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GRADE LEVEL CONFIGURATION
STUDY COMMITTEE GOAL

To research grade level configurations, identify models that provide efficient service delivery which enhance student achievement and recommend a grade level configuration to the Finance Committee, Student Achievement Committee, and the Board that meets our needs for the next ten to fifteen years.
Analytical Approach

The analytical approach used for this facility study involves data collection, sampling, and the employment of a decision making model that identifies the problem/s, defines the problem/s, lists alternatives with pros and cons, and offers one or more recommendations to the school board.

Review of Data

The Grade Level Configuration Study Committee reviewed data from the 2011-12 Facility Study Committee and other research documents all with 24/7 access via Dropbox and email. The Committee met for two months and worked many hours considering data, District curricular and facility needs, and grade configuration alternatives in preparation for making its report to the Finance Committee, the Student Achievement Committee, and subsequently to the Board.
# Grade Level Configuration Study Committee Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>School/Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phil Alm</td>
<td>District - Maintenance/Transportation Supervisor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Baird-Barnes</td>
<td>Psychologist - PJ Jacobs/SPASH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Banks</td>
<td>Parent - Roosevelt Elementary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim Basala</td>
<td>Parent - Jr. High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca Bevers</td>
<td>Parent - Roosevelt Elementary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawn Brandt</td>
<td>Parent - McDill Elementary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Coffman</td>
<td>Principal - Plover Whiting Elementary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heather Cramer</td>
<td>4K Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendy Fix</td>
<td>Parent - Jr. High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joyce Fuehrer-Mancl</td>
<td>Parent - Jr. High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca Gaboda</td>
<td>2nd Grade Teacher - McKinley Elementary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob Greenwood</td>
<td>Principal - Roosevelt Elementary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Gundersen</td>
<td>Parent - Washington Elementary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Hopp</td>
<td>Parent &amp; 6th Grade Teacher - McKinley Elementary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelly Johnson</td>
<td>6th Grade Teacher - Bannach Elementary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kay King</td>
<td>Parent - Kennedy Elementary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerry Klismith</td>
<td>Parent - Jr. High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karlyn Krautkramer</td>
<td>District - Admin Asst to Director of Business Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Lass</td>
<td>Tech Ed Teacher - PJ Jacobs Jr. High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Leahy</td>
<td>Math Teacher - PJ Jacobs Jr. High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Jo Lechner</td>
<td>District - Director of Elementary Education, Co-Chair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt McHugh</td>
<td>Student - Ben Franklin Jr. High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Mlsna</td>
<td>Science Teacher - PJ Jacobs Jr. High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connie Negaard</td>
<td>Principal - Ben Franklin Jr. High, Co-Chair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dick Okray</td>
<td>Citizen At Large</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Owens</td>
<td>District - Director of Business Services, Co-Chair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maggie Pozorski</td>
<td>Student - PJ Jacobs Jr. High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jill Pritzl</td>
<td>Special Education Teacher - Ben Franklin Jr. High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Ries</td>
<td>Counselor - Ben Franklin Jr. High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry Rothmann</td>
<td>Citizen At Large</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Schultz</td>
<td>Madison Elementary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Strasman</td>
<td>Assistant Principal - PJ Jacobs Jr. High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Steinweber</td>
<td>Parent - Plover Whiting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Tepp</td>
<td>Math Teacher - Ben Franklin Jr. High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon Vollendorf</td>
<td>Director of Secondary Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Wietrzykowski</td>
<td>6th Grade Teacher - Bannach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Young</td>
<td>Parent - Jr. High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deb Zaske</td>
<td>Parent - McKinley Elementary &amp; Jr. High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
General Comments by the
Grade Level Configuration Study Committee

The Grade Level Configuration Study Committee (Committee) reviewed the 2011-12 Facility Study Committee Final Report to better understand current District enrollment trends, facility capacities, needs of special programs, and to better understand various facility issues requiring attention.

It must be understood that while this Committee focused its efforts on grade alignment, the Committee recommends that the remodeling and other improvements identified in the 2011-12 Facility Study Committee Final Report be incorporated.

The Committee concurs that enrollment growth over the next five to ten years will be slow to moderate. However, several elementary schools are already at or are exceeding working capacity and population growth in the southern portion of the District is outpacing growth elsewhere in the district.

Other notable problem facility space issues include bathrooms, dining facilities, gym space, weight rooms, and special education needs, as well as safety issues involving pick-up and drop-off of students, control and observation of who enters or leaves a school building, obsolescence of surveillance equipment and the need for more video surveillance coverage. Furthermore, technology over the next five to ten years is a challenge. Obsolete technology needs to be replaced with new technology. Innovations in e-texts will likely replace hard copy books and require widespread use of tablets in the next five years.

