with transportation) and then utilize community sites for half day 4K and additional full day options. |
| There appear to be enough to digest at this point |
| Avoid shifting a 'problem' from one school to another. For example, school A now has lower usage and school B has high usage. Simply shifting usage from school B to school A does not solve the problem.<br><br>Consider smaller additions to schools that are almost to or just over capacity. |
| Don't remove diversity from our schools and actually listen to the whole community. It seems like you've already made up your minds and this feedback is simply just to check a box. |
| 0% of the presentation had mention of any of the charter/other schools that are very much a part of MMSD and either come from or feed into the schools that were mentioned...ie. Nuestro Mundo, Spring Harbor, Badger Rock, Wright...how does re-districting impact these schools? Are they still planned to pull from or feed into the schools that they currently do? Or will there be changes? |
| I am a Madison resident living in Section E, north of Regent Street between N. Whitney Way and Segoe Road. I urge the district to keep the boundary at N. Whitney Way so that Section E remains with Van Hise, Hamilton, and West.<br><br>The proposed plan conflicts with several Building for the Future goals. It reduces walkability by assigning students to schools farther from home and requiring crossings of major roads, especially Whitney Way. It also undermines safety, as Whitney Way is a busy six-lane corridor in places and has long served as a logical school boundary.<br><br>The proposal would also reduce diversity at Van Hise and Hamilton and disrupt established feeder patterns by changing both middle and high school assignments for Section E students. This would separate children from classmates, friends, and neighbors and move many families away from their walkable neighborhood schools.<br><br>Please keep the boundary at N. Whitney Way and allow our children to continue attending their neighborhood schools. |
| I have concerns about the impacts on Emerson and Mendota Elementary Schools of the proposed boundary changes. |

| |
|---|
| Specifically, I advocate for section H to stay with Mendota, allowing students continuity.<br><br>Additionally, as proposals are made to add sections to Emerson, it is important to consider how much space in the Emerson building is safe and appropriate for classroom use - not simply a part of the building.<br><br>As well, I urge consideration of the actual effects of resource distribution between schools. These effects are not purely based on number of students, but also quantity and sources of funding for schools (Emerson is not currently designated a "Community School", for example), need levels of students and families, equitable distribution based on income levels, etc.<br><br>Let's make sure that there is equitable distribution across our schools!<br><br>Thank you for your work on behalf of our school community. |
| I am very concerned with the shift in the Emerson/Mendota boundaries in the most recent draft. Decreasing Mendota's enrollment, while still having high economic need, would be extremely detrimental to the school. What would happen to the community school resources and staffing? I worry it would create less flexibility and opportunities for the students who remained the Mendota attendance area. In addition, a huge apartment complex just opened in the Emerson attendance area, and I have heard there are plans for additional housing developments in the area. Was this factored in to the utilization numbers? Putting Emerson over target utilization numbers and increasing their need feels like it would put a lot of unnecessary stress on the school community. Keeping more students at Mendota would be better for both Mendota and Emerson communities. It is unfair that Mendota has to split for middle school. Could all of the Mendota attendance area go to Sherman? |
| It would be helpful to have members of the team come through schools and witness how schools are currently being used and what capacity they have available. We are unclear how utilization was determined |
| 4K is growing too much and taking away too many resources and space from our K-12 students. We should scale back. |
| Student safety. Specifically, avoiding situations in which students who currently walk to school would have to cross busy roads, like Whitney Way. The Whitney Way/Old Middleton intersection is challenging for adults to cross! It's hard to believe that the district would make students take that risk or force parents to make other arrangements. |
| Make sure the city builds housing for low income families so that all schools are diverse. I do not want Olson to lose that population however I understand and support those families in Renew apartments/Schroeder Rd. area wanting a school close to them. There is no city bus line that reaches Olson nor any affordable housing near Olson. |
| Please don't remove â€œsection eâ€ from van hise/hamilton. |
| I oppose removing Section E from Van Hise/Hamilton/West and want the boundary kept at N. Whitney Way. |
| Although a small number of schools don not currently have 4K classrooms. MMSD program is available and support at nearby private preschools so should not supersede space usage over attendance at the nearest school. |
| Don't break up walkable neighborhood school attendance. It really creates a dramatic harm for kids AND costs the district funds for bussing. |
| Keep children walking to their neighborhood schools as much as possible. |

