

Southwest Area Boundary Study Committee

Meeting # 4 Notes

October 28, 2015

Committee and School System Attendees

PTA/Parent Representatives

Nazish Khan – Arbutus ES
Krista Wallman – Arbutus ES
Kelvin Carney – Catonsville ES
Samantha Lewandowski – Catonsville ES
Larry Martin – Edmondson Heights ES
James Kitchel – Hillcrest ES
Donna Knutson – Hillcrest ES
Obi Linton – Johnnycake ES
Gina Anderson – Lansdowne ES
Jane Allen – Relay ES
Shaunta Chapple – Relay ES
Tadd Russo – Westchester ES
Allison White – Westchester ES
Christopher Burk – Westowne ES
Kecia Johnson – Westowne ES
Christine Hinegartner – Woodbridge
Keith Grayson – Woodbridge
Beverly Coleman – Member at Large

Teacher/Staff Representatives

Paula Doll – Catonsville ES
Whitney Plunkett – Edmondson Heights ES
Danielle Gemmell – Halethorpe ES
Erika Herman - Hillcrest ES
Cara Detwiler – Johnnycake ES
Nicola Styer – Lansdowne ES
Kim Noppenberger – Westchester ES
Andrea Gibble – Woodbridge ES

Principal Representatives

Brent Grabill – Arbutus ES
Linda Miller – Catonsville ES
Juliet McDivitt – Edmondson Heights ES
Jill Carter – Halethorpe ES
Doug Elmendorf – Hillcrest ES
Bre-Anne Fortkamp – Johnnycake ES

Stephen Price – Lansdowne ES
Lisa Dingle – Relay ES
Phil Byers – Westchester
Scott Palmer – Westowne
Lori Phelps – Woodbridge ES

System Representatives

Matt Cropper – Cropper GIS, Consultant to BCPS
Heidi Miller – Co-Chair
Monique Wheatley-Phillip – Co-Chair
Kara Calder – Executive Director, Strategic Planning and Research
Paul Taylor – Coordinator of Strategic Planning
Chris Brocato – Planning Analyst
Pam Carter – Planning Consultant
Candace Logan-Washington – Organizational Effectiveness
Lynn Morningstar – Transportation
Jane Lichter –
Eric Dodson – Communications

Other Attendees from the Community

Bryan Hammer
Monica Simonser
Brandy Campbell
Lance Byrd
Mark E. Pelcio Jr.
Natalia Paufile
Heather Norris
Allison Stump
Patrick Blair
Morgan Bleszar (?)
Yvette Gould
Allison Dietz
Thomas Bonner
China Willin
Matt Doyle
Alicia Brady
Reon Holloway
Felicia SImarroof
Sandra Fondelier
Margie Arndt
Josh Arndt
Sharon Loving
Pete Jenior
Tracey Bowden – Catonsville Times
Cathy Engers

Bob Brady
Doug Yaider
Katie Resner
Quint Gray

Materials provided for members of the Southwest Area Boundary Study Committee were distributed to each member of the committee and staff. The materials included a meeting agenda and schedule, materials updated to reflect preliminary September 30, 2015 enrollment, responses to questions and requests for information raised at Meeting #3, draft options A – E introduced at Meeting #3, and new draft options F and G. These new options were developed in response to feedback received at Meeting #3.

The draft option materials included 8 ½ x11” maps of options A – G as well as large table sized maps of the options for review in small groups. Disaggregated data for all options was provided in the form of charts reflecting Full-Time Equivalent Enrollment (FTE), FTE percentage of enrollment, number of students over/under capacity, percent minority enrollment, and percent of students receiving Free-Reduced Lunch. Additional charts provided data on the number of students affected by each option.

Summary notes for Meeting 3 were included in the packet, along with copies of email items received on-line from committee members. Also included were a number of maps of current walking boundaries for specific schools.