The Committee estimates that removing one grade level from all current elementary schools would open up about 510 spaces making enrollment space available in each elementary facility for several years to come. The Committee searched for a grade level configuration solution that enhances student achievement while maintaining or improving efficiency of instruction and facility operations.
Grade Level Configuration Study Committee

Grade Level Configuration Matrix

Shown below is the Grade Level Configuration Matrix used by the Committee. It contains all of the mathematical combinations of grade level configurations possible. These combinations can be replicated in several instances. It is possible to have one grade level in multiple schools or multiple schools with multiple grade levels.

Many hours of discussion and debate unfolded as Committee participants weighed various alternatives. Ultimately, from all of the many possibilities, only one combination of grade alignment will prevail.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level Configuration Matrix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K - 1 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K - 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K - 3 6 7 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K - 4 9 10 11 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K - 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K - 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K - 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K - 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K - 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K - 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K - 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K - 12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Grade Level Configuration Study Committee (committee) agrees with the 2012 Facility Study Committee Final Report that the District’s elementary schools are at or nearing capacity. This condition limits the educational opportunities for students.

The challenge for the Grade Level Configuration Study Committee is to identify and recommend a PK-12 grade level configuration for the next ten to fifteen years that delivers a world-class education. Such a configuration needs to address student’s academic, emotional, social, and developmental needs. Public acceptance of and ability to fund a grade level configuration must also be addressed.

Adopted by Committee: January 15, 2013
DEFINITION OF THE PROBLEM
Grade Level Configuration Study Committee

The Grade Level Configuration Study Committee determined that a significant District challenge is to configure grade levels in a manner that will address students’ academic, emotional, social, and developmental needs. This configuration is intended to resolve the District’s facility space issues that are projected to continue for the next ten to fifteen years. Enrollment numbers alone are not the cause of the District’s current space dilemma. Expansions of federal and state mandated programs contribute equally, if not more, to the District’s situation.

Research is inconclusive on prescribing an optimum grade configuration. Studies indicate that alterations in grade level configuration are typically compelled by a lack of facility space and/or by financial considerations. This Committee seeks a grade level configuration that relieves the District’s space problems and does the following:

- Provides more space in elementary schools without shifting the space problem to the secondary level
- Incorporates research based instructional practices including technology
- Provides additional educational opportunities
- Addresses sports programs and extra-curricular activities
- Recognizes issues such as safety, security, staffing, transportation, public perception, and funding
- Recognizes non-classroom facility issues in current cafeterias, gymnasiums, bathrooms, special education spaces, food prep areas, and content appropriate spaces.

Adopted by Committee: January 22, 2012
The Grade Level Configuration Study Committee recommends that the following two grade level configurations be considered as the primary viable options to use in resolving our facility space issues for the next ten to fifteen years.

They are not prioritized. It is the Committee’s opinion that circumstances and cost of construction at the time of final evaluation will dictate the more appropriate course of action. The two configurations are as follows:

- Move 9th grade to SPASH (expansion to SPASH); 6th grade to Ben Franklin and PJ Jacobs
- Configure district with K-3 Schools; 4-6 Schools; no change to Jr. Highs, SPASH, or Kennedy

The Grade Level Configuration Study Committee concurred with the findings of the 2012 Final Report of the Facility Study Committee where it called for additions and remodeling at various schools, addressing security issues, and improving technology.
Grade Level Configuration Study Committee Recommendations Detail

- **Move 9th grade to SPASH (expansion to SPASH); 6th grade to Ben Franklin and PJ Jacobs**

This configuration puts grades 9 through 12 in SPASH. In order to accomplish this configuration, additions to provide more classroom space and remodeling to core facilities such as bathrooms, dining areas and food preparation areas must be addressed. Several of these needs have already been identified in the 2012 Final Report of the Facility Study Committee.

This configuration puts all students earning high school credit for graduation in one facility, provides greater academic opportunities, and increases co-curricular and extra-curricular opportunities.

There will be increased pressure for gym and field space. Additions will be needed to address this problem.

It is recommended that grades 9 and 10 be closed campus and configured within SPASH as 9-10 groupings and 11-12 groupings, almost as separate campuses to the extent possible.
Grade Level Configuration Study Committee
Recommendations
Pros and Cons

9. Move 9th grade to SPASH (expansion to SPASH); 6th grade to Ben Franklin and PJ Jacobs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Con</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Academic options</td>
<td>• Big building / large space / large enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Smooth transition for sports</td>
<td>• Funds needed for additions &amp; remodeling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Remodeling specific areas</td>
<td>• Staffing certifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Staffing-pupil services</td>
<td>• Increased competition for classroom, field, and gym space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Center / campus idea</td>
<td>• Staffing pupil services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Transportation</td>
<td>• Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Change in structure / philosophy—JH to MS concept</td>
<td>• Change in structure / philosophy—JH to MS concept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Age appropriate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increased Co-curricular and Extra-curricular opportunities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Recommend grades 9 and 10 be closed campus.
Grade Level Configuration Study Committee
Recommendations Detail

- Configure district with K-3 Schools; 4-6 Schools; no change to Jr. Highs, SPASH, or Kennedy

This creative configuration is aimed at grouping children developmentally and provides unique opportunities. In this model a certain number of elementary schools would house only grades K-3, while the remaining elementary schools would house grades 4-6. Enrollment pressure is reduced by constructing additions as needed onto buildings in each of the two groupings. This approach is especially helpful in addressing “bubbles” in a given grade level enrollment. If at the time of final consideration Jackson Elementary is available, it could be included in the mix.