| |
|---|
| Continue to give residents in Westmoreland a choice between Hamilton and Cherokee middle schools so kids can remain with their same cohort from elementary through high school. Or solve for this by having everyone who attends Midvale/Lincoln go to the same middle school, similar to Franklin/Randall, regardless of DLI involvement. Or consider having kids who live closer to Franklin attend a different middle school instead of allowing them to bus to Hamilton when people in Westmoreland who are closer to Hamilton are not allowed to attend that school. That makes no sense and the current boundaries are no longer supporting diversity or equity goals. |
| Allowing students currently enrolled (and their siblings) to stay in their current schools |
| I wanted to share my thoughts regarding boundary area T shifting to midvale / Lincoln. I would prefer the option to still send my child in area T to Thoreau. Keeping school walkable is important to me, especially as a one car family. I understand that she would be able to bus to Midvale / Lincoln but getting to these schools, for events, volunteering, or picking up a sick child, would be more challenging for me. I would love to keep my child in a neighborhood school. Thank you! |
| remember to plan for the families, not the buildings. Shifting the problem doesn't actually solve the problem (i.e. taking one school from 90% capacity to 70% and pushing that 20% to a neighboring school). |
| For Wexford Village, even though Stephens is not in our neighborhood, it still feels like our neighborhood school because so many students and staff live in the neighborhood |
| As an Elvehjem alum, I feel strongly that deep intervention is needed to fix the broken insular culture. As one former Madison teacher told me. â€œ Elvehjem is mostly white and they are proud of itâ€ |
| It would be best to integrate the newer apartments and townhouses into the schools needing numbers filled as well as leave room for the newly planned units and single family homes yet to be built rather than changing the dynamics of identity long-established neighborhoods have in their current schools. Dividing families and friends in addition to embracing g a rapidly growing community is disheartening and my child has cried several times thinking he will have to move to another school year after next if rezoned. Our family has been distraught over having to make this adjustment and feel it is unfair considering we pay the higher percentage of taxes in the nation, drive on horrible roads, and now have the threat of our neighborhood schools being dismantled and rearranged while still paying over 7% tax increases yearly allowed by last year's referendum. It is cruel and gut wrenching because making connections in today's society is hard enough without causing the unnecessary pain of new kid syndrome for our children which does carry emotional trauma well-documented and against the collective nature of MMSD where quality education and community are the core of our pride. |
| Not switching boundaries so capacity issues move from one school to another, because that is not a good solution. If areas of the city are developing too quickly and the city didn't prepare properly for these increases in population density, including families with children, that is on the city to solve the issue without placing the burden on existing schools. |
| What is best for students, families, and communities. I do not think this includes boundary changes within neighborhoods. |
| Reconsider rebuilding crestwood. Why not build a new school on the far west side and reset the boundaries for the other two near west elementary schools. Those schools are already under utilized. |
| while family input is deeply important, Madison is changing, and change is difficult. I grew up going to a neighborhood elementary school, but as a child of immigrants who definitely did not look like the majority of our student population. while ostensibly included, i had a marginalized experience. We can create strong communities by providing our children an experience that develops their critical thinking skills and sense of community, by engaging their families and embracing their cultures. we do not need to live down the road from the school to feel a sense of security, belonging, community, AND especially, to provide our children with high quality education |

| |
|---|
| We live in Zone E (N Whitney Way & Sheboygan Ave) and there are a few other families we know that either live in the apartment complexes, or have bought houses north of Regent. Our kids go to Van Hise ES and the proximity, walkability, the sense of community are amazing. Van Hise kids meet and play at the Rennebohm Park every day. We are confused about the re-zoning specific to this odd patch to Crestwood because it's literally farther away by any means of measurement. There are three very busy car traffic roads (N Whitney Way, Old Middleton Rd, University Ave) that stand in the way for kids to go to school. These roads created hard boundaries to how communities see themselves. Zone E would have a hard time being force-integrated to the Crestwood community. |
| Please make more after school and before school/MSCR options for students and families and more alternative learning schools that specialize for students to learn in all types of instructional and social emotional supported programming. |
| In theory, I understand these goals. But it feels really bad to be in the areas (I live in area T) that are proposed to be moved to a new school farther away. I would be sad to have to switch from my walkable neighborhood school to driving to a farther school. |
