

A Challenge

A thorough look at how Hawthorn District 73 uses space and the potential impact on programs

Committee Members

Adequate Yearly Progress Committee

Rachel Boehm

Joy Brocks

Nick Brown

Jeff Chien

Robert Collins

Michelle Comitor

Jami Dehn

Mark Dolce

Audrey Dzhurov

Bill Fredricksen

Elissa Gong

Glori Huse

Susan Jones

Dimitrios Kallieris

Melissa Kaufman

Victoria Kieffer

Jen Klene

John Langelund

Maria Maldonado

Jill Martin

Robert Natale

Millie Naughton

Taunya Reback

David Sternfield

Jayson Tran

Connie Travis

Berenice Vega

Edgar Viveros

Katie Waggoner

Andy Wang

Michelle Weiner

Committee Members

Strategic Planning Committee

Jeffrey Bard

Erin Brickman

Nick Brown

Elizabeth Burda

Lisa Cerauli

Becky Clay

Amy Cohan

Robert Collins

Michelle Comitor

Linda Couri

Maureen Coutre

Eileen Duhig-Larson

Jeanne Engelkemeir

Bill Fredricksen

Lou Gatta

Lindsay Gerjol

Jason Glassman

Elissa Gong

Brad Goldstein

Maria Gonzalez

Melissa Henderson

Lisa Jay

Jamie Kahn

Committee Members

Strategic Planning Committee

Robyn Kaufman

Conor O'Grady

Cheryl Steffens

Victoria Keiffer

Beth Palid

James Tohme

Cindy Kessler

Sonali Patil

Eduardo Tomayo

John Langelund

Silvia Robies

Jayson Tran

Jill Martin

Michael Rockelmann

Renee Ullberg

Ghita Mueller

Rebecca Sear

Katie Waggoner

Jennifer Mulcrone

Betsy Sostak

Jennifer Zbylut

Rob Natale

Margaret Sowul

Committee Members

Reorganization Committee

Mimi Batson

Michelle Comitor

Meghan Lane

Nancy Beaumont

Bill Fredricksen

Deb Logan

Nick Brown

Lou Gatta

Tara Moncada

Sherry Budziak

Leslie Getlin

Millie Naughton

Liz Burda

Elissa Gong

Beth Palid

Nicole Carson

Andrea Johnson

Jared Reardon

Becky Clay

Melissa Kaufman

Shannon Sheridan

Robin Cleek

Victoria Kieffer

Randi Szoke

Robert Collins

Becky Kotzin-Gustafson

What We Learned?

Issues to Resolve

- **Provide an equivalent learning environment (programs) for all students**
- **Provide efficient use and allocation of district resources**
- **Provide a balance in demographic disparity among buildings as best as possible**
- **Provide a plan to control the enrollment numbers and patterns of students to maximize the use of the buildings to resolve disparity in current usage levels**
- **Provide a plan, and if possible, locate space for EC/Pre-K**

A New Focus

The Strategic Plan

- **HIGH-LEVEL STRATEGY #2:** Implement a plan that identifies the **facilities and resources** required to provide an equitable distribution of those resources across the district.
- **HIGH-LEVEL STRATEGY #6:** Identify and implement common commitments and set expectations to ensure **equitable access** to high quality programs for all students district-wide.
- **HIGH-LEVEL STRATEGY #7:** *Expand **early intervention** opportunities such as full day kindergarten.*

Board Direction

Direction by the Board to the Reorganization Committee after reflecting on the new Strategic Plan:

1. Full day kindergarten at all schools. The Board would like the Reorganization Committee to explore the opportunity to provide a full day kindergarten program for all students.
2. Grandfather clause. They would like current students to be grandfathered into their current school. The Board of Education would like the Reorganization Committee to determine how to grandfather students into their current schools. If not possible, the Board wants a compelling rationale why it would not work.

Board Direction

Direction by the Board to the Reorganization Committee after reflecting on the new Strategic Plan:

3. Dual Language. The School of Dual Language is a curriculum program school as opposed to a choice. The Board has affirmed that any reorganization recommendations include the School of Dual Language as it currently exists (K-5) and has asked for more information to be gathered from the DL community to determine whether there is interest in expansion of the program to K-8.
4. School Choice. The Board of Education has agreed that the current state of school choice is not supported nor in alignment with the new Strategic Plan. They are open to other choice possibilities in the future. The Board is directing the Reorganization Committee to **not** maintain the current choice model in the reorganization plan.

Full Day Kindergarten (FDK)

You will hear the term FDK during this process and presentation. It stands for Full Day Kindergarten.