Greater teacher collaboration is expected along with more remediation and enrichment opportunities.
Grade Level Configuration Study Committee
Recommendations
Pros and Cons

15. Configure district with K-3 Schools; 4-6 Schools; no change to Jr. Highs, SPASH, or Kennedy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Con</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Each grade level is more concentrated</td>
<td>• Remodel / restructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Addresses the bubble</td>
<td>• More transitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Less travel for teachers (specialties)</td>
<td>• Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Allows teachers to specialize</td>
<td>• Multiple buildings may affect family schedules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More collaboration for students &amp; staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More remediation/enrichment opportunities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Library resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Special resources - MAPES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Age appropriate grouping</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Not Prioritized*

Note: The District did see a savings from closing Jackson. Board implied that if enrollment and student needs change, then opening Jackson would be a possibility.

Note: Added space needed to accomplish configuration could be achieved with additions to schools, or opening Jackson if available/feasible.
Grade Level Configuration
Study Committee

All Configurations
Considered
with
Pros & Cons
Grade Level Configuration Study Committee
Identified Alternatives/Solutions—Listing

1. Realign grades – (K-5) (6-7) (8-9) – Middle School & Jr. High
2. Redistrict – realign all elementary boundary lines
3. Open Jackson Elementary School
4. Build a new elementary school
5. District wide kindergarten center at the Jackson site
6. Create a 6th grade middle school at the Jackson site
7. Create a 6th grade middle school at a new site
8. Create a 6-7 middle school at Jackson site and a 6-7 middle school at a new construction site
9. Move 9th grade to SPASH (expansion to SPASH); 6th grade to Ben Franklin and PJ Jacobs
10. Two Kindergarten Schools (north and south); Grades 1-6 at seven other schools (open Jackson, Kennedy stays K-6)
11. Implement year-round school or trimester schedule
12. K-5 at elementary schools; 6-8 at the Jr. High’s; 9-12 at SPASH; 9-12 new Plover school
13. Three K-1 Schools; Three 2-3 Schools; Three 4-5 Schools; One 6-7 School; One 8-9 School; One 10-12 School; open Jackson; no change to Kennedy
15. Configure district with K-3 Schools; 4-6 Schools; no change to Jr. Highs, SPASH, or Kennedy
16. Addition to Plover-Whiting and Bannach, and redistrict
17. Make one Jr. High grades 5-6; one Jr. High grades 7-8; move 9th grade to SPASH (add on to building); open Jackson as elementary school
Pros and Cons of Alternatives

1. Realign grades - (K-5) (6-7) (8-9) – Middle School & Jr. High

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Pro</strong></th>
<th><strong>Con</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Staffing – sharing Jr. High &amp; Sr. High across buildings</td>
<td>- Moves the space problem to the MS/JH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Allows 6th grade teachers to teach to their strength</td>
<td>- Increases the distance for Jr. High students taking classes at SPASH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Relieves pressure in the elementary schools</td>
<td>- Additional transition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Increase co-curricular and academic opportunities for 6th graders</td>
<td>- Referendum needed for renovations and additions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- No new buildings needed</td>
<td>- Licensing certification issues 1-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Address facility needs with additions</td>
<td>- Gymnasium space (7th grade basketball = 8 teams)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Transportation likely not a problem</td>
<td>- Must also address-Special education, Specialized programming, Cafeteria needs, Collaboration, and Sports/extra-curricular activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Current instructional practices must change</td>
<td>- Current instructional practices must change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 6-7 staffing mobility</td>
<td>- Transportation with sports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Transportation with sports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Licensing certification issues 1-8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Not Prioritized**
Pros and Cons of Alternatives

2. Redistrict – Realign all elementary boundary lines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Con</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• May be the cheapest option</td>
<td>• A. Temporary fix – doesn’t solve the problem long term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Local neighborhood schools</td>
<td>• B. Could expand the problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Could correct some boundary line issues</td>
<td>• C. Greater disruption for families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Might reduce transportation costs /</td>
<td>• D. Doesn’t deal with structural needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>issues</td>
<td>• E. Does not make full use of assets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Minimal change in staffing</td>
<td>• F. 6th grade remains at elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 6th grade remains at elementary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Pros and Cons of Alternatives

