

**Questions from Community Café held at Maple Grove Senior High  
Wednesday, February 20, 2008**

- Should redo boundaries to make more fair – explain reason.
- Kindergarten – \*Aides are a “cheap” way to help. Long-term - look at all day. Short-term – KIDS NEED a stronger start. Research proves importance.
- If there are changes to the proposal, does the public get input?
- If the proposal fails, then what?
- With reduced funding that Oak View will be receiving with Fair Oaks moving over and having a ratio of 1 to 6 or 1 to 7 that do not speak English, how will this proposed move help the Fair Oaks children?
- How much of the compensatory funds will move to Oak View to help the Fair Oaks children succeed?
- Why not bring in the Magnet and allow the neighborhood kids to remain in Weaver Lake?
- Why does the community only have 1 proposal to discuss?
- In bringing the Fair Oaks school into Oak View this will bring the Fair Oaks test scores above the No Child Left Behind standards. What does this do to the current population scores at Oak View? What data do you have?
- With Fair Oaks having the highest percent ELL in the district how will Oak View take all this on and succeed?
- Increased transportation costs? \$800K, reduction doesn't make sense.
- How can you help the Fair Oaks children succeed if Fair Oaks has less funds available when Fair Oaks is moved to Oak View?
- Did we look at designating a grant writer to fill the gap for programs?
- How will district pay for legal costs from inevitable legal action if this proposal is adopted?
- Why does the district consistently over-spend their budget by 2-3% every year?
- Is it possible to lease the buildings for schools closed? What will happen to Osseo Elementary building?
- Why are we looking to expand programs (Magnet, Early Childhood) during a budget crisis?
- Did we look at cutting middle management at the district level?
- You are making radical and negative changes, what will happen if you pass a levy in November?
- Who is going to be on the school patrols at the K-3 schools?
- Our district has an obligation to the K-12. The districts' proposal is putting a lot of resources into early childhood!!! How do you justify this with the huge budget short fall we have at the expense of the K-12 program?
- How will voting occur? Will you:
  - a. vote yes or no on the entire proposal?
  - b. vote yes or no on specific line items?
  - c. vote on other proposals that have not been presented yet?
  - d. What are the specific line items that will be voted on yes or no?

### Questions from Community Café held at Maple Grove Senior High

- Have you considered all-year calendar schools to increase building utilization and thus reduce budget cost?
- When will you hold another referendum?
- How are the Magnet schools funded? Is it completely federal funding?
- Weaver area was only one to vote yes on all 3 levies, why are we most affected?
- Boundary changes – census 421 has been moved 3 times (to Rice Lake, Rush Creek, Weaver Lake) and now back to Rush Creek. Do the people who make boundary changes know who they have moved already?
- If the monetary gains to be made are so minimal not to be put in the packet, why are there cuts considered for talented and gifted programs?
- What can come from transportation? Fee for service?
- Why only one proposal?
- Have health care costs for administrators and teachers been adjusted over the past 3 years, e.g., pass some of the increases onto 279 staff. Refer to Wayzata savings.
- Look at kindergarten student/teacher ratio! Fernbrook current 24:1 – next year 30:1. South Dakota, North Dakota, and Wisconsin have full day with better ratios and aides.
- There was a projected \$13.2 million deficit for 2006-07. Actual was \$9.2 million. Why?
- How does this proposal ensure that the quality of education for all students is unchanged and assure the parents this is the case?
- Why is the hearing not covering closing of Weaver Lake?
- Think about splitting Magnet school K-2 & 4-6, 2 buildings not neighborhood schools.
- Why did Edgewood receive new windows, renovations only to close?
- How will this help families when 1 child is at a K-3 school another at a 4-6 school and another in junior high? Parents can't be involved with everything – splits families.
- What is the number of students on the Edgewood waiting list prior to the announcement to move it to Weaver Lake?
- Is all this really going to do anything?
- Why is there no discussion of alternatives to the current proposal? Why is there only one proposal being considered?
- Once this current crisis is resolved, what is the plan to prevent such an event in the future?
- When will there be a hearing for closing/repurposing Weaver Lake Elementary?
- Why didn't the School Board go out for a levy in 2006/07 vs. eating up our reserve?
- Why not rezone? District is too large.
- Is desegregation “mandated” or not? This was contradicted.
- Why is the Board so opposed to taking questions publicly?
- So what are the schools' administrative staff's experiences in MANAGING budgets-- teachers should teach – business people run business
- Why is this process being rushed and not thought out?
- Fair Oaks currently has lower class size due to poverty. Can we expect that Oak View will have lower class sizes than the average district elementary school since those students are coming to Oak View?

