

MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION OF HOWARD COUNTY

November 15, 2005

The Board of Education of Howard County held a public work session to discuss the 2006/2007 Proposed Attendance Area Adjustments on Tuesday, November 15, 2005, at 7:00 p.m., in the Board Room of the Department of Education, located at 10910 Route 108, Ellicott City, Maryland. The following were present:

Courtney Watson, Chairman
Patricia S. Gordon, Vice Chairman
Joshua M. Kaufman
Diane B. Mikulis
Mary Kay Sigaty
Jeffrey Lasser, Student Member

Sydney L. Cousin, Superintendent and Secretary/Treasurer
Raymond H. Brown, Chief Operating Officer
Sandra J. Erickson, Chief Academic and Administrative Officer
Patti Caplan, Director of Public Relations
David Drown, Manager, School Planning
Arlene Conway, Recording Secretary

Chairman Courtney Watson called the meeting to order at 7:10 p.m. and Mr. Lasser led the group in the *Pledge of Allegiance*.

Mrs. Watson explained that staff was requested to review ideas that were presented to the Board by written and public testimony to identify the pros and cons of those proposals.

Mr. Drown stated that the options were refined to a point where differences are subtle in terms of percentages or marginal when comparing “percentage of capacity utilization” and “feeds.” He noted that the Board will need to determine which factor or factors will be given the most weight this year in establishing attendance areas for the 2006 school year.

Mr. Drown presented responses to general questions from Work Session I.

1. Question: When were the polygons in the Superintendent’s Recommendation moved last?
Answer: A data sheet was provided. In brief, the Superintendent’s Recommendations meet the standards of Policy 1675.

2. Question: Why are the MSA test data for Work Session I different than in the Attendance Area Adjustments document?
Answer: It was suggested by Mrs. Erickson that test data be processed and illustrated for redistricting purposes in the same way as principals receive data in test reports. It is a good suggestion and consistent with our continual improvement philosophy. In brief, the test data illustrates the same general percentage of difference as reflected in the redistricting document when comparing results. If differences do occur in the data sets, the differences support the Superintendent's Recommendations.

3. Question: Will the Maple Lawn development generate the students anticipated?
Answer: Maple Lawn currently accounts for approximately 33% of the 419 Single Family Detached (SFD) units (141 Maple Lawn and 278 other) scheduled for construction in the Fulton ES attendance area (2005-2008). As Maple Lawn continues to develop, it will account for an increasing amount of the projected growth at Fulton of 300 students through 2011. However, if projection error rates are such that Maple Lawn does not meet the anticipated number of students, the second redistricting of Fulton ES in 2010 of 118 students east of Route 29 will not be recommended in order to maintain acceptable capacity utilization rates at Fulton ES. This fall back position is available if needed. The second redistricting of Fulton ES is reflected in the data on page 51 of the Attendance Area Adjustment document.

4. Question: What impact will Turf Valley have on the projection at Manor Woods ES?
Answer: Turf Valley will have 1459 residential units and 322 additional students projected between 2007 and 2013. It is certain that Manor Woods ES will not be able to accommodate all of the students generated by the Turf Valley project without redistricting. Manor Woods ES is projected to have 1003 students in 2011 with a capacity of 769.

Mrs. Watson asked what percentage of overcapacity at Manor Woods ES is due to the development at Turf Valley. Mr. Drown responded that 95% of the growth projected for Manor Woods ES is associated with Turf Valley.

Mrs. Watson asked if there is any indication that delays in the development could occur. Mr. Drown noted that delay is always a potential and, currently, the first occupancies are expected in 2007. The enrollment projections are based on the best information that was available in May 2005.

Mrs. Mikulis asked if redistricting for the new Northeastern ES is expected to provide any relief for the enrollment generated by Turf Valley. Mr. Drown responded no. He pointed out that the feasibility study does indicate the relationship of this year's redistricting for middle schools and the new Northeastern ES.

