

CCPS Redistricting and School Closing Committee
Approved Meeting Minutes
July 12, 2018

Committee Members Present: Dr. David Lever, Michael Hardesty, Rosemary Kitzinger, Raymond Prokop, Christina McGann, Steve Aquino, Denise Beaver, Margaret Pfaff, Rita Misra, Erin Yeagley, and Vaughn Paylor

CCPS Support Staff Present: William Caine

Recording Secretary: Kim Gold

The meeting was called to order at 5:30pm.

The minutes from June 28, 2018 were approved (motioned by Steve Aquino, and seconded by Rosemary Kitzinger).

Dr. Lever gave an overview of what the meeting would cover. The plan is to talk about comprehensive redistricting options and if there are any other options that should be discussed and presented to the board. Then, the committee will work on evaluating and prioritizing the options using the matrix that has been created.

The committee began the discussion about Comprehensive Redistricting (the planning option that was deferred from the previous meeting). They discussed the pros and cons of this option. With system-wide comprehensive redistricting, there would need to be a set time frame (i.e. every 3 or 5 years) where a group like this should meet to re-evaluate the tasks listed and determine what needs to be done moving forward. Ray Prokop mentioned that there is a process already in place where they annually look at enrollments, bus routes, construction and feeder patterns, and the need for or recommendation for boundary adjustments is presented and discussed.

Comprehensive Redistricting will not solve the issue of all students attending the closest school to their home due to the density of population and the capacity of the schools. There will always be students who may go to a school that is not the closest to them due to the other factors that need to be considered when setting boundaries. It was suggested that the committee should outline the factors that might cause a need for comprehensive redistricting in the future. It was mentioned that with the enrollment stability in CCPS this is not something that will likely be needed, but it would be good to have it in place in case anything ever changes due to economic development.

The committee discussed the importance of the community and letting them know that we “hear” them and that we have discussed the things they have mentioned (including the overcrowding of certain schools, the lack of certain programs). There should be a good way to inform the community of all the committee did and everything the committee looked at and discussed. There is a need to restore trust in the process by bridging the gap between the Board and the public/community.

Another planning option was presented by Christina McGann as an alternative to the large middle school option. It would look something like this: with the closure of East Middle, the East Middle and West middle 6th grade students would go to Sandymount and William Winchester Elementary Schools, which would be restructured as 3-6 schools (not a rebuild), and West Middle would become a 7-8 school (a combination of East and West’s 7th and 8th). Grades K-2 from William Winchester and Sandymount would both be redistricted to different elementary schools, and these schools would house their current 3-5 and split the 6th graders from East and West Middle. This solves the East Middle problem, but it would take lots of study to determine if it would be a possible option. Per Bill Caine, it may require a comprehensive redistricting of all of the East and West Middle school boundaries. The programs offered, educational opportunities, and feeder patterns would all have to be considered and explored. Ray Prokop raised the question of whether the 6th graders at Sandymount and William Winchester would be considered middle school students or elementary school students.

Dr. Lever questioned whether or not the committee should work on the details of this option so that it could then be presented to the Board; or is this something that we have discussed and considered not to be a great option in comparison to the others on the table? Dr. Lever suggested doing a write up on it so that it can be included in the “also considered options.”

Dr. Lever reviewed the list of Board of Education Goals for RSCC and then went over the current list of Planning Objectives for the committee. He asked for others that RSCC members believe should be added to the list and will then need to be weighted. Michael Hardesty suggested adding “Does not negatively impact student ride times/transportation” to the list of objectives that need to be weighted. There was considerable discussion about the exact language that should be used to describe each Objective.

Dr. Lever went over the setup and structure of the matrix and gave examples of how it would be completed, using positive and negative numbers and zeros to indicate the impact that each Planning Option has on the particular planning objective. The 1st step would be for the committee to weight the factors. It was acknowledged that this is not an entirely objective weighting system but because everyone has different backgrounds and values, that it is acceptable. The committee agreed that a 1, 2, 3 rating was sufficient. Some of the objectives were modified (see below) and a rating was determined (majority ruled on the voting so the below numbers were not all unanimous).

Improves functional setting for current and new educational programs—3

Improves school feeder patterns—1

Improves or maintains the overall FCI system-wide—3

Generates financial efficiencies / reduces operating expenses—3

Reinforces the community role of schools—2

Supports economic development--1

Does not negatively impact ride times—2

The committee ended by discussing how there were too many options at the moment and they needed to be dwindled down before presenting to the Board in September. By doing this rating system, and completing the matrix, the committee should get a better idea of which options are the best and most cohesive plans to present.

The next meeting will be on July 26, 2018 from 5:30-8:30pm and the location is yet to be determined. The hope is to hold the meeting at either East or West Middle School.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 pm.