| 1. Do know where new housing will occurr and how will you account for that?<br>2. What is the projection of growth for Nuestro Mundo?<br>3. How is legal access to DLI programming included in projection?<br>4. Will DLI access change with new zoning/will priority neighborhoods shift impacting students who Already access DLI programs at neighboring schools?<br>5. IF a new school is approved to be built on sprecher, how will that shift the timeline for rezoning?<br>6. IF a new school is approved to be built on Sprecher, will students be expected to change zones twice?<br>7. What impact will this have on our teachers?<br>8. In the presentation, trying to keep schools in the ideal utilization zone brought relief to schools with major overcrowding issues but overall seemed to tip the scale to overcrowding at every other school. How will MMSD support these schools as they transition to major increases in student population?<br>9. If there are so many schools that will now be empty - why are we not heavily considering how to use those schools vs go to referendum for two new schools?<br>10. How do we critically analyze these growth projections when MMSD continues to lose students year after year? |
| Please consider using a 2-3 year model when moving families to a new school. Hoping there will be options for 4th and 5th graders to have some choice. |
| I am an educator at Orchard Ridge Elementary writing to share my thoughts about the proposed boundary line changes. I have serious concerns about the potential impact on our students and families.<br>Orchard Ridge is a neighborhood school. Many of our students, particularly those in Sections B and M, come from lower-income families. These students are more likely to face challenges getting to school consistently and on time. Having a school in their immediate neighborhood gives them the option for their children to walk to school. This is not simply a convenience. It is an essential part of having access to school for families who do not have reliable access to a car or who are balancing work and other financial challenges.<br>Our school has worked hard to build a strong walking school bus program that helps students get to school safely and on time. This has been especially important because our school has historically struggled with attendance and tardiness.Our walking school bus provides a safe and dependable way for students to get to school without requiring a parent or caregiver to drive them. Increasing the distance that students would need to walk could create another barrier for those who are already struggling with attendance. This is especially concerning in Section M, where some students can literally see Orchard Ridge from their homes. These are low-income students that currently have a very convenient way to get to school.<br>In contrast, students in Section U are already bused to Stephens or Crestwood Elementary. If they remain |

| |
|---|
| at Stephens or Crestwood, they would continue to have access to transportation, so the change would have less of an impact on their ability to get to school. Reassigning Section U to Orchard Ridge Elementary offers no real benefit, as these children will rely on busing regardless. Meanwhile, displacing our families in Sections B and M, would make getting to school more difficult. The potential drawbacks of this proposal significantly outweigh any perceived advantages.<br>While there are certainly many factors that influence boundary decisions, I hope the district will carefully reconsider the equity implications of the proposed changes. For some of our students, removing access to a walkable neighborhood school and the walking school bus is not just about convenienceâ€”it is about removing a significant barrier to consistent school attendance. I believe the proposed changes would disproportionately affect our lower-income families and the students who rely most on the accessibility of Orchard Ridge Elementary. |
| Hi. I am concerned about the boundary change to Thoreau Elementary. I would like to advocate that MMSD keeps the Thoreau boundaries intact. Keeping the diversity of the school and allowing neighborhoods to go to school together is also very important. This would keep students in their neighborhood school, minimize the impact on students, and keep schools walkable. I want our school to be at the target number of students, not 100 students below it! I would also request that MMSD enact a legacy enrollment policy so that kids who have started attending Thoreau can remain at our school.<br>Thank you for your consideration |
| I am concerned with the boundary change to Thoreau Elementary School, specifically changes to boundary T. It's important to keep children in their neighborhood school. Many of the families walk to school daily with their neighbors, which is important part of our community. We continue to stay in the neighborhood and Madison to have this sense of community. Keep area "T" as a choice area or as "T" to keep schools walkable and impact on our students/neighborhood to a minimum. |
| Since ORE is also going to have new construction, what is the additional capacity for that school? It will change from a walking school to a bused site. What does that mean for that community? |
| Staffing. How will staff be moved? How will we ensure buildings have what they need? How will we avoid schools being left behind? |