5. Question: Can redistricting associated with the New Western ES be delayed?
 Answer: No. The New Western ES in 2006 provides 788 seats. The school was placed in the capital improvement program to provide relief for western schools that are projected to be in the 110% to 135% capacity utilization range in 2006. Fulton ES will be at 110.1% in 2006, 116.7% in 2007, and 128.4% in 2009. In addition, Manor Woods ES will be at 109.9% in 2006, 115.9% in 2007, and 136% capacity utilization in 2009 without redistricting.

Mr. Kaufman asked what factors might change in the western region if the redistricting were delayed by one year. Mr. Drown stated that the recommended polygons would probably not change; however, some schools will be undercapacity and some overcapacity. Redistricting is inevitable because the growth in the Fulton ES and Manor Woods ES areas will be more than the schools can accommodate.

6. Question: Why is the alternate only addressing Patapsco MS?
 Answer: The Superintendent's Recommendation creates a 9.3% feed from Hollifield Station (Patapsco MS attendance area) into Dunloggin MS (polygon 108) which remains through the projection period. The Middle Alternate does not move polygon 108 (located in Hollifield Station) which eliminates the 9.3% feed problem. The other feeds created meet or exceed the standard by 2011 through natural growth or future redistricting illustrated in the Feasibility Study.

Mr. Kaufman asked if the middle school is sited in a different location than planned, how difficult would the elementary decisions be in order to prevent feed issues and would there be other impacts. Mr. Drown responded that if a middle school cannot be constructed within the target area, there could be feed implications. The current plans are based on the premise that the new middle school will be located in the target area.

Plan Options

- Question: What is staff's assessment of options suggested for additional review as reflected below?
 Answer: Staff continues to support the Recommendations in the Attendance Area Adjustment document.

Option A: Patapsco MS redistricted directly to Ellicott Mills MS

- Plan: Redistrict as in the Recommendation with the following exceptions:
 Redistrict students directly from Patapsco MS to Ellicott Mills MS (polygons 106 and 108) rather than redistricting students from Dunloggin MS (polygons 103 and 104) into Ellicott Mills MS.
- Strength: Redistricts fewer students than the Recommendation.

Weaknesses: Attendance areas are not contiguous, and Dunloggin MS-to-Mt. Hebron HS feed is 12.7% rather than the 18.5% in the Recommendation.

Staff Assessment: The weaknesses in this option outweigh the strength.

By consensus, the Board removed this option from the table.

Option B: Polygon 170 remains at Folly Quarter MS
--

Plan: Redistrict as in the Recommendation with the following exceptions:
Polygon 170 remains at Folly Quarter MS rather than being redistricted to Mount View MS.

Strengths: Redistricts fewer students than the Recommendation, and Folly Quarter MS-to-Marriotts Ridge HS feed returns from 7.8% in the Recommendation to its current 13.4% feed.

Weakness: Students in polygon 170 will have two less-than-15% feeds--Manor Woods ES into Folly Quarter MS (9.1%) and Folly Quarter MS into Marriotts Ridge HS (13.5%).

Staff Assessment: The weakness of creating two small feeds to fix one small feed outweighs the strengths.

Option C: Polygon 179 Manor Woods ES and Mount View MS

Plan: Redistrict as in the Recommendation with the following exceptions:
Polygon 179 remains in Manor Woods ES instead of being redistricted to Triadelphia Ridge ES and is redistricted to Mount View MS instead of remaining at Folly Quarter MS.

Strength: Polygon 179 is closer (2.2 miles) to Manor Woods ES than Triadelphia Ridge ES resulting in a savings in transportation.

Weaknesses: Manor Woods ES is over the 115% APFO standard for one year. The feed of Folly Quarter MS to Marriotts Ridge HS is reduced to 5.3% from 7.8% in the Recommendation.

Staff Assessment: Moving polygon 179 to Mount View MS reduces, rather than increases, the Folly Quarter MS-to-Marriotts Ridge HS feed of 7.8% to 5.3%. The weaknesses outweigh the strength.

