



**2016 School Study Committee**

**Meeting Minutes January 5,**

**2017**

**5:00 – 8:00 p.m.**

**Harvey Education Center, Board Room**

**Present:** Tim Ayres, Ted Berryhill, Brian Bushey, Jessica Curtis, Lance Delbridge, Susie Disselkoen, Jon Droscha, Steve Duane, Liz Evans, Shelly Fanson, Matt Hall, Amy McVaugh, Patrick Meyers, Kerry Minshall, Christopher Mumby, Mitch Perrault, Mike Prelesnik, Sandy Smalley, Joe Starch, Mike Thompson, Sally Trout, Chris Waltz, Russ Whipple, Chris Wright.

**Absent:** Erik Cargill, Laura Fenger, Josh Galloway, Tim Williams

**Also Present:** Superintendent Ron Drzewicki, Mike Kenney, and Ted Moore

**Public Comment**

No comment from the public.

**Approval of Minutes**

Minutes approved.

**Request/Clarification Forms**

No comments or questions asked.

**EPIC MRA Survey Research Services**

Mr. Bernie Porn, President, from EPIC MRA, presented to the committee an overview of the survey services that he could offer the district. His company has worked with school districts that are going out for a bond proposal and those districts that have been unsuccessful with a bond election. He shared possible options and questions for conducting a survey of the community.

Possible questions that could be included on a survey include opinions about how the schools are currently doing, perception of taxes compared to what the school district provides to the community, awareness of overcrowding and where overcrowding occurs within the school district. The survey could also include a general description of a potential bond proposal and average cost to the homeowners. The survey could also include a list of possible bond components and ask the survey respondent which options they would or would not support. The survey would be conducted as a phone survey with approximately 30% utilizing cell phone numbers.

The survey can help determine what option(s) the community would support and also topics where additional communication and education needs to be provided to the community. It could take approximately a week to draft the survey, and 3 to 5 days to conduct the phone survey. The entire process takes approximately 4 to 6 weeks to complete and provide results. The survey typically takes 18 to 20 minutes with 50+ questions with an estimated cost of \$18,000. A few members of the committee asked how the questions would be drafted. Superintendent, Ron Drzewicki, suggested that the committee provide feedback of the hot topics that should be included on the survey and have EPIC MRA draft a survey.

Mr. Porn recommended that descriptions of improvements the recent community survey showed support for, such as technology, safety, etc. be included on the survey because it provides more information for the committee to work with.

### **Configuration Options**

The group was asked to review a handout that contained 3 high level options of grade configurations.

1. No grade configuration changes. (Option #1)
2. Move 1 grade from each existing elementary buildings. (Options #2, #3, #11).
3. Move 2 grades from each of existing elementary buildings. (Options #4, #9, #10, Old Bond proposal).

The committee was asked to consider the pros/cons of moving zero, one, or two grades. The committee was told not to consider any costs associated or possible building locations at this point. A member commented that it may be helpful to consider the costs because it may impact a decision. For example, if moving two grades is a much higher cost than moving one grade it may impact a decision. Another member commented that a survey could help provide the feedback that the committee could use on the movement of grades. Chairperson, Chris Waltz, explained that the committee discussions on these topics would help make decisions and also identify areas that could be included on the community survey.

Superintendent, Ron Drzewicki, shared with the group that making a decision about how many grades to move to address the overcrowding issue is one of the most important educational decision the committee will make. Superintendent, Ron Drzewicki, reminded the committee that the decisions made with this committee will be something the community will benefit from for many years.

The committee discussed pros and cons of each option such as, number of students per building, transitioning of students, operational costs, and educational value. Superintendent, Ron Drzewicki, shared with the group that grade configuration will not necessarily increase or decrease school scores. Research says that more transitions can be detrimental but can be overcome based on how the school and parents handle the transition. From an operational standpoint, many districts are going to combined grade configurations for operational efficiencies, however, this is not proven to have better or worse educational value. A member asked if considering having K-5 at HEC would be something the committee should consider. Superintendent, Ron Drzewicki, shared that having K-5 moved to HEC could potentially put an operational burden of close to \$500,000 of additional costs on the general fund. It also makes it more difficult to balance classroom size (number of students) per grade per building. It is easier to add one section at one building that houses an entire grade than to add a session at each of the elementary buildings.

The committee voted on zero, one, or two grades being moved.

- Zero Grades = 2 votes
- One Grade = 3 votes
- Two Grades = 17 votes

The committee was asked to then consider and vote on the options within moving 2 grades. The committee was asked to consider the following options:

1. K-1 moved
2. K moved to HEC and 5<sup>th</sup> grade moved to MMS
3. 4th-5th moved

The committee discussed various pros/cons such as the number of students per building, transition of students, possibly more flexibility of moving 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> graders. Several members wanted to survey the community to determine which of the 3 options of moving 2 grades were preferable. A member said they were concerned with only taking 3 options of moving 2 grades to the community. The committee transitioned to discussing various topics related to moving grades, configuration options and transitioned to possible items to include on a survey.

#### *Survey Hot Topic Ideas*

The committee discussed possible hot topics for inclusion on the community survey:

- Moving 5<sup>th</sup> to Middle School
- Transition of students at various grades
- Early Learning
- Land purchase

A member asked if we are going to be working on the survey does the committee need to still meet on January 19<sup>th</sup>. A decision on meeting or not on January 19<sup>th</sup> will be based on progress of a draft survey.

The committee voted to ask the School Board for the approval to conduct a survey. The committee voted and approved: 20 Yes votes, 0 No votes, and 3 committee members that were recently elected to the School Board abstained.

**Public Comment**

No public comments.

**Next Meeting Dates**

- Thursday, January, 19, 2017
- Tuesday, January 31, 2017