

## **Facilities Committee Report:**

**Committee members:** Matt Rich, Kevin Dorken, Nancy Morell, Katie Siegel, Neal Siegellak, Heather Hopkins, Ellen Fagerburg, Cathy Freidinger, David Tojo , Merryll Brownlow, and John O'Connor

### **Committee Assignment:**

The 2008-2009 Facilities Committee was assigned the task from the Board of Education to determine if the student populations from each of the three elementary school clusters (Westbrook/Glen Grove, Henking/Hoffman, and Lyon/Pleasant Ridge) could be numerically balanced in order to take advantage of the open classroom space at Pleasant Ridge School. The committee met three times between the months of January and March and analyzed six possible solutions.

### **Background Information:**

In each model of enrollment change, it was determined that additional classroom space would be required at Lyon School. Since there is a discrepancy in available classrooms between Lyon and the other primary schools in the district, it is currently operating close to full classroom capacity during the 2008-2009 school year and is tasked to operate at full capacity during the 2009-2010 school year. As such, addition space in the form of a building addition or mobile classrooms would be required for any shift in boundaries. Current modeling of Pleasant Ridge School identifies three open classrooms for both the 2008-2009 school year and the 2009-2010 school year.

As of September 2008, the Westbrook/Glen Grove Cluster had an enrollment of 1009 students, the Henking/Hoffman Cluster had an enrollment of 1101 students, and the Lyon/Pleasant Ridge Cluster had an enrollment of 892 students. Based on the enrollment modeling performed by George Armbruster, it was identified that both Henking/Hoffman and Lyon/Pleasant Ridge cluster enrollments would remain steady with less than 1% change, whereas the Westbrook/Glen Grove cluster was predicted to increase by 10%, adding 100 students driven by growth within the Glen.

Thus, the task of the committee was to determine methods to reduce enrollment numbers in both the Westbrook/Glen Grove and Henking/Hoffman clusters by adding students to Lyon/Pleasant Ridge.

### **Variables Analyzed:**

The Committee analyzed the movements of the following nine enrollment areas:

- East Lake/Glendale/Glenview Rd./ & Greenwood
- East Lake/Glendale/Glenview Rd./ & Shermer
- Tower/Compass/Johns/ & West. Lake
- Railroad & Harlem
- Old Willow & Waukegan
- Glenview/Shermer/East Lake/ & Lehigh
- Railroad/Glenview Road/ & Waukegan
- Railroad/Golf/ & Overlook
- Chestnut/Lehigh/East Lake/ & Patriot

The Committee analyzed each scenario based for the following qualities:

- Achievement of numerical balance based on 2008-09 enrollment numbers.

- Achievement of numerical balance based on predicted 2013-14 enrollment numbers.
- Geographically rational movements.
- Number of students impacted.

**Scenarios Considered:**

- 1) Move Tower/Compass/Johns/ & West. Lake and Railroad & Harlem enrollment areas to Lyon/Pleasant Ridge Cluster.
- 2) Move Railroad & Harlem and Chestnut/Lehigh/East Lake/ & Patriot to Lyon/Pleasant Ridge, Glenview/Shermer/East Lake/ & Lehigh to Henking/Hoffman, and East Lake/Glendale/Glenview Rd./ & Shermer and Old Willow & Waukegan to Westbrook/Glen Grove Cluster.
- 3) Move East Lake/Glendale/Glenview Rd./ & Greenwood, East Lake/Glendale/Glenview Rd./ & Shermer, & Tower/Compass/Johns/ & West. Lake to Lyon/Pleasant Ridge Cluster.
- 4) Move East Lake/Glendale/Glenview Rd./ & Greenwood, East Lake/Glendale/Glenview Rd./ & Shermer, & Tower/Compass/Johns/ & West. Lake to Lyon/Pleasant Ridge and Railroad/Golf/ & Overlook to Henking/Hoffman Cluster.
- 5) Move East Lake/Glendale/Glenview Rd./ & Greenwood to Henking/Hoffman and Tower/Compass/Johns/ & West. Lake and Railroad & Harlem enrollment areas to Lyon/Pleasant Ridge Cluster.
- 6) Move East Lake/Glendale/Glenview Rd./ & Shermer to Westbrook/Glen Grove, Tower/Compass/Johns/ & West. Lake and Railroad & Harlem enrollment areas to Lyon/Pleasant Ridge Cluster, and Chestnut/Lehigh/East Lake/ & Patriot to Henking/Hoffman Cluster.

**Results:**

The facilities committee reviewed each of the scenarios:

	Difference in Number of Students between Lowest Enrollment Cluster and Highest Enrollment Cluster 2008-2009 school year	Difference in Number of Students between Lowest Enrollment Cluster and Highest Enrollment Cluster 2013-2014 school year	Geographically Rational (scale 1-5 with 5 being the most rational movement)	Number of Students Impacted by the move
No Move	209	209	4	0
Model 1	69	43	3	127
Model 2	127	44	1.5	527
Model 3	146	103	2	185
Model 4	124	59	1.5	207
Model 5	121	13	3	153
Model 6	287	79	2	450

**Conclusions:**

Based on the scenarios studied, each of the three elementary school clusters could become more balanced through changes in the geographic boundaries of the district. In studying the models, the committee would recommend that should the district choose to change boundaries, it should further investigate models 1, 3, & 5. These models seemed to be the most geographically sound and impact the fewest number of families. During this investigation, the district should consider the following questions:

- 1) What will be the impacts to each cluster's socio-economics, limited English proficient population, and special education population?
- 2) What type of additional space is appropriate, would this be in the form of mobile classrooms or permanent additions at the primary level?
- 3) Should we be moving students from current enrollment clusters only to put them in mobiles in their new location or should we add the mobile classrooms to the current locations of need?