### Questions from Community Café held at Maple Grove Senior High

- What support are you providing for larger class non-English and special needs to teachers and for the child that is up to speed what is going?
- Why are the Magnet programs being expanded during a budget crisis--Magnet programs are a luxury; there is concern that we are keeping educational luxuries at the expense of student needs?
- A key interest is to expand the STEM program. How is this justified when the projected enrollment is lower?
- You say Rush Creek is currently under capacity. I am there! I don't see any extra classrooms in the building, and class sizes are already 32-35 for 4<sup>th</sup> – 6<sup>th</sup> grades.
- Does the district anticipate building a new elementary school in the near future?
- What is the plan to deal with the future state funding decreases?
- If Magnet curriculum is as good as they say why separate this amongst schools? Why not then integrate and roll out amongst entire district?
- Can we privatize district administrative staff as a cost saving?
- Where is the long-term plan? Why not cut athletics more? Where are the proportional cuts between district staff and teachers?
- Where is proof Magnets work? State, national numbers.
- Where is the community involvement? Why is the Action Team so unrepresentative of the community? Why don't Board members ask questions...only 2 asking questions?
- We want a new/different proposal, when will this be coming? Not IF, when?
- There are current discrepancies in enrollment at some schools? Why not change boundaries instead of close schools?
- Once this budget cut process is done, will the district budget stabilize?
- Where is the fairness in putting one school – EW – over another – Weaver Lake? The current proposal seems to say the Magnet has priority over “standard” school.
- What happens if we don't desegregate?
- Can you provide nationwide data that demonstrates the effectiveness of Magnet schools?
- Are you going to publish answers to these questions? When?
- Park Brook is the smallest school in the district and is an older building. Why is Park Brook not considered to be closed? (Fixed costs associated with building and same number of administrators to run.)
- Why are we expanding a Magnet (STEM) program when we need to cut the budget significantly?
- How does the single proposal address the key interest #3 where it states “emerging from MULTIPLE scenarios that have been well-researched and responded to by the community...” Where are the MULTIPLE scenarios?
- How does the administration address key interest #9 where it states “all participants in the process need...to operate within their roles...and accountabilities? Are they aware of the Code of Ethics for School Administrators? Subpart 2 subsections A and K should be noted.
- Why are there not more cuts in or at the administration level (directors) that do not directly affect the students?

## Questions from Community Café held at Maple Grove Senior High

- What will happen to the Osseo Elementary building when it closes?
- Are students from Minneapolis bussed into MGJH? Is so, why?
- What were the guidelines given to TeamWorks before they came up with this proposal?
- Can you stay at Basswood if you're being transferred to Rice Lake if you're going into 5<sup>th</sup> grade? Siblings? Why create an island?
- Why isn't Weaver's population split more equitably? Would the School Board offer preference to WVR families wishing to open enroll?
- Why isn't open enrollment publicized (as Magnets are) to promote diversity? Does ISD 279 only want diversity when we are paid for it?
- Why was program based budgeting suspended?
- How do we justify spending \$3 million on Osseo Elementary remodeling 3 years ago and now propose to close it? How fiscally responsible is this?
- Why aren't junior and senior high boundaries being considered now?
- If schools close, can open enrollment students move with their "host" school (i.e., closed) students?
- Consolidating K-3 no doubt will save money, but won't the extra cost in extended bussing more than negate the savings?
- What happened to the goal of establishing strong neighborhood schools?
- What is student retention rate at Magnet? Do students that start stay?
- Why did the Board see expanding the STEM program as a key interest? Is integration a key reason or are there other reasons?
- Do we have an idea of how many of the 166 teachers will be cut at the elementary level?
- What does the "dollar figure won't change" mean if the cut is \$400,000? (in extra-curriculars)
- Has the issue of 35-40 busses exiting WVR been addressed? Very dangerous.
- Did you consider long-range demographics?
- Why was leveraging current successful schools not one of the Board's "key interests"?
- Will FO 6<sup>th</sup> graders (2008-09) be able to go to the same junior high as the OAK/CI students they'll go to school with?
- Why was the district's policy for boundary adjustments "suspended"?
- How did expanding a Magnet program become part of a budget reduction proposal?
- One of the following is true:
  - a. Board knew well in advance of the levy vote the district was \$16 million short, or
  - b. The Board budgeted for \$16 million that it hoped to get from the vote.Which is true?
- Why is there only ONE proposal to discuss?
- How come school closings were not broken out on Budget Reduction Summary provided? It looks like they are hidden.
- If pre K-3 and 4-6 is a priority, why is it only being considered for CI/OAK/FO?

