

Southwest Area Boundary Study Committee

Meeting # 5 Notes

November 11, 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
Romaine Smoot – Edmondson Heights ES
Corinne Louden – Halethorpe ES
Paul Zaw Khai – Halethorpe ES
James Kitchel – Hillcrest ES
Donna Knutson – Hillcrest ES
Obi Linton – Johnnycake ES
Jeff Sanford – Johnnycake 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 ES
Keith Grayson – Woodbridge ES
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
Patricia Wilding – Lansdowne ES
Kim Noppenberger – Westchester ES
Andrea Gibble – Woodbridge ES
Lisa Musacchio – Woodbridge ES

Principal Representatives

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 ES
Scott Palmer – Westowne ES
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
Mychael Dickerson – Communications

Other Attendees from the Community

Mary Pat Doyle
Jason Palmateer
Lauren Kosloski
Morgan Buhszar
Ron Buhszar
Cathy Engers
Yvette Gould
Bob Jorgenson
Kevin Nelson
Allison Dietz
Stacie Palmer
Margie Arndt
Danette Zaghari-Mask
Don Anderson
Matt Roberts
China Zillian
Katie Riesner
Carrie Grahl
Justine Stull
Natalia Paufile
Mike Bowler
Amanda Bartolini
Bryn Shellenberger
Ann Morton
Monica Simonsen
Amanda Helt
Brandy Campbell
Susan Iovanetti
Katie Knight
Tracey Border
Jennie Hammer

Elizabeth Smith
Andrew Bonic
Jeanni Hines
Jennifer Bean
Thomas Bonner
Kathleen Browning
Quint Gregory
Sarah Fondelier
Joanne Heaney
Sharon Loving
Mark Pelies
Eric Ebersole

Materials for the Southwest Area Boundary Study Committee were distributed to each member of the committee and staff, including meeting agenda and schedule, materials updated to reflect preliminary September 30, 2015 enrollment, responses to questions and requests for information raised at Meeting #4, draft options A – G presented at Meeting #4, and new draft options H - L. These new options were developed in response to feedback received at Meeting #4.

The draft option materials included 8 ½ x11 maps of options A – L 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 #4 were included in the packet along with copies of email items received online from committee members. Also included were maps of current walking boundaries for the involved schools.

Meeting Highlights

- At 6:00 p.m. Heidi Miller, committee co-chair, opened Meeting #5 with thanks to the attendees and announced that the next meeting, to be held on November 18, 2015, will be the Public Information Session. Ms. Miller reminded committee members that it was important that they attend to help facilitate discussion with the community. Ms. Miller also reminded participants of the importance of attending Committee Meeting #6, scheduled on December 9, 2015, to ensure that all school representatives will be on hand to participate in the selection of the boundary change option to recommend to the Board of Education.
- Committee Co-Chair Monique Phillip announced that next week BCPS will launch an online survey to provide an opportunity for members of the public to provide input relative to the proposed boundary change options. The survey will also be available in Spanish and Burmese. There will also be translators available at the Public information Session to assist participants who speak Spanish or Burmese.
- Mr. Cropper thanked members of the committee for their commitment to the process and announced that additional boundary change options that were developed based on input from Meeting #4 would be included in the evening's presentation, increasing the total number of options under consideration to twelve. He indicated that the goals for the evening would be to narrow down the number of options to about four to present at the Public Information Session on November 18, 2015.

