Present: Melissa Griffiths, Hallinan Principal  
Brandy Begin, Hallinan Parent  
Nancy Wakefield, Hallinan Parent  
Patrick Shuckerow, Forest Hills Principal  
Gina Johnston, Forest Hills Parent  
Mary Irene Cooper, Forest Hills Parent  
Scott Schinderle, Lake Grove Principal  
Kati Radziwon, Lake Grove Parent  
Lilian Sarlos, Oak Creek Principal  
Christi Macy, Oak Creek Parent  
Laura Coyle, Oak Creek Parent  
Dan Draper, River Grove Principal  
Chandra Vallely, River Grove Parent  
Michael Martin, River Grove Parent  
Kari Montgomery, Westridge Principal  
Shannon Turner, Secondary Southside Parent  
Molly Ducker, Secondary Northside Parent  
Rachel Roberts, GIS Analyst, FLO Analytics  
Alex Brasch, GIS Analyst, FLO Analytics

Advisory/Support: Dr. Jennifer Schiele, LOSD Assistant Superintendent  
Stuart Ketzler, LOSD Assistant Superintendent of Business Services  
Mary Kay Larson, LOSD Director of Communications  
Kirsten Aird, LOSD School Board Member (Board Liaison)  
Cheryl Walsh, LOSD Support

Absent/Excused: McKay Larrabee, Senior Analyst, FLO Analytics  
Rachel Rittman, Westridge Parent  
Omar Romero, Westridge Parent  
Frank Luzaich, LOSD Executive Director of Elementary Programs

Also Present: 5 visitors

1.0 Review meeting norms, charge, and guiding principles  
Mr. Brasch opened the meeting at 6:06 p.m. noting Ms. Larrabee is unable to attend. Ms. Larson discussed open meetings. The boundary committee meetings will be open to the public and will be posted in The Current and on the district meeting calendar. Our desire is for the committee to work uninhibited. This is a work in progress. Scenario maps will be posted as a work in progress. Visitors this evening were welcomed, asked to observe the process, and to be respectful of any exploratory ideas brought up by committee members. The info@loswe go.12.or.us email is up and working. The committee was asked to forward any
emails they receive to this email. A FAQ sheet is being developed to address the feedback, concerns and questions that arise.

Mr. Brasch reviewed the agenda for the evening. There will be one more meeting before our first open house on February 5th. At our meeting next week, we will review what to expect during the open house. The meeting norms, committee charge and guiding principles were reviewed.

One of our main goals is to balance enrollment. Specifically, we want to balance enrollment between River Grove, Westridge, and Hallinan (south side) and balance enrollment between Lake Grove, Oak Creek, and Forest Hills (north side).

2.0 Springboard Review from 1/15 meeting
Mr. Brasch reviewed the springboard map boundaries and statistics. He reminded the committee to focus on total capacity but consider programming and aim for a target of 85% for most of the schools.

3.0 Workgroups/group discussion with scenario modeling
Maps were passed out and the committee was divided into north/south workgroups to start working on scenarios.

4.0 Regroup and discuss workgroup updates
The breakout groups concluded their work and the whole committee reconvened at 7:37 p.m. and a presentation was made by the south and north teams on their boundary recommendation.

South Side Highlights:

Looking at the springboard proposal map and boundaries F, G, H, and I, the south side recommendation was to put back those boundaries to where they were. They have the River Grove Spanish immersion moving to Uplands and add a K-1 strand as well which would bring River Grove’s numbers temporarily down to 402. Best practice for moving small children, it did not make sense to move 60 kids in and out at this time. The best practice would be to move one strand of Spanish immersion to Uplands and add another K-1.

It is expected that River Grove will be rebuilt if the next bond passes in 2021. There will be a couple years of planning, permitting and construction, but they would rejoin the Spanish immersion program at Uplands during this time. A larger building would be built to bring everyone back to the new River Grove building. That could make that building about 700, and to stay within the 85% capacity, our hope would be that the staffing at Uplands to support the Spanish immersion program would move back to River Grove so they would have the building, space, and staff to support.

A concern was mentioned regarding traffic. In planning, traffic will be addressed. If the bond didn’t pass, you still would have to decompress River Grove and keep Spanish immersion at Uplands. A couple of positives would be to try to start a second strand of Spanish immersion
has been discussed already and this is a good time to do it. Second, we are not moving any boundaries on the south side so outside of Spanish immersion we are not moving any south side families.

There are 57% of Spanish immersion families are in the River Grove area. Is there any concern they would not want to be in the program if it moves to Uplands? The Spanish immersion program is currently being built. There is a lottery process to get into the Spanish immersion program. There are 28 spots in the program. We first look at siblings. If the siblings are in River Grove, those kids go first. Of 28 spots, 10 kids are siblings, 18 spots left, 9 go to north side, 9 go to south side.

If a second strand of Spanish immersion were to begin, the committee would like to know where those students live. The district would follow the same process to start-up a second strand and will need to discuss further because there are currently more south side than north side students on the waitlist. If the bond does not pass and we could not move River Grove to Uplands, the group discussed moving Spanish immersion to Palisades, but that too would require a bond because some work is required for that to be a running building again.

**North Side Highlights:**

The north side group looked at the springboard proposal which impacted about 370 kids. In this updated committee draft, Westlake would stay with Lake Grove. The goal was to keep the three boundaries consistent and reduce the amount of students being impacted. They discussed residents versus transfers. We need to look at kids at each site. We have kids from River Grove that have been long standing members at Lake Grove based on where they live transferring in each year. There was mention of grandfathering in students so if they are currently in 4th grade, they can stay and complete fifth grade. The district replied they could be thrown back into the transfer guidelines and we could look and see if there is room.

All three boundaries on the north side connect. We have Oak Creek giving to Lake Grove because Oak Creek is over and Lake Grove is under. Forest Hills is at capacity so if we pull from Oak Creek, then we need to give to Lake Grove. There was also comment about wanting to see more kids of color in their school to balance diversity and this is something the committee should consider as we discuss these scenarios. Oak Creek is the most diverse and has the most students on free and reduced meals.

The committee was asked if this should be the first committee draft (Committee Boundaries Draft #1) and starting point for next week’s meeting. The show of hands revealed the majority of the committee was in favor of this Committee Boundaries Draft #1. These changes will be noted and we will rerun the summary stats. On the springboard proposal map, there is a blue section that goes to River Grove. It would be good to see how many of those students are transfer students. A lot of the River Grove transfers that come to Lake Grove are in the area west of the Lake Grove school.

**5.0 Wrap up and next steps**

At the meeting next week, the committee would like to see a map of transfer students within the district. We will also revisit the residence-attendance matrix next week. The meeting was adjourned at 8:01 p.m.