### **Questions from Community Café held at Maple Grove Senior High**

- The \$16M deficit is less than 5% of the annual budget. Why not cut 3% across all budget categories instead of closing schools?
- What will happen to the buildings that close? Will you sell or lease them?
- Did the district incur expenses from the previous bus contract?
- Why should the Cedar Island/Oak View/Fair Oaks merger be considered under the same time constraints as the rest of the plan? There is no clear cost savings from the 3 school merger.
- There should be a plan to re-balance school population every 3 to 5 years. Is there one?
- What is the cost of repurposing Weaver Lake Elementary? (i.e., why move the STEM school?) transport costs, repurposing classrooms, etc...
- Why did the levy proposal materials promise no school closings if the vote on the first question passed?
- Why did the Board hire a consultant to develop a budget? That is the job of the Board and we should not be spending funds to do the job of the Board.
- What is the School Board's philosophy for ECFE? Why do we want to expand the program?
- Why is the proposal being considered as a cohesive proposal instead of 3 parts? The 3 parts seem unrelated.
- Why are special education costs rising so much faster than state aid?
- How would the budget cuts differ if Maple Grove was split as its own district?
- Can the STEM school take kindergarteners? Proposal shows 0.
- Why did we just pass up an \$800,000 grant for smaller learning communities (SLC)?
- Why don't we have people pay part of the transportation fee if they are going to ride the bus? (excluding special education)
- Who decided key interests and why?
- If we do not come up with another proposal why get input?
- Why move out or around special education rooms to the detriment of students who can not accept change?
- Whose goal is to "expand" the Magnet program? Why? What is benefit?
- Cost of repurposing schools?
- Because the "average" child will get less quality time because of needs of time for the "other" kids.
- Did we look at delaying curriculum development by 1 year?

*MGS*  
*I Would Like to Thank*

- Thank you Dean!!! Whether you vote for or against, I know you turned over every rock to reach your choice.
- I would like to thank those administrators & district representatives here giving their time tonight.
- Thank you Superintendent and School Board members. Stay true to the vision and our children will become all they can be.
- Dean Henke for being an active participant and questioner.
- Thanks to the School Board and Cabinet for staying strong and doing the right thing by closing schools and adjusting boundaries.
- Thanks to Rich Melvin for clearly explaining the proposal and answering questions to concerned citizens.
- Thank you to the administrators and others for giving their time tonight to talk to community members about this proposal.
- Thank you! To Dean Henke for having an open mind!
- Thank you for all that you do!! This is a thankless job...no amount of \$\$ would make it worthwhile!
- Thank you to the families of the Board members and administrators. We know their time working on these issues takes them away from the family. Thanks for your support.

MGSH  
Budget Reduction Proposal  
Short Term

Strengths	Weaknesses
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• decreases number of empty classrooms</li> <li>• meets immediate budget goals without tapping reserves</li> <li>• consolidates resources (eliminates duplication)</li> <li>• Magnet school on both east &amp; west side</li> <li>• utilize building space well</li> <li>• potential reduction of administration</li> <li>• potentially relieving overcrowding</li> <li>• restructure if transportation</li> <li>• middle school sports restructuring</li> <li>• saves the \$16.3 million needed</li> <li>• some/most of bussing “islands” were eliminated</li> <li>• identification of 16 plus million in cuts</li> <li>• K-3 idea is good – more individual attention</li> <li>• pursue interest in science, math, etc.</li> <li>• no wasting space, smaller class sizes</li> <li>• good job of cutting from everywhere, not just one category</li> <li>• balances the budget</li> <li>• expands the STEM Magnet</li> <li>• shows importance/recognizes ECFE</li> <li>• increases diversity in certain schools</li> <li>• save money (proposed)</li> <li>• more contiguous school attendance areas</li> <li>• more educational opportunities (potentially) for “disadvantage” students</li> <li>• speed</li> <li>• repairs this years budget but at what cost to the kids</li> <li>• cuts meet necessary budget reduction number</li> <li>• energy efficiency save dollars and good</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• emotional impact of loss</li> <li>• be more transparent about fund “cuts” vs. “shifts”</li> <li>• loss of small school atmosphere</li> <li>• raises class size</li> <li>• increased teacher stress leading to leaving ISD 279</li> <li>• student stress &amp; anxiety</li> <li>• low English speakers going into bigger classes</li> <li>• kids falling through the cracks</li> <li>• lower after school opportunity</li> <li>• replacing one school</li> <li>• lack of community involvement – no collaboration – only feedback</li> <li>• no input on key interest &amp; issues – provided by administration</li> <li>• lack of alignment with core values in strategic plan</li> <li>• too short of time frame compromises values and has detrimental impact on thousands of students</li> <li>• lots of assumptions with Magnet – need to expand, no big demand – mysterious, assume WVR students will join</li> <li>• destroys neighborhood schools</li> <li>• no community input was taken in preparing TeamWorks proposal – contradicts core values of ISD 279</li> <li>• only one proposal – no alternatives presented to the public</li> <li>• <u>not</u> treating everyone with “equal intrinsic value” – contradicts core values</li> <li>• traffic congestion on Weaver Lake Road (particularly between stop lights right off I-94)</li> <li>• student achievement at individual schools was not considered in criteria for school closings</li> <li>• larger class sizes</li> <li>• more support</li> <li>• rushed decision</li> </ul>