### 3. Open Jackson Elementary School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Con</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Viewed as a logical solution by the public</td>
<td>- A. Jackson may be used for other purposes – professional development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Would solve the problem with redistricting</td>
<td>- B. Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- May be less costly than some other options</td>
<td>- C. Extensive renovations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 6th grade still in elementary schools</td>
<td>- D. Refurnish the building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- No new building needed</td>
<td>- E. Two referendums needed – capital and operating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Limited staffing issues</td>
<td>- F. Not located where the population problems exist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Transportation</td>
<td>- G. 6th grade still in elementary schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Eliminate capacity issues</td>
<td>- H. Limited staffing issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Beautiful site / green space</td>
<td>- I. Transportation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The District did see a savings from closing Jackson. Board implied that if enrollment and student needs change, then reopening Jackson would be a possibility.
### Pros and Cons of Alternatives

#### 4. Build a new elementary school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Con</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Mid to Long term solution to overcrowding</td>
<td>• Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Integrate technology</td>
<td>• Requires referendum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Opportunity to build a “green energy” efficient school</td>
<td>• More opportunity for students in classes, extracurricular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Could be located where the population is highest and growing</td>
<td>• We have a vacant school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Already have land</td>
<td>• Proximity to Plover Whiting and McDill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Staff issues limited</td>
<td>• Staff issues limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• New building</td>
<td>• Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Transportation</td>
<td>• 6th grade remains at elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 6th grade remains at elementary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Not Prioritized*
5. District-wide kindergarten center at the Jackson site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Pro</strong></th>
<th><strong>Con</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Great for early intervention of academic needs</td>
<td>• Age appropriate length of bus time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Special needs targeted at one specific school</td>
<td>• No role models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fix elementary space issue</td>
<td>• Hundreds of kids &amp; snowpants/shoes/potty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A lot of space to play</td>
<td>• Not constructed for building to be all kindergarten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Low traffic</td>
<td>• Update and upgrade costs and additions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Collaboration</td>
<td>• Staff relocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 4K to K transition</td>
<td>• Families split</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Staff relocation</td>
<td>• Kindergarten rooms at current schools will need to be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Early childhood / special education included together</td>
<td>redesigned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Parent drop off and pick up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Close to active train tracks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• K to grade 1 transition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Kennedy Elementary could continue as a K-6 building thus reducing travel time for those kindergarten students.
### Pros and Cons of Alternatives

6. **Create a 6\textsuperscript{th} grade middle school at the Jackson site**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Con</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Strong social bonds amongst students</td>
<td>• Building too small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Strong academic interventions (RTI)</td>
<td>• Additional transitions for students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Strong academic program</td>
<td>• Split friendships and positive social situations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Building exists</td>
<td>• Transportation may be too far for some students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Large property</td>
<td>• Building may be used as a professional development center instead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Alleviate space problem at elementary</td>
<td>• 6\textsuperscript{th} grade resources limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• New academic structure</td>
<td>• Remodeling required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 6\textsuperscript{th} grade teachers can specialize</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• OK with transporting 6\textsuperscript{th} graders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Not Prioritized**
### Pros and Cons of Alternatives

#### 7. Create a 6th grade middle school at new construction site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Pro</strong></th>
<th><strong>Con</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enables the building to be tailored to meet needs of 6th graders</td>
<td>Have an empty school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great for intervention of academic needs</td>
<td>Transition to Jr. High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special needs targeted</td>
<td>Transportation costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addresses space needs at elementary schools</td>
<td>Resources limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Jr. High additions (classrooms)</td>
<td>Cost of construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New building / technology advanced</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotate teachers to their strengths</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age appropriate electives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible for future growth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District owns property</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Not Prioritized*
Pros and Cons of Alternatives

8. Create a 6-7 middle school at Jackson site and a 6-7 middle school at a new construction site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Con</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Takes care of the bubble</td>
<td>• Cost of construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Takes care of enrollment issues for a long period of time</td>
<td>• Another transition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Age appropriate grouping</td>
<td>• Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Uses existing facility</td>
<td>• Staff/staff support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Keeps sport alignment / traditions</td>
<td>• Referendum needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More field space for athletics</td>
<td>• Limits academic options for 7th graders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Both sites would be up-to-date / modern</td>
<td>• Jr. Highs might be under-utilized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 6th graders would have more options</td>
<td>• Two buildings = higher operating costs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not Prioritized
### Pros and Cons of Alternatives

9. **Move 9th grade to SPASH (expansion to SPASH); 6th grade to Ben Franklin and PJ Jacobs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Con</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Academic options</td>
<td>• Big building / large space / large enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Smooth transition for sports</td>
<td>• Funds needed for additions &amp; remodeling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Remodeling specific areas</td>
<td>• Staffing certifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Staffing-pupil services</td>
<td>• Increased competition for classroom, field, and gym space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Center / campus idea</td>
<td>• Staffing pupil services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Transportation</td>
<td>• Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Change in structure / philosophy—JH to MS concept</td>
<td>• Change in structure / philosophy—JH to MS concept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Age appropriate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increased Co-curricular and Extra-curricular opportunities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Recommend grades 9 and 10 be closed campus.
Pros and Cons of Alternatives

