



Long Range Planning Committee
Wednesday, April 5th, 2017
Meeting Minutes

Voting Members

X	Caryn Becker	X	Brad Geiger	⌋	Kati Knisley		
X	Laura Jensen	X	Anthony Wilemon	X	Bob Binder		
X	Cindy Barnard	X	Rudy Lukez	⌋	Todd Warnke		
X	Chris Williams	X	Joyce Mirenzi	X	Nicole Bolger		
X	Karen Zimmerman	X	Stephanie Stanley	X	Steven Franger		
X	Kay Dry	⌋	Michelle Major				

Non-Voting Members

X	Richard Cosgrove	⌋	Shavon Caldwell	⌋	Thomas Mc Millen	X	Meghann Silverthorn
X	Kurt Wolter						

X indicates attendance, ⌋ = notification, ⊗ = no notification

Call to Order

Long Range Planning Committee Chair Brad Geiger called the meeting to order at 6:00 pm

Review and Approval of March 2017 Minutes

No quorum. Minutes will be reviewed and voted on at the May meeting.

LRPC Membership

LRPC Chair Brad Geiger informed members that we currently have 6 vacancies that need to be filled and asked for recommendations as to how to fill these positions. It was noted that Karen Zimmerman is currently the only person on the membership subcommittee. Laura Jensen volunteered to also serve on the membership subcommittee and assist in recruiting new members. Some action items that members suggested to engage and retain members included:

- Reach out to coworkers, neighbors, other organizations you belong to, etc.
- Write a recruitment letter that could be posted on social media
- Have DCSD Communications put recruitment article on front page
- Rent a space/have a booth at something like Parker Days or other large community events
- Post announcement in Recreation Centers communications board

Brad Geiger stated that he would continue to work with Karen Zimmerman and Laura Jensen on a plan to more aggressively recruit members. He also stated that he would try to speak with the Board of Education student advisor to see if he knows any students are interested in filling the LRPC student advisor position. Planning Manager Shavon Caldwell noted that the LRPC Subcommittee Charter document had some ideas that could be pursued by the subcommittee and that she would re-share this document with Karen and Laura.

2017-18 Master Capital Plan

Planning Manager, Shavon Caldwell reviewed the Master Capital Plan review and publishing timeline with members. She informed members of the following general timeline:

- A draft copy of the MCP will be available for members to review shortly (a few days) before the May meeting.
- Members will have approximately 1 week to perform their review and make comments (by May 8th).

- Comments will be reviewed by staff and those that can be incorporated will be between May 8th and 15th
- BoE members will be given the opportunity to review and comment on the document after LRPC suggested changes have been incorporated (May 15-18th)
- Any changes suggested by BoE members will be shared with LRPC in last week of May and reviewed at the June meeting. Those BoE suggestions that are reviewed and agreed on by committee will be incorporated in the first week of June after June LRPC meeting
- Committee members (with guidance and assistance from the MCP subcommittee) will need to complete their intro and summary letters for the document no later than June 12th
- The finalized document will go to the printer and be submitted to the Board of Education electronic schoolboard site no later than June 13th.
- Members should plan on beginning on the Board of Education presentation in early May. A final version of the presentation that has been coordinated with staff should be completed and submitted to the staff no later than June 13th.
- The presentation will be given at the June 20th Board of Education Meeting. Currently, a 20 minute presentation with 10 minutes for Q and A exists on the June 20th agenda.

LRPC Chair Brad Geiger suggested that all members try to attend that June 20th meeting and reminded everybody to review the MCP before the May meeting so they're prepared to discuss. Planning Manager Shavon Caldwell also suggested that members be ready to discuss and decide on presentation logistics, content and theme at the May meeting. Currently Joyce Mireni and Michelle Major are the only members on the MCP subcommittee. Rudy Lukez volunteered to assist as well. The following additional suggestions were made by members and staff regarding the upcoming MCP review, publishing, and subsequent June 20th presentation:

- Educate those Board of Education members not familiar with document before June 20th meeting. Perhaps invite new school board member(s) to the June meeting when final review of document is done
- Determine (by the May meeting) what the committee wants the message of this presentation to be, i.e., is it a simple update from last year or are there bigger, higher level, topics that need to be addressed with this presentation? Ex.) Should this years presentation include a discussion on capacity along with updated reinvestment figures?
- Aim to have a draft presentation complete to review by June meeting; preferably by week before June meeting
- Combat any potential community perceptions and misunderstandings with a direct, factual, and data driven presentation
- Consider trying to strategically schedule this presentation in conjunction with Budget update and/or presentation where the FOC and CFO can address capital funding related concerns and questions

Capacity Review and Analysis

Director of Planning & Construction Rich Cosgrove and Planning Manager Shavon Caldwell briefed the group on their efforts to identify and engage with potential vendors that could assist with data mining and analysis discussed at the March meeting (determining the drivers of choice). They informed members that staff is currently looking into the qualifications and costs of several vendors and software providers including Davis Demographics, Guide K12, and Tableau. They informed members that they would continue to identify options for outsourcing as needed. Planning Manager Shavon Caldwell noted that she could provide the following requested analyses over the summer months:

- Choice data and out of district data
 - How many students are choosing a school other than their neighborhood school? What proportion of these students are choosing another neighborhood school vs. a charter school?
 - Where specifically are students that choose a school other than their neighborhood school going?
 - How many students are choosing to go out of district? Which districts are they choosing?
- Typical/average distance or time a parent/student will commute for choice
- Fickle factor, i.e., the number of times a student changes schools
- Best practices for adjusting boundaries.