Mr. Drown recommended that Option C not be considered because of the negative impact on the feeds. Mr. Kaufman expressed concern that the 7.8% feed would be reduced even more by this option.

Mr. Lasser expressed concern that the 7.8% would be decreased to 5.3%. He wished that there were some way to assign polygon 179 to Manor Woods ES because of its close proximity to the school.

Mr. Drown recommended that Option C not be considered. He noted that the strengths of Option C are included in Option G; however, the weaknesses are not part of Option G.

By consensus, the Board removed this option from the table.

Option F: Polygon 170 from Mount View MS to Burleigh Manor MS
--

Plan: Redistrict as in the Recommendation with the following exceptions:
 Include polygon 170 from Mount View MS to Burleigh Manor MS with 164 and 167 at the middle school level.

Strength: Utilizes more of the available seats in Burleigh Manor MS.

Weakness: Polygon 170 is closer (one mile) to Mount View MS than it is to Burleigh Manor MS, therefore, more transportation costs.

Staff Assessment: This option does not “fix” any weakness in the Recommendation. Redistricting 170 to Burleigh Manor MS utilizes all their available seats at the present time. The Doughoregan Manor (Carroll Properties), which is in the Burleigh Manor MS attendance area, may be considered for 400+ acres of development. Consequently, Burleigh Manor MS will need capacity to accommodate this growth.

Mr. Drown recommended that the Board not consider Option F.

Mrs. Mikulis asked how the feeds would be affected by this option. Mr. Drown provided the following feeds if this option were approved:

<u>Burleigh Manor MS</u>	<u>Mount View MS</u>	<u>Marriotts Ridge HS</u>
Centennial Lane – 54.5%	Manor Woods – 23.8%	Burleigh Manor – 20.9%
Manor Woods – 30.4%	Waverly – 40.6%	Folly Quarter – 7.8%
Northfield – 14.8%	West Friendship – 35.5%	Mount View – 71.2%

Mr. Kaufman asked if staff had any idea how many housing units are planned for the Doughoregan Manor property. Mr. Drown said that there is no information available at this time. Mr. Kaufman asked how it would impact the 2011 middle school redistricting in general and polygon 170 specifically. Mr. Drown responded that students would have to be moved from Burleigh Manor MS to a more western middle school. Mr. Kaufman suggested that it might be better to keep 170 at Mount View MS.

Ms. Sigaty asked what the impact would be if polygon 170 were moved to Burleigh Manor MS but did not move 164 and 167 from Mount View MS to Burleigh Manor MS. Mr. Drown responded that the net result would be about the same. He believed that the recommendation better utilizes the available seats at Burleigh Manor MS.

In response to Mrs. Watson, Mr. Drown stated that if Burleigh Manor MS needs relief in the future, polygon 170 would be the first area to be moved back.

Option G: Folly Quarter MS/Marriotts Ridge HS “Feeder Fix”

- Plan:** Redistrict as in the Recommendation with the following exceptions:
 Polygons 178, 179 remain in Manor Woods ES instead of redistricted to Triadelphia Ridge ES but are redistricted to Mount View MS.
 Polygons 180 and 181 are redistricted from Marriotts Ridge HS to River Hill HS.
 Polygons 212 and 213 are redistricted from Glenwood MS to Folly Quarter MS.
- Strengths:** Improves the current Bushy Park ES-to-Folly Quarter MS feed from 11.6% to 21.4% and eliminates the 7.8% Folly Quarter MS-to-Marriotts Ridge HS in the Recommendation.
 Glenwood MS capacity utilization falls within standards for an additional four years compared to the Recommendation.
- Weaknesses:** Manor Woods ES does not meet Policy 1675 standards (90%-110%) in 2008 or 2009 and does not meet the APFO standards (115%) in 2009. After redistricting and additions in 2010, Manor Woods ES is projected to be above 110% in 2012 through 2014. In addition, 95 more students are redistricted than in the Recommendation.
- There is an increase in transportation cost due to students attending schools farther away than in the Recommendation and with the high school phasing-in of this option.
- Finally it redistricts the same neighborhoods that were redistricted in 2005 at the high school level.
- Staff Assessment:** Capacity Utilization at Manor Woods ES is projected to be over the APFO standard in 2009. Additional redistricting above and beyond what is in the Feasibility Study may be necessary beyond 2010 for Manor Woods ES. This suggested option would involve flip-flopping polygons 180 and 181 between Marriotts Ridge HS and River Hill HS. Transportation costs of \$58,000 per year will also be incurred at the high school level due to the phasing-in over two years for this redistricting option. Overall, the Recommendation has fewer weaknesses than this option.