10. Two Kindergarten Schools (north/south); Grades 1-6 at seven other schools (open Jackson, Kennedy stays K-6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Con</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Redistricting</td>
<td>• Redistricting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Kindergarten resources in one school</td>
<td>• Lack of interaction with older students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Early Childhood Special Education could be housed there.</td>
<td>• Kindergarten at Kennedy would be perceived as isolated (limits student opportunities)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Easier transition between 4K &amp; 5K</td>
<td>• Too many transitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develop appropriate instruction (PBIS)</td>
<td>• Separation of siblings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Limited remodeling - cheaper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Specialty schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Room for some 4K students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The District did see a savings from closing Jackson. Board implied that if enrollment and student needs change, then reopening Jackson would be a possibility.
Pros and Cons of Alternatives

11. Implement year-round school or trimester schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Con</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• More short breaks</td>
<td>• Depending on model, may not solve space problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increased student retention by eliminating 3 month break</td>
<td>• Alters family vacation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 2/3 students in building at one time</td>
<td>• Alters summer sports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Impacts community organizations &amp; extracurricular activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Modify HVAC systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ends UWSP &amp; school schedule alignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lose summer school and enrichment program depletes opportunities to kids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Affects 16+ yr olds summer jobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Transportation cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Requires restructure of remediation, enrichment programs (Great Escape, YMCA camp)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Loss of revenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Operating cost</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Pros and Cons of Alternatives

12. K-5 at elementary schools; 6-8 at Jr. Highs; 9-12 at SPASH; 9-12 new Plover school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Pro</strong></th>
<th><strong>Con</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| - All 4 high school grades together (9-12 programs at same site)  
- Grade configuration consistent with credits and extracurricular activities  
- Extra space at SPASH and elementary schools  
- More participation in sports & other activities  
- 2 middle schools are more developmentally age appropriate | - Cost  
- Extra/unused space at SPASH  
- Schools should be similar in size  
- Staff and staff travel  
- One school versus other school rivalry  
- Empty school available  
- District owned lot isn’t big enough |

**Not Prioritized**
Pros and Cons of Alternatives

13. Three K-1 Schools; Three 2-3 Schools; Three 4-5 Schools; One 6-7 School; One 8-9 School; One 10-12 School; open Jackson; no change to Kennedy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Con</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Curriculum more consistent</td>
<td>Transportation start and end times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. More teacher collaboration</td>
<td>Too many transitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Enhanced academic, extracurricular options for 6th graders</td>
<td>Jr. Highs overcrowded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Better remediation</td>
<td>Kennedy alone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(opportunities limited?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost to reopen Jackson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No neighborhood schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family concerns/siblings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The District did see a savings from closing Jackson. Board implied that if enrollment and student needs change, then reopening Jackson would be a possibility.
### Pros and Cons of Alternatives

14. Three Jr. High’s – grades 6-9 (new site for 3<sup>rd</sup> Jr. High)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Pro</strong></th>
<th><strong>Con</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• 6&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; grade moved out of elementary</td>
<td>• Cost of new staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Vacant land available to build</td>
<td>• Share too many resources (athletics)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 710 students per school (smaller)</td>
<td>• Grade 6-9 age group too big</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More opportunities (leadership)</td>
<td>• Teachers will travel too much (no ownership and less available to students)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sports &amp; clubs</td>
<td>• Developmentally ready?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Developmentally ready</td>
<td>• Reduced academic opportunities (further divides students into smaller groups)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic Opportunities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Facilities up-to-date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Jackson – 3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; Jr. High (pro &amp; con)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pros and Cons of Alternatives

15. Configure district with K-3 Schools; 4-6 Schools; no change to Jr. Highs, SPASH, or Kennedy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Con</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Each grade level is more concentrated</td>
<td>• Remodel / restructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Addresses the bubble</td>
<td>• More transitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Less travel for teachers (specialties)</td>
<td>• Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Allows teachers to specialize</td>
<td>• Multiple buildings may affect family schedules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More collaboration for students &amp; staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More remediation/ enrichment opportunities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Library resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Special resources - MAPES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Age appropriate grouping</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The District did see a savings from closing Jackson. Board implied that if enrollment and student needs change, then reopening Jackson would be a possibility.