Strengths	Weaknesses
<p>for environment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• redoing boundaries – necessary – good goal to have contiguous boundaries</li> <li>• transportation savings – 2 mile walking distance for 7-12 (not younger)</li> <li>• energy savings</li> <li>• excess supply reductions – Smart Board, dock cams, mounted projectors</li> <li>• professional development</li> <li>• non-licensed staff – custodial cut</li> <li>• meets your budget</li> <li>• equal distribution of sacrifices</li> <li>• meets objective of cutting \$16M</li> <li>• energy savings</li> <li>• transportation tiers</li> <li>• energy savings</li> <li>• met short term goal of cutting budget</li> <li>• change to junior high athletics</li> <li>• longer walking distance is good for physical fitness</li> <li>• saves \$16M for 1 year</li> <li>• ECFE for disadvantaged</li> <li>• rebalances school boundaries (at cost of neighborhood schools)</li> <li>• very few</li> <li>• balances the budget</li> <li>• expands the STEM</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• not enough community input/involvement</li> <li>• “done deal”</li> <li>• district budget – transportation cuts should be more</li> <li>• administration cuts</li> <li>• closing a top performing school (WVR)</li> <li>• siblings splitting apart</li> <li>• teachers moving schools/being cut</li> <li>• relationships being split (teachers/students)</li> <li>• losing young teachers to other districts</li> <li>• impact on kids</li> <li>• shuffling kids around</li> <li>• trading a STEM school for community school</li> <li>• increased class size</li> <li>• increased bussing</li> <li>• longer school days</li> <li>• decreased student performance/test scores</li> <li>• increased safety concerns</li> <li>• burnt out teachers</li> <li>• process going too fast</li> <li>• decrease in sports/arts/extra curricular activities</li> <li>• displacing connect program</li> <li>• too large an impact on (~3000) special education students</li> <li>• % too high of moved/impacted students</li> <li>• freezing open enrollment unfair</li> <li>• the money saved by closing schools is a small fraction of the cuts – should consider broader cuts elsewhere</li> <li>• can’t guarantee that bussing changes ACTUAL will save \$</li> <li>• unknown costs to repurpose buildings</li> <li>• disruption of 1000s of students throughout district</li> <li>• possible loss of federal NCLB from schools which are ‘below’ – then redistribution so scores make \$ from NCLB unavailable</li> <li>• too quick of a timeline for the importance of topics – less than 6 weeks from proposal to decision making</li> </ul>

Strengths	Weaknesses
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• former “Birch Grove” students disrupted again – not optimal to their well being</li> <li>• loss of property values</li> <li>• destruction of community schools/communities</li> <li>• uprooting special programs to other sites (DHH, etc)</li> <li>• loss of students who go outside 279</li> <li>• address western potential growth – cost future schools – do we have the \$</li> <li>• class size increase/teacher reduction</li> <li>• not cutting the critical positions when 60% of the budget is non-personnel dollars</li> <li>• too fast process – was everything looked at</li> <li>• junior and senior high</li> <li>• expansion of early childhood programs is not mandated – strategic plan “desire” that is a luxury we can’t afford in budget crisis</li> <li>• no data to support need for expansion of Magnet program (projected enrollment for next year is down)</li> <li>• lack of community input in process – no collaboration or parental involvement – does not align with strategic plan</li> <li>• short time frame doesn’t provide enough time to make wise decisions</li> <li>• too many transitions for kids; increased mobility – reduced parental involvement will result</li> <li>• cost to implement offsets savings</li> <li>• 3-Act</li> <li>• sports cut</li> <li>• custodial cut</li> <li>• teacher cuts – not beneficial for student/teacher ratio and educational opportunities for students</li> <li>• loss of community by closing neighborhood schools</li> <li>• displacing our children</li> <li>• transitioning special education children by having K-3 and 4-6 in different schools</li> <li>• increased class size leads to decreased learning</li> <li>• this isn’t the time to experiment with our children – Oak View/Cedar Island – does data</li> </ul>