Mr. Kaufman stated that moving polygons 180 and 181 back to River Hill HS has both significant strengths and significant weaknesses. It does not fix Manor Woods ES over-utilization. He also stated that he was very uncomfortable in moving the same neighborhoods that were moved just one year ago, and he did not want to set that precedent. He pointed out, however, that it is important to consider the option's strengths concerning the middle schools.

Mrs. Watson asked if the option would allow more time before a new middle school would have to be constructed. Mr. Drown responded that it is possible, since Glenwood MS would get relief immediately.

Mrs. Watson pointed out that without the new middle school, Mount View MS will be at 108% capacity in 2010, which is within the target. Glenwood MS can least accommodate overcrowding. Mrs. Watson also noted that this option improves the feeds in this area.

Mrs. Watson stated that if the additions to three existing elementary schools in this region are not feasible, and a replacement school for West Friendship ES is constructed, it would allow students to remain at Manor Woods ES until the new school opens. She also noted that the potential for new development on the Doughoregan Manor property was not known at the time the replacement school was removed from the capital improvement program. This points out the obstacles the staff and Board face when planning for growth and development.

Mrs. Mikulis asked if the property would be served by public water and sewer. Mrs. Watson responded that it currently is not served by public utilities. The property is adjacent to the metropolitan area which is served by public utilities.

Mrs. Watson stated her preference to have more time to study this option. Mrs. Mikulis asked how the option could be implemented without splitting families between two high schools.

Mr. Lasser asked how the feeds would be impacted if the high schools were not included in this option. Mr. Drown responded that it would worsen the already very small feed from Folly Quarter MS to Marriotts Ridge HS.

Board members requested additional information and options to address the negative impact of Option G on the high schools.

Board members expressed concern that families who live in the polygons impacted by this option were not given notice of this option.

Ms. Gordon stated her concern that redistricting would impact the same neighborhoods for two consecutive years.

Dr. Cousin stated that staff can provide options for the high schools; however, each option is going to have a downside. He agreed with Mrs. Watson that the Board would have to weigh the feed fixes against undoing last year's redistricting. The recommendation did not include this option because of its negative impact on the high schools.

Mr. Kaufman stated that by returning these neighborhoods to River Hill HS, it creates uncertainty for all future redistrictings. Mrs. Watson understood Mr. Kaufman's concern; however, she pointed out that if the new process being used for the capital budget and redistricting were in place last year, there is a strong probability that those communities would not have been moved to the new high school.

Option D: Polygon 126 from Fulton ES to Pointers Run ES
--

Plan: Redistrict as in the Recommendation with the following exceptions:
Redistrict polygon 126 from Fulton ES to Pointers Run ES with 118,120,123, and 192 at the elementary level.

Strength: Pointers Run ES-to-Lime Kiln MS feed is within the 15% feed standard in 2006.

Weakness: The capacity utilization at Fulton ES is 90% and Pointers Run ES is above 110% for four of the six years illustrated.

Staff Assessment: The suggested option fixes the less-than-15% feed but at the expense of Fulton's and Pointers Run's capacity utilizations. Both schools would fall outside the 90%-110% standard.

Mr. Drown noted that the feeds would be fixed by 2011. He recommended this option not be considered.