| Nuance? Possibly outreach to community organizations ( neighborhood associations etc.) to help diverse experiences in communities beyond school if creating diverse school populations becomes too big of a hurdle logistically for schools and families. |
| Continuity should be an option for those who do not wish to change schools. We have built a genuine community at our school and having our child change schools halfway through elementary school feels cold, heartless, and that the children are not at the core of these changes. This can completely change their lives so the option to opt out and stay at your current school should absolutely be available. |
| The north-of-Regent carve off possibility has caused great stress in our neighborhood. We live less than a mile from VanHise/Hamilton. It would be inane to put our kids on busses to attend much further away. Regardless, any decision made needs to prioritize continuity for already enrolled kids--the last thing these kiddos need is another disruption and switching schools is hard on children at any age. |
| We are in the area where are kids go to Thoreau but they are wanting to move it to midvale. Legacy students and younger kids in those families should be allowed to remain in the district. In general, we bike to school right now and midvale is much farther and harder to bike to. We would be unhappy about this change! |
| I don't think Mendota should drop the block to the East of Sherman. That is where many students and teachers live and I would argue it keeps the school more diverse as those single family owned houses are more stable than much of the housing that funnels into Mendota. If you do so you will see more families open enrolling elsewhere. |

| |
|---|
| I am concerned about the boundary change to section T. I would like to advocate that MMSD keeps area T as Thoreau and enacts a legacy enrollment policy. This would keep kids in their neighborhood school, minimize the impact on students, and keep schools walkable. Thank you for your consideration. |
| Have a sensory room placed in all schools for the students to use in need. A dysregulated student will interfere everyone in the classroom.<br>Have mental health specialist in schools, kids are more depressed, anxious nowadays. |
| As a parent (with a future MMSD student) residing in area T, I would like to advocate for MMSD to keep area T zoned as Thoreau instead of being re-zoned to Midvale Lincoln. My priorities are (1) building community with a neighborhood school and (2) proximity to school to facilitate engagement and logistical ease. The split campus model of Midvale Lincoln would present a significant challenge for these priorities. Lincoln Elementary's distance and inaccessibility by bike is of particular concern. Lincoln Elementary is 4x as far away and requires biking on busy roads (including Park or Fish Hatchery, which are not suitable for elementary school children to ride on); this would make it harder for us to engage in events and extracurriculars, particularly if we have two children attending two different schools at the same time. I believe strongly in neighborhood public schools and want to build long-term relationships with teachers, staff, and administrators, and, as a parent stretched thin, I believe I can best achieve this goal by being zoned for Thoreau which our family can easily access, all attend the same school simultaneously, and have continuity within a school for 6 years. Thank you for your consideration. |
| Keep Stephens open as a typical elementary school. |
| Neighborhood schools are important. We do not want Thoreau changed into a community site. Our family is fortunate, and are still within the boundary but for those who now fall outside of it, they should be grandfathered in if changes were to occur. Quite frankly I do not think that boundaries should be changed. I do not fell that Thoreau is over crowded and have actually been very happy with how the school is run. |
| I am concerned about the proposed lines for the Emerson area. It appears that the opening Huxley apartments were not considered when 2 additional sections were added to the Emerson area. I believe the plan is flawed and is enlarging Emerson's borders too far, the school will not be able to support that many students. |
| cost to residents |
| I would love for the changes to the Orchard Ridge attendance zone to be reconsidered, or for a clearer reasoning for the changes to be given. There is value in having this neighborhood school, and a lot of our families rely and thrive on this community we have built. |
| I attended the Stephens Open House and interviewed families who showed up about the proposed changes.<br>Here is what they said:<br><br>There were many families pleased to see that draft two was very different from draft 1 and they were very happy that their area was unaffected. One family from Valley Ridge wanted me to make it known that they are very happy to be staying at Stephens.<br><br>I spoke with 3 families from the Allied Drive area that stated please don't change us from Stephens. One of those families went to Toki as a student and would prefer there not be a change 1. because they love Stephens and 2. they would prefer their student goes to Gillespie instead of Toki.<br><br>One family I spoke with from the Allied Drive neighborhood was so against the change that she asked about sending their child to Stephens anyway, even if they are moved to Orchard Ridge. I told them about the open enrollment process and that you would have more information about that if it is needed. |

| |
|---|