Strengths	Weaknesses
	<p>say to do this – budget time not a time to do this</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● loss of enrichment proposal choice</li> <li>● lack of trust in School Board</li> <li>● putting all these busses on the road will jeopardize our children’s safety</li> <li>● many schools are already near or at capacity – how can schools handle more students</li> <li>● modifying TAG program</li> <li>● continuation of Magnet program</li> <li>● three years ago the district spent three million dollars to improve Osseo Elementary – now it’s being closed – how is that fiscally responsible</li> <li>● under No Child Left Behind, schools are penalized or rewarded based on performance – why are we repurposing WV, our top performing school</li> <li>● huge disruption to children</li> <li>● poorly thought out</li> <li>● expand special program – ECFE &amp; Magnet at cost of core education</li> <li>● flawed process</li> <li>● poorly communicated</li> <li>● key interests do not reflect interests of majority</li> <li>● closing schools only saves \$800,000</li> <li>● administrative costs are too high/cuts not deep enough</li> <li>● overcrowds schools</li> <li>● closed neighborhood schools</li> <li>● transportation cost higher than other districts</li> <li>● more students needing transportation</li> <li>● no room in schools for expansion – schools will be nearly to capacity</li> <li>● closing high performing schools in growing area</li> <li>● boundary decision purposes unclear – BW pocket to OAK/CI</li> <li>● still many questions</li> <li>● students at BW not moving in community (small group asked to move)</li> <li>● cut too deep in classroom should be more proportional to district spending “admin”</li> <li>● narrow planning period</li> </ul>

Strengths	Weaknesses
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• lack of community involvement</li> <li>• new proposed cuts don't really provide realistic savings</li> <li>• expansion of Magnet and ECFE should not be our key interest during budget crisis</li> <li>• mixes cost savings with program changes – K-3/4-6 too many transitions for elementary aged kids</li> <li>• eliminating important and beneficial classes (ie. ALP) ~ hard to clear 48 person level, and less focus because of the large class size</li> <li>• eliminating senior high classes because of failure to meet minimum class size</li> <li>• looking at cutting “middle man” in administration</li> <li>• no looking into curriculum refreshment (consider putting it on hold)</li> <li>• student child ratio consideration in lower grades (kindergarten)</li> <li>• teachers don't know about autism, so resources should be kept not eliminated</li> <li>• destroys neighborhood schools, communities, identity of the school/students/neighborhoods</li> <li>• set back students in connect program – development/learning</li> <li>• lack of community input (this does not count)</li> <li>• destroys faith in School Board by a community that voted yes on all three levy items (WVR)</li> <li>• too little time to plan and make critical decisions</li> <li>• lack of alternative proposals considered</li> <li>• conflicting information on east/west growth with MET Council on district growth</li> <li>• unproven K-3/4-6 structure</li> <li>• impacts all students in district</li> <li>• time to implement is too short</li> <li>• should have been addressed in '06 (School Board mistake)</li> <li>• \$17M shortfall in 06/07 erodes school reserves</li> <li>• only one way to balance the budget</li> <li>• too heavy on cuts at student/teacher interface</li> <li>• once cuts are made – difficult to reserve</li> <li>• undefined process for staff cuts</li> </ul>

Strengths	Weaknesses
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="873 241 1284 275">• training enough STEM teachers</li><li data-bbox="873 283 1295 317">• schools are closing – irreversible</li><li data-bbox="873 325 1446 359">• no budget line item for sale of closed facilities</li></ul>