Note: Added space needed to accomplish configuration and could be achieved with additions to schools, or opening Jackson if available/feasible.
## Pros and Cons of Alternatives

### 16. Addition to Plover Whiting and Bannach, and redistrict

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Con</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• May be cheaper than other options</td>
<td>• May not provide enough space with adding on to only two schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• May be more efficient bus routes (less time on bus)</td>
<td>• Potential short-term fix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Neighborhood schools with redistricting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Solves the problem where it exists</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Not Prioritized**
Pros and Cons of Alternatives

17. Make one Jr. High grades 5-6; one Jr. High grades 7-8; move 9th grade to SPASH (add on to building); open Jackson as an elementary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Con</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• 9-12 building – better fit for kids</td>
<td>• Cost to add on to both Jr. Highs and SPASH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Curriculum better aligned</td>
<td>• Too many transitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sports better aligned</td>
<td>• Transportation cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 4K would fit in elementary</td>
<td>• Moves bubble</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The District did see a savings from closing Jackson. Board implied that if enrollment and student needs change, then reopening Jackson would be a possibility.
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and
Agendas
GRADE LEVEL CONFIGURATION
STUDY COMMITTEE
GROUND RULES

I. Attendance/Promptness
   A. Members agree to be prompt and make every attempt to attend meetings.
   B. Minutes, agendas and information will be emailed to members prior to each meeting.
      Those absent will receive information as well.
   C. Anyone who will be absent should call Karlyn Krautkramer at 345-5432 or email.
   D. Breaks will be taken as needed during the course of the meeting.
   E. Meetings are scheduled for two hours and committee members agree to stay on task
      and work to accomplish business within that time frame.

II. Conversational Courtesies
   A. Members agree to respect the opinions of others and not take anything personally.
   B. Members agree that at times they may disagree with others, but will remain
      considerate.
   C. Members agree to talk openly and be creative in their thinking.

III. Participation and Commitment (within and without)
   A. These meetings are open discourse and members are free to talk to others outside
      the meeting about discussions. Some ideas considered by the group that are
      exploratory or come from brainstorming sessions may cause confusion or concern in
      the community when taken out of context, so discretion should be used when
      sharing or trying to explain such ideas.
   B. Members agree to support other group members in accomplishing the goal of the
      committee and agree to be respectful of others opinions.
   C. Members agree to support decisions arrived at as a group.

IV. Decision Process
   A. Members agree to strive for consensus, but agree to accept and support a 2/3rds-
      majority vote on matters of impasse.
   B. Members agree that minority comments on issues will be provided if requested by
      dissenting members.
AGENDA

1. Call to Order
2. Roll Call
3. Introductions
4. Explain Goal of Grade Level Configuration Study Committee
5. Explain Ground Rules
6. Explain Facilitator’s Role
   a. Discuss Community Member or Parent as Co-Committee Chair
   b. Appoint Committee Recorder (Karlyn Krautkramer)
   c. Explain Analytical Approach and Adherence to Decision-Making Model
7. Begin Review of Data
   a. Review 2011-12 Facility Study Committee Final Report
   b. Review Grade Level Configuration Research Data
   c. Discuss initial draft of Identification of the Problem
   d. Break into Work Groups
      i. Discuss and Revise ID of Problem draft if needed – Flip Charts
8. Committee of the Whole - Share Work Groups Thoughts
   a. Show Group Ideas on Flip Charts
   b. Agree on Identification of the Problem Draft Ideas
9. Your concerns
10. Next meeting date:
    January 15, 2013
    Board Room, Bliss ESC
    5:00 p.m.
11. Adjourn
AGENDA

1. Call to Order
2. Roll Call
3. Review Committee Goal & Ground Rules
4. Approve Last Meeting Minutes
5. Review Analytical Approach and Adherence to Problem Solving Model
6. Consider, Revise, and Approve Identification of the Problem – Final Draft
7. Discuss and Review Data
8. Begin/Continue Statement for Definition of the Problem
   a. Break Into Work Groups – Create Bullet Points Describing Definition of the Problem
      i. Base Thoughts on Goal
      ii. Infuse Ideas from Identification of the Problem
      iii. Consider New Ideas
9. Committee of the Whole Reconvene - Share Work Group Thoughts
   a. Show Group Ideas on Flip Charts
   b. Agree on Definition of the Problem Draft Ideas
10. Begin Brainstorming Alternatives if Time Allows
11. Your concerns
12. Next meeting date:
    January 22, 2013
    Professional Development Center, Bliss ESC
    5:00 p.m.
13. Adjourn
Grade Level Configuration Study Committee
Bliss Educational Services Center
Professional Development Center
January 22, 2013
5:00 p.m.