The Board has asked that the Reorganization Committee look to see if there is space to offer free FDK for all incoming kindergarten students starting in 2015.

Space? Do We Have It?

As noted by architects from Legat:

Yes, Hawthorn has space if the architectural capacity of the buildings is controlled. This means managing the distribution of students and programs.

The committee found that there is space for balancing programs such as FDK if capacity of the buildings is managed.

FDK Personnel

Current Enrollments:

K = 429

1 = 430

Current Sections District wide:

K = 20

1 = 17

We currently have 14.5 Kindergarten teachers teaching 429 students and 17 first grade teachers teaching 430 students.

We need approximately 3 teachers

Grandfathering

For this project, grandfathering is only being considered for students attending a Hawthorn District 73 school as of May, 2015.

Siblings are not included in the calculations or considerations.

Questions

Can families opt out of the grandfather clause?

Yes

Do we know how many families would opt out?

No

The committee was surprised to see that there was about a 60/40 split on the feedback from the forum and online as of May 29th.

Considerations

Calculations show we have space to grandfather students 1-5 in current buildings.

Transportation is not expected to increase due to grandfathering.

Staffing is not expected to increase due to grandfathering.

Considerations?

What about those that refuse?

We don't have any accurate data on how many would refuse this option and it is difficult to anticipate the impact.

This presents a possible concern if enough families opt out as it could impact all or some buildings.

Current Building Usage Levels

- Townline/DL – 97%
- Aspen – 98%
- Elementary South – 95%
- Elementary North – 70 %

Ideal Capacity Design

According to Architectural Design

- Townline/DL – 3 sections per grade per school
(6 total per grade for the physical building)
- Aspen – 3 sections per grade (**Currently 4**)
- Elementary South – 5 sections per grade
- Elementary North – 4 sections per grade (**Currently 3**)
- 18 sections per grade for the district K-5

FDK & Grandfathering

Each proposal incorporates space for the Board to consider offering *free* FDK to all students

And

To consider grandfathering students at high levels in each building.

Three Options

- Neighborhood – Boundaries
- Relocating Schools
- All Five Elementary Schools are Choice Schools

Neighborhood

Students would attend schools as determined by boundary lines.

Schools that would need attendance boundaries:

- Aspen Elementary
- Townline Elementary
- Elementary South
- Elementary North

Benefits

- Students would attend schools in their neighborhood as determined by boundary lines. (Boundaries would be designed by a new committee of stakeholders.)
- Neighborhood schools would resolve building overcrowding and under utilization.
- Transportation costs would decrease as a result of fewer busing routes.
- Dual Language would be maintained at its current Townline location.
- Programs would be balanced across all schools.
- Enrollment and demographics could be more evenly distributed.
- There is room to bring the early childhood/prekindergarten program back to campus.

Considerations

- Dual Language is the only choice option
- Some staff may need to switch buildings due to enrollment adjustments from new boundaries

Forum Questions

The committee did not design boundaries and this would be a task for another committee

Would students that can currently walk be moved and ride a bus?

We don't see a change in boundaries in which students would move from walking to riding a bus.

Would Middle School Boundaries be impacted?

Yes, it is anticipated that the middle school boundaries would eventually reflect the elementary boundaries.

Forum Questions

Would Aspen retain the Glasser Theory?

That would be a building decision and it is anticipated it would remain.

Relocate Schools

- This concept moves three schools – Aspen, Elementary North and The School of Dual Language – to new facilities to adjust enrollments to match the building design capacities. Each entire building staff and student population would be reassigned to a different school building in the district.
- The Aspen School student and staff population would relocate to Elementary North to accommodate its current enrollment.
- Dual Language would relocate to Aspen, which is designed for a capacity of three sections per grade level. Additionally, Dual Language would then have its own building.
- Elementary North students would relocate to Townline School, thus creating one north side school that combines the Townline and Elementary North student and staff populations.
- Elementary South would remain in the current building.

Benefits

- Dual Language would have its own building.
- Students and staff at Elementary South School would not change to a new building.
- The new locations would make better use of space, thus resolving building capacity issues.
- There is room to bring the early childhood/ prekindergarten program back to campus.

Considerations

- Requires moving staff and students in three buildings.
- Fewer choice seats would be available to families due to the elimination of the Townline option, which would mean parents may not get their choice for their child.
- Due to traffic patterns, facilities would retain their current start and end times; thus, Aspen moving to the Elementary North building would change Aspen's start and end times by 45 minutes. The start and end times stay with the facility. Dual Language moving to the current Aspen building would change the start and end time for these families by 45 minutes.
- Doesn't necessarily redistribute resources.
- Doesn't resolve all the issues the current choice process has unintentionally created.

