

Modified Salem #2 Proposal

This proposal concerns the disposition of students from Salem only. All other aspects of the Salem #2 proposal stay the same. The goal of this proposal is to eliminate the necessity of relocating 95 students from Sayre. This goal can be accomplished by the following.

1. Extend the Sayre boundary to include the NE corner of the Salem eastern boundary down to 7 Mile and Tower road.
2. Extend the Bartlett boundary between Sayre and Brummer boundaries through the open land to the west of Dixboro road to connect with the area referred to as Salem central Boundary. District to Bartlett the Salem central boundary and the remaining portion of Salem eastern boundary not going to Sayre
3. District the Salem western boundary to Brummer.
4. The east/central/west boundary lines may need to be adjusted somewhat.

Reasons to consider this proposal:

- It reduces the total number of students impacted from 429 to 334. 95 fewer students are moved which is a reduction of 22%. The only students being redistricted are the 262 from Salem and the 72 from Hardy.
- Salem students are divided into 3 relatively even sized groups. Each school receiving students from Salem will have less than 25% new students. In the Salem Model #2 option the new student ratios vary from 18% to 35%.
- In Salem Model #2 Sayre will lose 21% of its existing students and have 35% new students. While this change is not as extreme as the one proposed for Kent Lake in the Dolsen #1 model which everyone seemed to feel was unacceptable, this is a very significant change for the school to have to adjust to.
- It is our belief that new students will do better in a building whose learning culture and family support system is as intact as possible. Teachers can be more supportive of new students when they have fewer of them and they have established relationships with families to rely upon.

Other points to consider:

This plan does not technically create an island but it is outside the desired parameters for redistricting. It does not however set any precedents. At this time there are other districting anomalies that exist which are also outside of the desired parameters. They include the island in the Millennium district and the pocket at the Western edge of Hardy's boundary that closely resembles an island. The High School and Middle School boundary lines pass through unoccupied territory in many places. Although this proposal is not ideal, is not worse than other choices that have been made in the past.

A concern has previously been expressed relating to travel time. In three separate tests, one in the morning and two in the afternoon the increase in time for Bartlett over Sayre ranged from 2 minutes and 10 seconds to 2 minutes and 40 seconds.

In summary:

This proposal reduces the number of students being redistricted to the minimum possible.

The drive time difference between Sayre and Bartlett has been shown to be less than 3 minutes under normal travel conditions.

The boundary changes proposed do not go beyond that which currently exists in the district.

This model provides for socio-economic equity, and leaves room for growth at each school.

Transportation costs should not be different between this model and Salem Model #2.

Given that one of our guiding principles is to make as few boundary changes as possible, and our guiding principles do not speak to avoiding islands or other districting anomalies, this proposal should be considered by the committee.

Original Dolsen Option

	Classrooms Available	# Currently in use	% of Classrooms in Use	Proposed # of Classrooms	Proposed % of Classrooms in Use	Current Student Count	Current Average Class Size	Target Student Count	Proposed Student Count	Variance with Target Class Size	Proposed Average Class Size	Increase/Decrease in Student Count	# of Students Out	# of Students In
Bartlett	17	11	65%	15	88%	273	24.8	391	398	7	26.5	125		125
Brummer	20	15	75%	17	85%	349	23.3	443	442	(1)	26.0	93	41	134
Dolsen	17	12	71%			275	22.9					(275)	275	
Hardy	20	19	95%	17	85%	518	27.3	443	426	(17)	25.1	(92)	152	60
Kent Lake	20	19	95%	17	85%	489	25.7	443	445	2	26.2	(44)	259	215
Salem	17	11	65%	14	82%	262	23.8	364	368	4	26.3	106		106
Sayre	22	17	77%	20	91%	439	25.8	521	526	5	26.3	87	65	152
Classrooms in District	133	104	78%	100	86%			2605	2605					
Classrooms in District after School Closing	116											Impact #	792	792

Original Salem Option

	Classrooms Available	# Currently in use	% of Classrooms in Use	Proposed # of Classrooms	Proposed % of Classrooms in Use	Current Student Count	Current Average Class Size	Target Student Count	Proposed Student Count	Variance with Target Class Size	Proposed Average Class Size	Increase/Decrease in Student Count	# of Students Out	# of Students In
Bartlett	17	11	65%	15	88%	273	24.8	391	368	(23)	24.5	95		95
Brummer	20	15	75%	17	85%	349	23.3	443	435	(8)	25.6	86		86
Dolsen	17	12	71%	14	82%	275	22.9	364	362	(2)	25.9	87		87
Hardy	20	19	95%	17	85%	518	27.3	443	453	10	26.6	(65)	131	66
Kent Lake	20	19	95%	17	85%	489	25.7	443	459	16	27.0	(30)	30	
Salem	17	11	65%			262	23.8					(262)	262	
Sayre	22	17	77%	20	91%	439	25.8	521	528	7	26.4	89	95	184
Classrooms in District	133	104	78%	100	86%			2605	2605					
Classrooms in District after School Closing	116											Impact #	518	518

SUMMARY

Option			Impacted Students	Students from School Closed	Students Moved from Other Schools									
Original Dolsen Option			792	275	517									
Original Salem Option			518	262	256									
Salem Model #2			429	262	167									
Modified Salem Blended Option			334	262	72									