MGSH  
Budget Reduction Proposal  
Long Term

Advantages	Concerns
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• fiscally responsible</li> <li>• sound management of facilities</li> <li>• school boundaries make sense</li> <li>• Magnet school on both east &amp; west</li> <li>• supports early childhood programs</li> <li>• hopefully less school closings/changes in future years due to population changes</li> <li>• K-3/4-6 ability to focus on development level – teach, discipline</li> <li>• Kids will get more attention for the things they are learning in their grade level (K-3) (4-6)</li> <li>• won't be a huge change for the kids after a while – will be beneficial to their education with more specialized attention</li> <li>• keep saving \$ every year</li> <li>• expansion of STEM Magnet/ECFE</li> <li>• non which are clear and proven</li> <li>• don't see any at this time</li> <li>• benefits of early childhood for children without access – but why centralize-- disburse to open classrooms in current buildings</li> <li>• good to use Strategic Plan, but need to put fiscal responsibility first – deal with “musts” K-6 core education first</li> <li>• energy efficiency</li> <li>• getting rid of some top heavy management</li> <li>• equal distribution of sacrifices</li> <li>• honestly don't see any</li> <li>• unconvinced</li> <li>• change to junior high athletics</li> <li>• strengthens community participation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• future cuts are very worrisome – how will we continue to fund our schools if the levies continue to fail?</li> <li>• people have fears about “east vs. west” issues ~ i.e. cultural differences, lack of understanding, etc.</li> <li>• didn't work in Mpls. district, why do it here</li> <li>• can kids live up to potential</li> <li>• keeping up standards (state)</li> <li>• destroys neighborhood schools</li> <li>• lack of any alternative proposal available for consideration</li> <li>• lack of interest in looking at other options even when superintendent says she wants to hear about our ideas</li> <li>• under utilization of buildings for 16-20% is results of increased class sizes – closing schools will force us to maintain large class sizes – short term fix ~ is large class size our goal</li> <li>• STEM benefits at expense of mandated core K-6 programming</li> <li>• ADM/per pupil funding for mandated K-12 not early childhood - consider all-day kindergarten – spread early childhood in neighborhood schools</li> <li>• Fair Oaks/Oak View proposal results in forced integration – studies prove integration is not effective</li> <li>• why experiment with FO/CI/OAK K-3, 4-6 when no proven track record</li> <li>• we will lose more students to other schools if this proposal is approved</li> <li>• 4000 students choose other educational choices resulting in a loss of \$38 for the 07/08 with this proposal more will be lost</li> <li>• site programs need to be contained in current buildings to maintain consistency &amp;</li> </ul>

Advantages	Concerns
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• awareness of School Board members and when elections are</li> <li>• potential awareness by state leaders of need to fully fund schools</li> <li>• expands the STEM</li> <li>• transportation savings</li> </ul>	<p>continuity (people &amp; location)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• alienated supporters will not pass future levies</li> <li>• proposal inadequately quantifies the cost of upgrading facilities for repurposing (i.e. technology at WVR, retrofitting facilities for Pre K at CI)</li> <li>• unknown how junior and senior high boundaries will be affected</li> <li>• growth in the district – housing development specifically in the BW, RC and FB census/attendance areas</li> <li>• would moving the STEM so far west decrease the likelihood that new families of protected students from the far east side would choose to enroll, thus causing an unbalanced student body (too many non-protected students) this is the purpose of the Magnet school program</li> <li>• will moving FO students to OAK help then achieve AYP</li> <li>• long-term AYP provision?</li> <li>• loss of community</li> <li>• “integration proposal” vs. budget proposal</li> <li>• focus is off K-12 and early childhood is expanding</li> <li>• longer bus rides</li> <li>• the district literature said “status quo” and didn’t mention closing schools (referring to item #1)</li> <li>• PB has 384 students and is the smallest building, why isn’t it closed</li> <li>• paying speakers thousands of dollars that are equivalent to a teacher’s salary</li> <li>• losing young teachers to other districts</li> <li>• not enough individual attention for students in large class sizes</li> <li>• losing funding due to students switching to private school</li> <li>• lack of future support/levy</li> <li>• short term fixes may not bring long term results</li> </ul>

Advantages	Concerns
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• could hurt future enrollment</li> <li>• continuous poor budget management at all level-federal, state and district</li> <li>• re-purposing costs</li> <li>• long-term impact on test scores/academics and extra curricular/activities</li> <li>• decreased community commitment</li> <li>• loss of students from 279 (to other public &amp; private)</li> <li>• loss of capacity for number of students, will we have to open another school as communities grow (Target Corp. new hospital, etc.)</li> <li>• still need to maintain potential “empty” schools regardless of whether building empty or in use by school – no guarantee to rent or utilize those spaces</li> <li>• loss of community support for our schools – very concerned that future levies will not pass and further cripple 279 financially</li> <li>• much larger class sizes</li> <li>• why punish the children in schools for decision by voters</li> <li>• potentially increasing bussing and east/west bussing</li> <li>• are K-3 and 4-6 programs long term viable</li> <li>• money they are expecting for Magnet schools may change</li> <li>• extra cost Magnet school how it pulls from rest district</li> <li>• potential growth and need for new schools</li> <li>• will this plan fix the poorer performing schools (note 6/19 elementary schools are in the bottom of the 10% of the 850 schools in the state)</li> <li>• closing WVR does not address growth on west side of district – foresee need to build another elementary school in coming years – Fernbrook will have capacity issues (610 growth)</li> <li>• Magnet school may not work (look at LA) – STEM is a buzzword that could change/Birch</li> </ul>

