

2012 Attendance Area Committee  
Meeting #5  
July 24, 2012

Summary

The fifth meeting of the 2012 Attendance Area Committee (AAC) began at 7:00 PM. Joel Gallihue, Manager of School Planning, opened the meeting.

Staff members in attendance:

Ken Roey, Executive Director, Facilities Planning and Management  
Joel Gallihue, Manager of School Planning  
Jennifer Bubenko, Planning Specialist

Committee members in attendance:

|                  |                   |
|------------------|-------------------|
| Khalid Boushaba  | Lisa Schlossnagle |
| Amy Grutzik      | Marc Steingesser  |
| Renee Kamen      | James Weidemann   |
| Bill Lewis       | Michelle Yeh      |
| Geoffrey Pickett | Carmesha Young    |
| Craig Renier     |                   |

Committee members not in attendance:

Brendan Robinson

Administrative

A sign in sheet was passed around.

Handouts

Committee members received summary notes from the July 17<sup>th</sup>, 2012 AAC meeting, citizen emails/feedback to AAC, and reports/assessment for plans AAC\_L.

Presentation

See attached Power Point Presentation.

Other discussion

- Plans AAC\_I and AAC\_J were briefly discussed. The AAC learned from these plans and created the AAC\_L plan in the 7/17/12 meeting.
- In the assessment, the MSA strength/weakness score is provided based on whether the score is brought closer to the county-wide average (strength), even if the percentage pass rate is lower, or further from the county-wide average (weakness), even if the percentage pass rate is higher. Increasing the MSA pass rate of a school is a school based initiative.
- The current assessment tool rates capacity utilization criteria based on two things:
  1. Did the percentage of capacity utilization change (if not: =)?
  2. If so, was the capacity utilization brought within 90%-110% (if yes: +, if no: -)?

- There was a concern noted that regarding improving a capacity utilization from 69% to 83% is a negative, but leaving a school at a low utilization is not considered a negative. The assessment tool only assesses changes in a redistricting plan.
- Portions of the 2016 elementary school redistricting listed in the Feasibility Study (polygons 304, 305, 1304, 1305) were included in the AAC\_L plan.
- A member noted concern about changing West Friendship ES's boundaries in 2013 and again in 2016. Discussion followed about the number of students moved, the accuracy of long term projections, making more redistricting moves in one year to avoid returning to a specific school in a few years, and waiting a few years for redistricting in areas where development hasn't come to fruition to avoid potentially unnecessary moves.
- A new potential elementary school in the Turf Valley area is not currently in the Capital Budget but would be expected beyond 2019.
- One County Council member has expressed concern about continued capital funding when schools in the western portion of the county are under-utilized.
- Policy 6010: School Attendance Areas includes factors that must be considered in the development of any school attendance area adjustment plan and is available for review online at: <http://www.hcpss.org/board/policies/6010.pdf>
- Remember that the AAC advises the Superintendent and Staff makes a final recommendation to the BOE. The BOE receives citizen feedback throughout the process.
- Transportation changes due to redistricting (longer bus rides) were discussed. Should changes in the length of bus trips be compared to the previous route, or an average route for that area of the county (i.e. On average, Western region bus riders may have longer rides.)
- The BOE will approve one year of redistricting at a time. Future redistricting will reviewed for approval in future years.
- Accuracy of projections pushed down to polygons was noted. The 2009 polygons were reviewed. On average, the polygons were off by approximately ½ a student, the standard deviation was 4.5 and the range was up to 14-15 off.
- Adjustments in the polygon lines have been considered and approved in the past. One example is the Flamewood Drive area as approved by the BOE in November 2011.
- The AAC\_L1 plan was created by staff from the AAC\_L plan. There were adjustments in the New ES #41 area to accommodate potential future walk areas.
- The AAC\_L2 plan was created from the AAC\_L plan using an alternative redistricting scenario in the Swansfield ES/Longfellow ES area.

### Group Work

Work on redistricting plan(s) as a group. The group decided to start with plan AAC\_L (reports were posted online before the meeting) and make adjustments. The new plan was named AAC\_L3. See reports posted online for additional plan details.

The group can work on multiple plans and come up with contrasting arguments for differences in plans.

Here is a summary of the AAC's L Series of plans:

AAC\_L – leave as created on the 7/17/12 meeting

AAC\_L1 – start from AAC\_L, only switch polygons 1043 and 36

AAC\_L2 – All changes from this evening plus redistricting in the northern side of Swasnfield ES (previous recommendation from 2011)

AAC\_L3 – All changes from this evening plus redistricting in the southern side of Swasnfield ES (as discussed in the 7/17/12 meeting by the AAC)

Staff will look at logical changes to the Feasibility Study 2014 Middle School redistricting to help resolve small feeds for the AAC to prepare for next week's meeting. Then the "M" series will be created with middle school changes.

#### Homework

Continue consideration of group work. The meeting adjourned at approximately 9:00 PM.