| I spoke with one family who lives on Crescent Rd. who has a child with special needs and said "lo que sea" whatever happens, happens, they did not seem to have an opinion either way. I perceived that because it was a couple of years away, I would not affect an older sibling/friend.<br><br>I spoke with 4 families from the Allied Neighborhood who mentioned wanting to stay with Stephens because of the bilingual programming.<br><br>One Spanish Speaking Allied neighborhood family stated that they welcome the change to Orchard Ridge as it is much closer.<br><br>One Spanish speaking family that I spoke with was originally excited about Orchard Ridge being closer, but when I brought up that ORE is not in the plans to have bilingual programming, they did not want the change.<br><br>As I walked out of the gym. I walked with a social worker from JFF, her name slips my mind. She shared with me that she serves the Allied Drive neighborhood. She fears that this decision is already a "done deal". She told me that she knows many families in this area fear speaking up due to immigration status and language barrier that they feel they cannot push back even if they do not want the change.<br><br>One parent who is not a part of the Allied neighborhood said "removing Allied takes away diversity from our school. I am not a fan."<br>She believes that this will impact the amount of low socioeconomic status of families that will attend Stephens. |
| What size elementary school supports the types of teaming - co-planning, co-teaching, and co-serving that we as a district want to see? |
| Please don't create a situation where the students of color and students living in poverty are the ones who have to travel the farthest to school. |
| Please balance socio-economic diversity at schools |
| N/A |
| Families choose neighborhoods to live in so that their children attend the same school in their neighborhood and have the same neighborhood friends. I live in E which is in Hill Farm. Making my children go to Crestwood is wrong and destructive. It's so much farther for them to travel, they will be alienated in the HF community,and they have to switch schools that they are already attending. Redistricting them is the worst thing you can do ! |
| The school, not proximity, is what defines a neighborhood. If your neighbor goes to a different school they are essentially on their own path regardless of physical closeness. When boundaries are drawn consider that they are cutting through very old neighborhoods and tension could occur. MGT I am sure has very sound methods for deciding to some extent but they cannot account for how this affects aspects of daily life, how it plays out in the local parks and activities. Please walk around the neighborhoods you are affecting and imagine this, and you may have a different perspective.I know lines need to be drawn and I support the vision but they can be drawn not right through a neighborhood park (Rennebohm). Think about other forms of diversity not just racial or ethnic, you cannot assess diversity just by what is most able to be perceived or what looks good on a brochure or on statistics. Disability, neurodivergence, intellectual, socioeconomic and viewpoint should be HEAVILY considered and represented- including RENTERS, many of which fall into this very desirable category of diversity. |

| |
|---|
| The current proposal to bus children who currently attend VHE to Crestwood will create undue burdens to many families. And it will disrupt diversity our school celebrates. When we walk back from school, we hear Russian, Chinese and Korean being spoken. That it is beautiful. Children should be able to walk or hike to school - it is healthy for their mind and body, and creates independence. I know not all children can have this, but VHE is SO CLOSE to those homes and apartments. Moving this children for the sake of 4K is misguided. |
| the importance of walkability |
| I believe MMSD should look beyond school boundaries and consider what would truly help improve student attendance, academic success, and mental health.<br><br>One thing I would strongly encourage the district to explore is a four-day school week or shorter school days for elementary, middle, and high school students.<br><br>I believe many students are overwhelmed with long school days, homework, extracurricular activities, and responsibilities outside of school. High school students especially may also be balancing part-time jobs and preparing for adulthood.<br><br>Could giving students more time to rest, recharge, attend appointments, and spend time with their families help improve attendance? I believe it is worth exploring. A healthier school-life balance could help students feel more motivated and engaged in their education.<br><br>I would also like MMSD to consider how changing school boundaries affects students who have learning challenges, anxiety, 504 plans, or IEPs. Stability, transportation, access to support services, and family input should be important factors in these decisions.<br><br>I understand that changing school schedules would require careful planning to protect instructional time, support working families, and make sure students continue receiving the education they deserve.<br><br>Ultimately, I would love to see MMSD explore whether a four-day school week or shorter school days could improve attendance, reduce stress, and create a healthier learning environment for all students. |