Advantages	Concerns
	<p data-bbox="922 233 1073 264">Grove failing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="873 275 1438 415">● closing strong schools will have ramifications for years – takes years to rebuild what we already have academically and with strong bonds between teacher, parent, students</li> <li data-bbox="873 426 1438 531">● transportation cost may go up particularly if neighborhood kids opt out of Magnet – assumption they will go to Magnet</li> <li data-bbox="873 541 1438 646">● potential for district to lose many students to private schools/other districts – could lose millions in ADM</li> <li data-bbox="873 657 1438 762">● community support for district waning – future levies in jeopardy/distrust in “hidden agendas”</li> <li data-bbox="873 772 1438 877">● if K-3 is way we’re going, why aren’t we expanding that program to other schools--is this a model we want to follow</li> <li data-bbox="873 888 1438 951">● forced integration doesn’t work – big cultural issues</li> <li data-bbox="873 961 1438 1024">● neighborhood schools foster community involvement/support</li> <li data-bbox="873 1035 1438 1140">● doesn’t align with Strategic Plan – community has done more research than TeamWorks in 3 weeks</li> <li data-bbox="873 1150 1438 1213">● teachers may have distrust in way they will be reassigned</li> <li data-bbox="873 1224 1438 1287">● Board’s/administration’s key interests may not reflect communities</li> <li data-bbox="873 1297 1438 1402">● proposal doesn’t maintain quality education for all students – doesn’t address fiscal responsibility to this point</li> <li data-bbox="873 1413 1438 1444">● development benefits to K-6 model</li> <li data-bbox="873 1455 1438 1602">● cutting ALP classes on basis of lower student/teacher ratio – by cutting they will not make big savings while eliminating talented and gifted programs</li> <li data-bbox="873 1612 1438 1644">● teacher cuts</li> <li data-bbox="873 1654 1438 1686">● extra curricular cuts – sports, 3-acts</li> <li data-bbox="873 1696 1438 1801">● the western side of Maple Grove will continue to grow and this proposal does not take into account this change in population</li> <li data-bbox="873 1812 1438 1875">● it is detrimental to the growth of our community because people will not move in</li> </ul>

Advantages	Concerns
	<p>when there are no community schools</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• how will this affect our test scores – we will lose our best and brightest to private schools or neighboring districts</li> <li>• chaos with junior and senior high boundaries for next year</li> <li>• by cutting so many extra curricular programs will this keep our kids competitive in the college selection process</li> <li>• this proposal is <u>re</u>-active not <u>pro</u>-active</li> <li>• re-purposing WVR is <u>not</u> a budget issue</li> <li>• this proposal does not follow the district Strategic Plan</li> <li>• we’re cutting a lot of the programs that are incentives for people to open-enroll from out of the district</li> <li>• there’s concern over having seniors and seventh graders in the same athletics programs</li> <li>• creating crisis on west side of district with boundary</li> <li>• losing neighborhood schools</li> <li>• not a long-term solution-band-aid</li> <li>• increased class size</li> <li>• alienates a large portion of the community that supports public schools</li> <li>• too much emphasis on ECFE</li> <li>• too much focus on Magnet programs</li> <li>• loss of trust in leadership and administration</li> <li>• loss of students to other districts and private schools</li> <li>• the ability to pass future levies has been harmed</li> <li>• bus traffic out of WVR will be very dangerous</li> <li>• funds haven’t been provided to get more technology into WVR</li> <li>• stabilized budget</li> <li>• losing students to private, home, charter schools</li> <li>• plan for assimilating new population at Oak View</li> </ul>