- At 6:04 p.m. Mr. Cropper reviewed planning block revisions made since the last meeting based on committee input. He shared that existing walking boundaries are now reflected on the maps of boundary options and that information on feeder patterns of progression from elementary to middle school is also included in the materials. (Middle school boundaries will not be affected by this boundary change process.)
- Mr. Cropper reviewed options H - L that were developed in response to suggestions and requests made at Meeting #4. He informed participants that Option J was developed to address concerns related to providing greater demographic balance throughout the area.
- Mr. Cropper reminded the participants that all options are still draft options. There is still time to make adjustments. The goal this evening will be to try to narrow them down to about four to present to the public. Information on enrollment, percent utilization for each school, number of available seats, percent of minority students, percent of students eligible for free/reduced price lunch, number of students affected by the boundary change, and elementary to middle school progression is provided for each option.
- Mr. Cropper pointed out where the utilization numbers for the new scenarios could be found in the packet.
- Mr. Cropper explained the sticker exercise that will help to develop consensus on four options to take to the Public Information Session. Committee members, other than principals, would be given a set of four stickers so that each could place stickers on the four boundary change options that he or she considered the best in meeting the goals and criteria established at the start of the boundary change process. Principals are not allowed to vote on the process per Board of Education policy.
- Committee members were asked to sign to pick up stickers. They were asked to use green stickers to mark their preferred options and only use the black stickers if a second round of voting was needed to narrow the twelve draft options down to four.
- At 6:15 p.m. committee members signed for their stickers and began to work on identifying their preferred options.
- At 6:48 p.m. Mr. Cropper called the committee together to review the results of the sticker exercise. He pointed out that it was obvious that some scenarios had received greater and lesser numbers of stickers. Mr. Cropper suggested having a discussion on those scenarios that had received the smallest numbers of stickers first to see if they should be weeded out or if folks who had supported them could offer rationales for keeping them beginning with Scenario C. He reminded the committee that even if some of these specific scenarios are ruled out, some positive aspects of these scenarios may be included in others.
- There was some question as to whether committee members should be making their voting decisions based on what was best for their school as opposed to all schools. Mr. Cropper reminded all committee members that he has continued to stress that all committee members should be thinking outside-the-box and selecting the scenarios that best met criteria for all of the schools and for all students; not just one school.
- A committee member stated that he understands the tendency to pick what is best for one's own community. However, he also indicated that individuals on social media are trying to divide communities during the process. He regarded that as a negative effect on the process. Mr. Cropper, again, reminded people to think about the big picture and what's best for everybody and that the best option is one that touches on the most criteria.
- The committee supported the removal of Option C from consideration at the Public Information Session, as with Option H, with just four stickers.
- Option J also had only four stickers, however, a member of the committee described it as the only option that offers any sort of opportunity for social change by achieving greater racial diversity

among the schools in the community. Another member suggested that this option be included in the Public Information Session to generate discussion on this issue.

- Mr. Cropper pointed out that while Option J does the most to provide demographic balance, it moves us away from other criteria, such as number of students impacted and walkability. He stressed that the best plan is one that touches on all of the criteria when you're doing redistricting and Option J may not do that.
- Various pros and cons to including or removing Option J from consideration at the Public Information Session followed. These included:
 - I did not vote for this one impacting over 2100 students, and that was just as negative.
 - This one never had a chance. That's a disappointment for what could be social progress.
 - Even with this scenario, the numbers don't have balanced demographics and to go further would be impractical.
 - Maybe it would be worthwhile to forward to public discussion.
 - It's unfortunate that all goals can't be met in every scenario, but it doesn't mean that these ideas can't be part of the discussion.
 - All of these issues you bring up should be addressed in planning where schools are built, what kind they are, where charter and specialty schools are placed, but this process is not designed to address that.
 - I think Option J should be a part of the discussion next Wednesday and this is a conversation we need to have to address changes that are happening in the county and how we can address them in an equitable manner.
 - I do agree with some of what's being said about the need for discussion, but because Option J does not meet enough of the criteria, it should not be taken to the public.
 - I think we have a responsibility to be practical and eliminate choices that are not going to make it to vote and have not met the criteria that were set out. We have to start eliminating.
 - We removed two options that each also had only four stickers, which raises the question why this scenario with only four stickers should move forward.
 - As a whole, there are only four stickers on this option.
- By group consensus, Option J was removed from consideration at the public information session. Then other options that had slightly more stickers were considered and eliminated, including A, D, F, G, and L.
- By 7:24 p.m. options B, E, I, and K had the most stickers, representing those that a majority of the members of the committee felt did the best job of meeting the goals and criteria of the boundary change process.
- Mr. Cropper indicated that these four scenarios will be relabeled as Options 1 through 4 to simplify the presentation at the Public Information Session. Four sets of data tables and maps will be presented. It was suggested that the areas where these scenarios differ should be highlighted so Mr. Cropper will strive to do so. Mr. Cropper also suggested that committee members continue to study the data on these scenarios in order to assist at the Public Information Session.
- Mr. Cropper asked that committee members arrive by 6:30 p.m. for the 7:00 p.m. Public Information Session. An overview presentation on the process to date will be made, followed by opportunities for members of the public to review large scale maps on the various scenarios. Committee members will assist the members of the public as they review the scenarios. Mr. Cropper will be available to assist with questions they can't answer. A survey will go live that evening. Electronic surveys will be available that night and will also be available online by computer and by cell phone.

At the conclusion of Meeting #5, the SW Area Boundary Study Committee recommended that Options B, E, I and K be presented at the upcoming Public Information Session. These four options will be renumbered and presented as:

Meeting 5	Public Information Session
Option B	Option 1
Option E	Option 2
Option I	Option 3
Option K	Option 4

NEXT MEETING:

Public Information Session

Wednesday, November 18, 2015

Catonsville High School Cafeteria

7:00 - 8:00 p.m.

(Committee members should plan to arrive by 6:30 p.m.)