AGENDA

1. Call to Order
2. Roll Call
3. Approve Last Meeting Minutes
4. Consider, Revise, and Approve Definition of the Problem – Final Draft
5. Begin/Continue Brainstorming Alternatives
   a. Break Into Work Groups – Create Bullet Points on Flip Charts
      i. Describe Alternatives Without Considering Pros & Cons
6. Committee of the Whole Reconvene - Share Work Group Thoughts
   a. Consensus on Alternatives
   b. List Pros & Cons
7. Prioritize Alternatives & Select Optimum Alternative
8. Your concerns
9. Next meeting date:
    January 29, 2013
    Professional Development Center, Bliss ESC
    3:00 p.m.
10. Adjourn
AGENDA

1. Call to Order
2. Roll Call
3. Approve Last Meeting Minutes
4. Continue with Alternatives Pros & Cons Activity
5. Committee of the Whole Reconvene - Share Work Group Thoughts
   a. Consensus on Alternatives and Pros & Cons
6. Review, Revise, and Approve Recommended Grade Level Configuration Model
   a. Discussions on Recommendations to School Board
   b. Consider, Revise, and Approve Outline for Final Draft
7. Discuss Who Will Make Presentation to Finance Committee/School Board
8. Your concerns
9. Next meeting date:
   February 5, 2013
   Continue Review, Revise & Approve Grade Level Configuration Model
   5:00 p.m.
10. Adjourn
AGENDA

1. Call to Order
2. Roll Call
3. Approve Last Meeting Minutes
4. Resume Building List of Pros and Cons for Alternatives # 10-17
5. Begin Discussions to Select Top Three Alternative Solutions of # 1-17
6. Reach Consensus on Alternatives by Priority # 1-3
7. Discuss Who Will Make the Presentation to the Finance Committee, to the Student Achievement Committee, and to the School Board
8. Your concerns
9. Next meeting date:
   February 12, 2013
   Professional Development Center, Bliss ESC
   3:00 p.m.
10. Adjourn
AGENDA

1. Call to Order
2. Roll Call
3. Approval of Minutes of Last Meeting
4. Approval of Alternative Solutions 1-17 and Pros and Cons for Alternative Solutions 1-17
5. Resume Discussion and Consideration of Top Three Alternatives
6. Reach Consensus on Alternatives by Priority
7. Discuss Who Will Make the Presentation to the Finance Committee, to the Student Achievement Committee, and to the School Board
8. Begin Discussions on Recommendations to School Board (if Time Permits)
9. Your concerns
10. Next meeting date:
    
    February 19, 2013
    Approval of Final Report Document
    5:00 p.m.
11. Adjourn
AGENDA

1. Call to Order
2. Roll Call
3. Approval of Minutes of Last Meeting
4. Discussion and Revision of Final Report Document
5. Approval of Final Report Document
6. Meeting of Those Who Will Make the Presentation to the Finance Committee, to the Student Achievement Committee, and to the School Board
7. Presentation Dates:
   - March 5, 2013
     Finance and Facility Committee
     5:00 p.m.
   - March 6, 2013
     Student Achievement Committee
     5:00 p.m.
   - March 11, 2013
     School Board Meeting
     3:00 p.m.
8. Adjourn
Grade Level Configuration Committee

Minutes of Meetings
MINUTES

1. Call to Order
   Dr. Tom Owens, Director of Business Services and Committee Facilitator called the meeting to order.

2. Roll Call
   Attending committee members signed in.

3. Introductions
   Dr. Owens introduced Co-Facilitators Mary Jo Lechner, Director of Elementary Education and Connie Neggaard, Ben Franklin Jr. High Principal. Committee members introduced themselves to the group.

4. Explain Goal of Grade Level Configuration Study Committee
   The goal of this committee is to research grade level configurations and identify models that provide efficient service delivery to enhance student achievement and recommend a grade level configuration that would meet our needs for the next 10-15 years to the Finance Committee, Student Achievement Committee, and the School Board.

5. Explain Ground Rules
   Dr. Owens reviewed committee ground rules which included attendance, conversational courtesy, participation and commitment, and decision process.

6. Explain Facilitator's Role
   a. Discuss Community Member or Parent as Co-Committee Chair
   Committee members were asked to consider acting as co-chair. This will be re-visited at a future meeting.
   b. Appoint Committee Recorder
   Karlyn Krautkramer was appointed as recorder for all GLC meetings.
   c. Explain Analytical Approach and Adherence to Decision-Making Model
   Dr. Owens explained the problem solving model the committee would be following through this process. The steps committee members will follow include identify the problem, define the problem, analysis of solutions or alternatives in the form of pros and cons, and offer recommendations to the board on how to resolve or address the issues.
7. Begin Review of Data
   a. **Review 2011-12 Facility Study Committee Final Report**
      Dr. Owens presented key points of information from the Facility Study Report.
   b. **Review Grade Level Configuration Research Data**
      Sample configurations were presented to the group.
   c. **Discuss initial draft of Identification of the Problem**
      Dr. Owens informed the committee that a draft document will be developed from the
      information collected from the committee’s work group portion of the meeting and
      presented at the next meeting
   d. **Break Into Work Groups**
      i. **Discuss and Revise ID of Problem draft if needed – Flip Charts**
         Each work group compiled a list of problems and issues with our current situation.