| Staff and teachers make the biggest difference for students. Class size is also extremely important! I appreciate all the work with consultants to best meet our diverse communities needs, but so many millions of dollars are spent on overhead and not enough on adult to children ratios. When I hear about the Support staff available in our neighboring districts, and the amount of people they have to support kids, I want to cry. MMSD teachers are stretched too thin, while so many initiatives and departments seem to have money to continue to research. My kids need $$ for the basics- staff, teachers and aides more than surveys, new curriculum and consultants. |
| Our family puts an extremely high value on friendships and relationships in this age of social media. Children have already developed close friendships and would not be attending school with the same cohort if the borders are changed to current proposals. We want our kids to have access to the lifelong friendships that can emerge if not disrupted by being split from their school cohort. |
| What are the existing alternatives (Private or Religious schools) in the immediate area. We seem to be loosing students to non public school alternatives. Wingra School, Eagle School, Blessed Sacrament School, Queen of Peace School in the Thoreau area are examples. |
| Please do not take our child out of the school he has grown accustomed to and where he wants to study. Moving him to another school would be very stressful for him. |

| |
|---|
| I am an educator at Orchard Ridge Elementary writing to share my thoughts about the proposed boundary line changes. I have serious concerns about the potential impact on our students and families.<br>Orchard Ridge is a neighborhood school. Many of our students, particularly those in Sections B and M, come from lower-income families. These students are more likely to face challenges getting to school consistently and on time. Having a school in their immediate neighborhood gives them the option for their children to walk to school. This is not simply a convenience. It is an essential part of having access to school for families who do not have reliable access to a car or who are balancing work and other financial challenges.<br>Our school has worked hard to build a strong walking school bus program that helps students get to school safely and on time. This has been especially important because our school has historically struggled with attendance and tardiness.Our walking school bus provides a safe and dependable way for students to get to school without requiring a parent or caregiver to drive them. Increasing the distance that students would need to walk could create another barrier for those who are already struggling with attendance. This is especially concerning in Section M, where some students can literally see Orchard Ridge from their homes. These are low-income students that currently have a very convenient way to get to school.<br>In contrast, students in Section U are already bused to Stephens or Crestwood Elementary. If they remain at Stephens or Crestwood, they would continue to have access to transportation, so the change would have less of an impact on their ability to get to school. Reassigning Section U to Orchard Ridge Elementary offers no real benefit, as these children will rely on busing regardless. Meanwhile, displacing our families in Sections B and M, would make getting to school more difficult. The potential drawbacks of this proposal significantly outweigh any perceived advantages.<br>While there are certainly many factors that influence boundary decisions, I hope the district will carefully reconsider the equity implications of the proposed changes. For some of our students, removing access to a walkable neighborhood school and the walking school bus is not just about convenienceâ€”it is about removing a significant barrier to consistent school attendance. I believe the proposed changes would disproportionately affect our lower-income families and the students who rely most on the accessibility of Orchard Ridge Elementary. |
| A child's comfort is a crucial factor. They are already accustomed to their current school, classmates, and teachers. Moving to a different educational institutionâ€”where the student body is already well-establishedâ€”will require the child to adapt to a new social environment. Furthermore, a longer commute to the new school will mean having to get up significantly earlier. All of this can cause psychological discomfort, which, in turn, may lead to increased stress and a decline in academic performance. |
| The East Buckeye neighborhood should stay in the Elvejhem/Ada Deer school boundary. My kids can walk a couple blocks to school versus having to bus to Henderson. Strong neighborhood schools in close proximity help maintain property values. Switching my assigned school to Henderson will remove my neighborhood school and likely impact me financially. |
| I do not want my children to be forced into leaving their current school. We chose our house based on the school it was assigned to. I hope the district will allow currently enrolled students to chose to stay at their current school even if the boundaries change. |
| Have a longevity policy that current sixth graders can stay in their current middle school until they enter high school- for those kids and families that were able to select their middle school to begin with. All incoming sixth graders of the 2028-2029 school year should go to the school in the new area. |
| I am a member of the Orchard Ridge Elementary community writing to share my thoughts about the proposed boundary line changes. I have serious concerns about the potential impact on our students and families.<br>Orchard Ridge is a neighborhood school. Many of our students, particularly those in Sections B and M, |