Mrs. Mikulis noted that the capacity for Pointers Run ES does not include the modular unit and there are 200 seats in the modular unit. She asked how the capacity would be affected if the available seats in the modular unit were calculated in the capacity. Mr. Drown responded that the capacity would meet the target; however, it would result in an elementary school with a capacity of almost 1,000 students. Mrs. Mikulis stated that the seats and students are there, they are used, and the school system paid for them.

Option E: Fulton ES redistricting from the west
--

Plan: Redistrict as in the Recommendation with the following exceptions:
Polygons 193, 197, and 198 remain in Clarksville ES.
Polygons 114, 119, and 194 are redistricted from Fulton to the New Western ES.
Polygons 118, 120, 123, and 192 remain in Fulton ES.

Partial polygon 188 remains in Pointers Run ES.

Strengths: The less-than-15% feed of Pointers Run ES to Lime Kiln MS is eliminated, and Clarksville ES meets the capacity utilization standard all years.

Weaknesses: A 10.6% feed is created Clarksville ES to Lime Kiln MS. Pointers Run is below the capacity utilization standard beginning in 2008-2011 of 88.3%- 89.5%. Also, there are additional transportation costs due to longer bus rides for students compared to the attendance areas assigned in the Recommendation.

Staff Assessment: The suggested option does not provide compelling improvements and results in longer bus rides, and therefore costlier transportation expenses, compared to the Recommendation. Mr. Drown recommended that the Board not consider this option.

Ms. Gordon asked if the Attendance Area Committee discussed this option and Mr. Drown responded yes.

Mr. Kaufman requested staff to provide data if the Clarksville ES students remain at the new school. Mr. Drown responded that the feeds would meet the targets, but the new school will quickly reach overcapacity.

Ms. Sigaty asked why the recommendation did not include polygon 194, which was split from the rest of the Highland community when Fulton was opened. Mr. Drown responded that at the time, all of the Highland communities could not be accommodated at Clarksville ES.

Mr. Kaufman requested that staff provide data that would show the numbers based on the recommendation and including polygon 194 in the new school.

Ms. Sigaty asked why some students were not moved out of Bushy Park ES. Mr. Drown explained that it would not be necessary after 2007, because the new Bushy Park ES will provide the needed capacity.

Mrs. Watson asked if Board members wanted to take either Option D or E off the table for consideration. Mr. Kaufman expressed concern that Option E creates a 10.6% feed and swaps one poor feed for another.

Ms. Gordon expressed concern that the options were brought forward at this time after the committee had studied and reviewed all of the options.

Mrs. Mikulis and Ms. Sigaty preferred to keep Option E on the table for consideration and, therefore, it was not removed at this time.

Mrs. Watson asked what the ramifications are of delaying the Fulton ES redistricting by one year. Mr. Drown responded that one school will be underutilized, and one school will be overcapacity. He added that the projected growth in the Fulton area cannot be accommodated in Fulton ES and the area will have to be redistricted.

Patapsco MS Alternate

Mr. Drown stated that the alternate would provide an option that does not create a feed of less than 15%. The alternate is, however, more complex and will involve high school redistricting to fix the feeds.

Ms. Sigaty observed that if polygon 97 is moved into Burleigh Manor MS this year, there would be only a very few students coming out of St. Johns Lane ES into Burleigh Manor MS for one year.

Ms. Sigaty stated that Thunder Hill ES feels underutilized. There are students who live in Dorsey that attend Thunder Hill ES as well as Northfield ES. She asked if those schools would be considered during the redistricting for the new Northeastern ES, and Mr. Drown responded yes.

Mrs. Watson stated that the Board has requested additional data for Fulton ES and Option G. The Board will review the information and discuss the options at the next work session. She announced that the work session would begin at 6:30 p.m. on November 17. She also said that the Board needs to give some direction to staff so that the lengthy and complicated motions can be drafted for consideration on November 22, 2005.

Dr. Cousin requested that the Curriculum Display scheduled for the meeting on November 22 begin at 3:00 p.m., and the Board agreed.

Mrs. Mikulis announced that she would not be at the meeting on November 22, 2005, due to a previously arranged family trip.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:15 p.m.