Meeting Highlights

- At 6:00 p.m. committee co-chair Monique Phillip greeted committee members and observers and thanked them for their involvement in the boundary change process. She then took a moment to respond to some questions that had been raised by members of the committee and other folks related to the impact that elementary school boundary changes would have on middle school and high school boundaries. She reminded committee members and observers that this is an elementary school boundary change process only and that changes made to elementary school boundaries will not affect middle school or high school boundaries.
- Mr. Cropper began his presentation by informing the committee that two new boundary change options (F and G) would be introduced tonight. In addition, maps of the walking boundaries of all of the involved schools would be available for committee review in response to questions raised at previous meetings concerning walkability.
- Mr. Cropper informed the committee that the main purpose of tonight’s meeting would be to review maps and data on new DRAFT boundary change options F and G that were developed based on committee feedback on options A - E that were presented at Meeting #3. In addition, the committee would be asked to make any further changes necessary to fine tune planning blocks in locations where questions or concerns had been raised.
- Mr. Cropper announced that committee members would have the opportunity to work in small groups to consider which boundary options had the most positive effects on each

school involved in the boundary change process. The group responses will then be used to fine tune existing options or inform the development of new hybrid options to be presented at Meeting #5.

- At approximately 6:10, Mr. Cropper asked committee members to review the existing planning blocks. Large-scale printed maps and aerial photos of some of the planning blocks in question were presented to assist in the process.
- Mr. Cropper informed the committee of a calculation error in some materials presented at Meeting #3 that were corrected in materials posted to the website the day after that meeting. He also directed their attention to a summary of input from the public that was provided to committee members on October 23 and October 28. Additional feedback from the committee has also been provided in tonight's packet.
- Mr. Cropper shared maps provided by the Department of Transportation for all of the schools involved in the boundary change process.
- At approximately 6:20, Mr. Cropper reminded committee members that they are still in the process of developing as many feasible DRAFT options as possible before attempting to narrow the field. Options F and G will be considered this evening, along with a review of options A – E. These options and any new or hybrid options developed by Cropper GIS based on feedback from tonight's meeting will then be refined at Meeting #5. The committee should be prepared to rule out options they believe do not meet the objectives and criteria established to the outset of the boundary change process during Meeting #5. The focus tonight is still to deliberate and select options to share at the Public Information Session, not to select the recommended plan.
- Mr. Cropper referenced maps and tables reflecting the impact of each option from A – G included in the packet for this evening's meeting. He highlighted the impacts of new options F and G that were developed to show a greater impact on the area north of Route 40. These options modified boundaries of other schools based on committee feedback from Meeting #3.
- At approximately 6:26 Mr. Cropper introduced the school-by-school exercise. The goal of the exercise was to reach consensus on which option(s) may be best for each school. The committee divided into small groups to engage in this exercise. Committee members were instructed to look at each and every school to determine which option(s) best meet the objectives and criteria of the boundary change process.
- At 6:30, the subgroups were asked to begin working on the school-by-school exercise, marking up their maps and making notes on which option(s) would be best for each school, given the data available on the effect of each option. Subgroups submitted their tallies to Chris Brocato, who recorded their tallies for each school in a chart on a transparency for display to the committee.
- The committee reconvened at approximately 7:20 to go over the results of the school-by-school exercise. Mr. Cropper displayed the results of the exercise in chart form. Mr. Cropper indicated that he will use these results to develop some hybrids containing the best boundaries for most of the schools He invited comments on the results. The major comments focused on the minimal effects of all options on Edmondson Heights, Johnnycake, and Woodbridge. They included the following:

- For Woodbridge, Johnnycake and Edmondson Heights there really was no option that was discernibly different, even with the new scenarios.
- The diversity table demonstrates much more diversity south of Route 40 than north of Route 40 for all options.
- We should look at some truly integrated options that run in the other direction (north to south) to see if we can improve the demographic diversity north of Route 40.
- Mr. Cropper responded by stating that, in his initial DRAFT options, more north to south movement took place, but those options were originally rejected because they violated other established criteria. He also noted that in some communities, residential segregation exists simply because of where families have chosen to live. He indicated that he would develop an option or options with the goal of improving overall demographic diversity throughout the area for consideration by the committee at Meeting #5.

NEXT MEETING:

Boundary Study Committee Meeting # 5

Wednesday, November 11, 2015

Catonsville High School Cafeteria

6:00-7:30 p.m.

(Light dinner for committee members served at 5:30 p.m.)