Advantages	Concerns
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• psychological impact, cognitive impact – move 170 days – how many spent in adjustment</li> <li>• students at BW not moving in community (small group asked to move)</li> <li>• no room in schools for expansion – schools will be filled nearly to capacity</li> <li>• impact on Maple Grove community – home values lower, housing market lower</li> <li>• huge shortsighted on budget balancing beyond year one – i.e., year 2 deficit</li> <li>• how does proposal ensure quality of education for all students</li> <li>• planning for future growth on west side of district - i.e., hospital, clinic</li> <li>• what if Magnet school is unsuccessful – what is contingency plan for WVR</li> <li>• loss of confidence in district</li> <li>• underestimate loss of students to other districts, private and home</li> <li>• freeze new curriculum research and development</li> <li>• increased class sizes – poor academic performance</li> <li>• need to rehire staff after new levy passes</li> <li>• people leaving district – won't vote to pass future levies ~ looking at transferring districts and private educations</li> <li>• cutting resource staff pushes behavior management to classroom – less attractive teaching positions – less curriculum teaching</li> <li>• ELL kids will never catch up</li> <li>• where's the plan for all day kindergarten</li> <li>• re-district/re-purpose due to new growth</li> <li>• student achievement/test scores</li> <li>• time to implement, per TeamWorks, is 2 plus years</li> <li>• continuing decrease in state funding</li> <li>• future referendums will not pass easily</li> <li>• capacity issues on west side (growth)</li> <li>• lose students to private, other districts</li> </ul>

Advantages	Concerns
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• large class sizes, student achievement</li> <li>• STEM benefits at expense of K-6 program</li> <li>• increased transportation times</li> <li>• continuing decreases in reserve fund balance</li> <li>• legal costs due to lawsuits</li> <li>• safety of students due to lack of full-time nurses, bus accidents due to more bussing</li> <li>• diminish Maple Grove as premier community</li> <li>• autism program weakened when it is the fastest growing affliction</li> <li>• unsupervised children due to shortened school time – increases latch key time for junior/senior high kids</li> <li>• losing focus on the K-12 core</li> <li>• pushing connect, special education programs out of Magnet physical location</li> <li>• need to see data regarding single family, multi-family town homes, apartments scheduled to go in Osseo, old granite co, Fermbrook census area, and related student projections--these areas are not all &gt;\$400K homes</li> <li>• impact to neighborhood vitality/viability where schools close</li> </ul>

**MGSB**  
**Ideas for Improvement**

- write to you legislators
- try to be open to new situations
- change is inevitable; progress is optional
- bussing charges
- form a community committee – each school/area/population represented
- increase athletic fees to \$230
- take the time to get input from a large number of district/community members, parents, etc.
- get input from all schools – get real, hard facts through community discussions, surveys, etc.
- multiple proposals should be presented and considered
- re-evaluate census areas on a more regular basis – every 3 years, perhaps
- put this proposal on hold to give time to look into other option
- charging for transportation (sliding scale)
- four day week – longer days
- addition to WVR for both WVR & EW students (a school within a school)
- referendum – another one in near future
- engage parent involvement
- re-evaluate effectiveness of key interests & prioritize and evaluate ramifications
- utilize current open classroom spaces to “host” ECFE – broadens availability to entire district
- continue budget proposal/continue proposal for another year for further ideas and more dialogue amongst public/Board
- open proposal to more community input – need more time
- have they considered all the ways to save teachers – this is the primary goal
- let kids be kids in grade school – make Magnet a higher level (older kids) when they are more mature and better utilize this extra funding
- raise fees for co-curriculars/extra-curriculars
- more time-- wait a year, use available fund balance to make \$800,000 that would be realized from school closings – need more parental/teacher collaboration – no time to do it under current proposal
- re-examine transportation – re-bid bussing companies
- consider budget reduction ideas put forth by community – some great ideas in there
- do not cut extra curricular activities with this many students in our schools
- extra curricular activities
- keep community schools open
- go out for new transportation contract (competitive bids)
- have more than one proposal – slow down, and think it out

## **MGSB**

### **Ideas for Improvement**

- keep more teachers and cut administrative support, athletics
- keep our kids with the kids they have been with
- schools can be successful with less \$
- listen and include parents in decision-making process
- use some of the ideas in the alternative proposal submitted
- more community input
- study students required to move multiple times
- more time to evaluate huge decision – all aspects
- get and consider multiple proposals - #3 of key interest to be shared with community
- action team should consist of community mentions, including site council members from each school
- Magnet school will never fill the space of WVR – will remain inefficient
- expansion of Magnet and ECFE should not be our key interest during budget crisis
- consider focus on grant writing to fill the gap
- look at fee for transportation service (for looking at a major cut)
- administration cost has gone up 29%, but student population only 1% - why can't we cut more there
- more permutations are needed on the key interests
- put ECFE in every building to utilize unused space