| |
|---|
| come from lower-income families. These students are more likely to face challenges getting to school consistently and on time. Having a school in their immediate neighborhood gives them the option for their children to walk to school. This is not simply a convenience. It is an essential part of having access to school for families who do not have reliable access to a car or who are balancing work and other financial challenges.Â<br>Our school has worked hard to build a strong walking school bus program that helps students get to school safely and on time. This has been especially important because our school has historically struggled with attendance and tardiness.Our walking school bus provides a safe and dependable way for students to get to school without requiring a parent or caregiver to drive them. Increasing the distance that students would need to walk could create another barrier for those who are already struggling with attendance. This is especially concerning in Section M, where some students can literally see Orchard Ridge from their homes. These are low-income students that currently have a very convenient way to get to school.Â Â<br>In contrast, students in Section U are already bused to Stephens or Crestwood Elementary. If they remain at Stephens or Crestwood, they would continue to have access to transportation, so the change would have less of an impact on their ability to get to school. Reassigning Section U to Orchard Ridge Elementary offers no real benefit, as these children will rely on busing regardless. Meanwhile, displacing our families in Sections B and M, would make getting to school more difficult. The potential drawbacks of this proposal significantly outweigh any perceived advantages.Â<br>While there are certainly many factors that influence boundary decisions, I hope the district will carefully reconsider the equity implications of the proposed changes. For some of our students, removing access to a walkable neighborhood school and the walking school bus is not just about convenienceâ€"it is about removing a significant barrier to consistent school attendance. I believe the proposed changes would disproportionately affect our lower-income families and the students who rely most on the accessibility of Orchard Ridge Elementary. |
| Safety. Making kids in Section E walk across Whitney way or take a bus is a lot less safe then walking to Van Hise or Hamilton. |
| Please strongly consider building the Acacia Ridge Middle School for future growth |
| Some of the boundary changes don't make a lot of sense. You should be prepared to explain any school changes, not only based on macro changes, but impacts to students and families in those zones you are changing. Requiring students to change schools mid-way severely impacts their experience and learning, especially when their peers are not changing schools. Change is hard for anyone, but kids may be especially sensitive to this change, especially when they don't understand it. You should also consider how logical boundaries are and how transportation options, time, and complexity change for families (especially multi-student families) where you change boundaries. |
| Section T change has me most concerned. That option would take my kids out of their neighborhood, make the logistics of getting them to and from school much harder in our two working parents household, leave me without the advice and learnings of my neighbors on how to ensure my children have a good experience, make it harder to keep community with all the families in my street who have kids 2-3 years older than mine (which is a significant reason we moved to our neighborhood) and make logistics more difficult as I have two children two years apart who would spend more time in different schools. I would advocate to keep area T as Thoreau or make it a choice district. |
| Put your focus on out focal students, prioritize their needs. Be more transparent about the fact that the numbers are wrong. You included students in toki's attendance area that actually go to spring harbor. When those students are removed we can get a better picture of where are needs actually are. |
| Some scenarios creat islands and would limit access. This is unfavorable. Also, Henderson proposals are outrageous. Further- why dont buildings that are currently chater or dli listed on the maps. I know |

| |
|---|
| they dont exlcusivly pull from neighborhoods in the area surrounding them but it is misleading to act as if they are not schools that exist |
| Please don't only prioritize the voices of privileged families who are disproportionally sharing them during this process. Consider who you aren't hearing from as much - individuals from marginalized racial and income groups - and what is best for their children's education. All schools should be diverse to ensure that resources are distributed equitably. If some schools will have higher concentrations of low income students, more resources and support should be allocated. |
| One of Thoreau Elementary School's greatest strengths is its combination of a strong community and a diverse student population. The proposed changes threaten to weaken that diversity, an attribute that many families specifically seek out and value. As a result, I worry that more Nakoma families may choose private schools, leading to a loss of engagement and investment in the public school community. |