She noted that some of the "soft data" and correlations members would like to analyze is not readily available data, and/or are items more suited for analysis by educators and those more familiar with analyzing educator effectiveness, performance, programming, etc. The following additional comments and concerns were noted by members regarding a more in depth capacity review and analysis:

- We should be looking at identifying potential demographic, location, and/or proximity drivers of choice. If we can't identify any of these items as drivers of choice then we hand it off to DAC. If the causation factor is not demographic related, I don't think that's our area.

- Be aware of changes in privacy laws if we want to look at test and performance scores. May just want to educate ourselves on what's available/will be available.
- This is bigger issue than LRPC and Planning. Programming and financial expertise come into play and is needed for cohesive solutions and recommendations.

The following additional comments and concerns were noted by members specifically regarding a review and analysis of the possibility and potential effectiveness of boundary changes to balance enrollment:

- Perhaps look at what JeffCo and DPS have done since these are similar Districts.
- Remember that even though we're a choice district, boundaries do matter. Many families are not familiar with the choice concept and by default attend their neighborhood school and it determines availability of bussing services.
- It's been so long since we've redrawn boundaries that we've created strange situation where some schools can't support that areas enrollment, there is no connectivity, or we're bussing kids longer distances than necessary.
- In trying to balance enrollment I think first thing that needs to be looked at is boundaries. Think despite choice a lot of people still assume that just go to neighborhood school.
- Verify whether or not student population coming from multi-family housing is more transient than those coming from single family housing. This should perhaps be a data point used if we reboundary
- Other criteria or objectives that could be considered in a reboundary effort (along with balancing enrollment) are:
 - Pedestrian connectivity-can students safely walk or ride a bike to their assigned neighborhood school?
 - Keeping subdivisions and/or planned developments intact, i.e. not splitting cohesive neighborhoods between different schools
 - Decreased commute times and/or District transportation costs
- A reboundary is not an instant fix. It's a slow acting, long term solution. Just keep that in mind that it's not an instant fix.
- Remember that we're trying to address low enrollment/utilization as well as over utilization
- Should identify the low hanging fruit, i.e., the easy reboundary opportunities and start with those areas.
- Maintaining certain enrollment at high schools is important for athletics and athletics serves as an important revenue generator for some schools

Planning Manager Shavon Caldwell reviewed a variety of datasets with members that could serve as a starting point in analyzing and identifying opportunities for potential boundary changes. Datasets included the current number of eligible students per attendance area, the number of seats available or short at each school (if all students residing in that attendance area attended their neighborhood school), and the utilization rate at each facility if that scenario were to occur. The scenarios showed eliminated all choice and did not account for the presence of charter schools. Additional data that was requested by members included:

- Addition of current enrollment and current, actual facility utilization to spreadsheet
- A breakdown of the special programming available at each school and a brief narrative/description of that programming
- An estimate of the number of charter school 8th graders that are matriculating into DCSD high schools vs. those that choose non-DCSD high school options
 - Specifically an estimate of how many 8th grade charter school students are matriculating to Chaparral HS

Planning Manager Shavon Caldwell agreed to provide this data as soon as possible.

LRPC Chair Brad Geiger then requested input from members on a potential timeline to perform this analysis and be prepared to present to the Board of Education. Members provided the following input:

- This is a massive effort. I think this is opening Pandora's box; we're unsure of the timeline until we start looking at the data and a potential process.
- An October deliverable and BoE presentation may be possible but we could definitely need more time than that depending on how things progress over the summer
- The Planning department begins working almost full time on enrollment projections in October. The majority of the analysis done by staff would need to be done over the summer months.
- I think we have a good idea of what types of recommendations should be made; the difficult part will be analyzing the data to confirm we're right and that it's not anecdotal evidence
- The scope of this seems so large... can we figure out how to narrow down somehow? Maybe it's a phased or rolling concept. Need to figure out how to narrow our focus down to something manageable.

- It seems as though we're definitely missing some institutional knowledge on this. It's like it's a muscle that we haven't used in awhile. Maybe we start with a few small adjustments and they begin to become easier as we go through the process a couple times. Maybe just look at schools that need it for right now?
- The format and message of this presentation to the Board is flexible. It could be one or a combination of any of the following:
 - A simple presentation of data and what we think that data is telling us
 - Request for direction from Board of Education on what type of capacity relief options they would like the committee to further analyze and/or pursue
 - A scope of work and recommendation to submit an RFP or RFQ for this analysis
- Need to be very direct and clear with our information and be very clear that we are not proposing any action right now. Adhere to LRPC concept that our job is to present data in an intelligible format and draw very direct correlations or conclusions.

Planning Manager Shavon Caldwell agreed to find a time to meet with the capacity subcommittee in May to begin drafting a scope of work and identify needed datasets and analysis. Members agreed that this topic could be revisited at the August meeting after the review and publishing of the Master Capital Plan.

2017 Summer Meeting Schedule

There will be no meeting in July.

Other

Chris Williams volunteered to serve on the Charter Application Review Team. Planning staff will coordinate his involvement in the process and ensure he gets all the information needed on the process from the Office of Choice Programming. Joyce Mirenzi also volunteered to serve as a CART representative in the case that Chris Williams was unable to do so. Laura Jensen volunteered to serve as the FOC liaison during member Katie Knisley's current leave of absence.

Board of Education Capital Update:

None.

Adjourn

Meeting adjourned at 8:15 pm.