Forum Questions

Is it enough of a change in choice to support the Board's direction?

The Board will have to decide if this was a significant enough change to the current choice process to meet the direction given.

Forum Questions

What is the estimated cost for moving the three buildings?

It is estimated that the district would rent a U-Haul truck and hire 6 additional hourly workers for the summer to move the three buildings.

Estimated cost is \$15,000 - \$20,000

Each teacher moving is provided with one comp day per the contract.

Forum Questions

Can't you just move Elementary North and Dual Language buildings and maintain Aspen at 4 sections?

Both EN and DL are 3 sections so the building usage does not change.

Maintaining Aspen at 4 sections is not recommended by the architects as it is above the capacity designs.

Can you move EC and Pre-k into the EN building with DL to make up the space?

That is already part of the considerations for the proposals and could be done if EN stayed at 4 sections or Aspen moved in at 4 sections.

5 Choices

- Administration, with community input, would develop a unique program for each school. The Dual Language program is a current choice. New programs would have an academic focus aligned to STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, Math), Art, Music, or other enhanced areas.
- Each school would retain the core curricular base that would ensure college and career readiness through Common Core State Standards.
- Enrollment caps for each building would resolve capacity issues for the district.
- Parents would rank their school preference by first through fifth choice and a lottery would be used to determine distribution of students.

Benefits

- Enrollment caps for each building would resolve capacity issues for the district. (Overcrowding or underuse)
- Choice schools would provide parents with multiple options for their children.
- Dual Language would be maintained at its current Townline location.
- There is room to bring the early childhood/ prekindergarten program back to campus.

Considerations

- Not all families would get their preferred choice
- Busing routes may increase
- Managing process takes a significant amount of administrative time and resources
- Would need more than 1 year to develop the 4 new academic options
- Doesn't resolve some issues with current choice process in the community
- Each year the option for choice diminishes as siblings are enrolled

Considerations

- Staffing Issues depending on outcome of choice lottery
- Parents deciding on choice to keep siblings in same building and not for the academic focus
- Needs a lot of communication to clearly communicate to parents about the choice options
- This option may add stress to parents' decision making process in kindergarten or for new families to the district

Forum

This proposal did not receive support from the forum feedback or the online survey for the issues identified.

The committee is not supporting this proposal as an option for Board consideration.

What About a Grade Level Design?

Grade level center schools are designed to house a group of grade levels in one building.

As an example, it is common to see a grade level center design have grades K-2 in a building and then grades 3-5 in a building.

After exploring the option of Grade Level Centers, the Reorganization Committee decided against it for the following reasons:

What About a Grade Level Design?

Grade level centers do not fit well into the current buildings as designed and with our current enrollment.

- Some buildings would lose instructional space and others would have unused classrooms.
- Grade level centers create a larger building feeling.
- Grade level centers do not completely resolve space shortages.
- School transitions increase for students.
- Grandfathering is not available for students.
- Grade level centers could become problematic for families who have children in multiple buildings with different start times.

Grade Level Center Info.

These capacities are based on a north/south campus, using K-3 grade level centers and 4-5 grade level centers. This strategy was the closest to accommodating projected enrollment in grade level centers.

As in all of the Grade Level Test Fit studies – the location of classrooms in existing facilities does not accommodate a grade level center strategy without additions or splitting grades in multiple buildings.

Examples

		Required	Existing
DL:	K-5, 3 sections	18	18
Townline	4-5 center	15	18
Aspen	4-5 center	15	18
EN	K-3 center	30	24
ES	K-3 center	30	30

Final Filter

Which proposal do you believe is best for the students long term?

Which proposal will be the easiest (least amount of impact on district) for the district to institute and maintain (sustainable)

Place your dots in this order

Green - First Preference

Yellow – Second Preference

Red – Third Preference

Outcomes

K-5
Neighborhood

Relocation

5 Choices

Dots

Dots

Dots

Green – 18

Green – 4

Green – 4

Yellow – 3

Yellow – 7

Yellow – 7

Red - 1

Red - 11

Red - 11

Appreciation to Reorganization Committee

- The Reorganization Committee worked very hard to follow the direction of the Board and the new Strategic Plan.
- Each proposal provides for some exciting options for Hawthorn.

Outcomes

- Potential free FDK for All students
- The ability to bring EC/Pre-K back on campus (EN)
- Avoid the need to do costly additions to buildings or purchase new facilities in the near future. This is big \$\$ \$ savings.
- Potential reduction in transportation costs