8. **Committee of the Whole - Share Work Group: Thoughts**
   a. **Show Group Ideas on Flip Charts**
      Each work group shared their ideas with the whole group. The following ideas/concerns
      were identified by multiple work groups.
      - Many schools are at or above capacity
      - Consider the impact and needs of students
      - Inadequate facilities/space at all grade levels – special education, cafeterias,
        gymnasiums, sensory rooms, food prep areas.
      - Safety and security issues exist at multiple schools
      - Transportation
      - Public and parent perception / buy-in
      - Best practices and procedures to match needs
      - Empty building available – Jackson
      - Staffing
      - Cost

   b. **Agree on Identification of the Problem Draft Ideas**
      Dr. Owens will develop a narrative from all of the data collected for review by the
      committee at the next meeting.

9. Your concerns
   *Interest in visiting Jackson as well as other schools was expressed by a number of committee
   members.*

10. Next meeting date:
    - January 15, 2013
    - Board Room, Bliss ESC
    - 5:00 p.m.

11. Adjourned at 7:00 pm
Minutes

1. Call to Order
   Dr. Tom Owens, Director of Business Services and GLC Committee Facilitator called the meeting to order at 5 p.m. on January 15, 2013.

2. Roll Call
   Committee members were asked to sign in.

3. Review Committee Goal & Ground Rules
   Dr. Owens reviewed the goal and rules with the committee.

4. Approve Last Meeting Minutes
   The minutes were uploaded to Dropbox for the committee to review.

   It was moved and seconded (Strasman/Rothman) to approve the minutes from the January 8, 2013 meeting as presented. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

5. Review Analytical Approach and Adherence to Problem Solving Model
   The steps of the decision-making model were reviewed with the committee.
   - Identify the problem
   - Define the problem
   - Consider Alternatives – identify pros and cons
   - Recommend/implement
   - Review & repeat process as needed

6. Consider, Revise, and Approve Identification of the Problem – Final Draft
   Dr. Owens presented a draft narrative of the Identification of the Problem. The committee reviewed and discussed changes to best reflect their view of the current situation resulting in the revised narrative below.

   The Grade Level Configuration Study Committee (committee) agrees with the 2012 Facility Study Committee Final Report that the District’s elementary schools are at or nearing capacity. This condition limits the educational opportunities for students.

   The challenge for the Grade Level Configuration Study Committee is to identify and recommend a PK-12 grade level configuration for the next ten to fifteen years that delivers a world-class education. Such a configuration needs to address student’s academic, emotional, social, and developmental needs. Public acceptance of and ability to fund a grade level configuration must also be addressed.
It was moved and seconded (Cramer/King) to adopt the revised Identification of the Problem. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

7. Discuss and Review Data
Dr. Owens reviewed the list of problems developed by the committee work groups during the first meeting as part of the identification of the problem process. The areas identified were incorporated in the development of the definition of the problem.

8. Begin/Continue Statement for Definition of the Problem
   a. *Break Into Work Groups – Create Bullet Points Describing Definition of the Problem*
      Work groups discussed and began listing thoughts and ideas to assist in defining the problem. Committee members were instructed to keep the following points in mind as they developed their list.
      - Base Thoughts on Goal
      - Infuse Ideas from Identification of the Problem
      - Consider New Ideas

9. Committee of the Whole Reconvene - Share Work Group Thoughts
   a. *Show Group Ideas on Flip Charts*
      Each group shared their ideas with the whole committee. The following ideas/concerns were identified by multiple groups:
      - Capacity / limited space
      - Public perception / awareness
      - Educational opportunities are limited
      - Non-classroom space issues (gymnasiums, cafeterias, special education, food prep, and bathroom facilities)
      - Programming mandates & initiatives – lack of space to accommodate
      - Transportation

   b. *Agree on Definition of the Problem Draft Ideas*
      Dr. Owens will develop a narrative from all of the data collected for review and adoption by the committee.

10. Begin Brainstorming Alternatives if Time Allows
    Time did not allow for this part of the process.

11. Your concerns
    Committee members shared the following thoughts and concerns.
    - Needs have changed due to mandates and initiatives, expanding programming.
    - The way we teach students has changed; things are not the way they used to be.
    - To enhance public perception and awareness, our needs should be framed in a story.
    - Public doesn’t understand what kids need to know and how teaching has changed due to technology.

12. Next meeting date:
    January 22, 2012 at 5:00 p.m.
    Professional Development Center, Bliss ESC

13. Adjourned at 7:00 p.m.
Grade Level Configuration Study Committee
Bliss Educational Services Center
Professional Development Center
January 22, 2013
5:00 p.m.

MINUTES

1. Call to Order
Mary Jo Lechner, Director of Elementary Education and Co-Facilitator welcomed the committee.

2. Roll Call
Committee members were asked to sign in.

3. Approve Last Meeting Minutes
The minutes from the January 15, 2013 meeting were uploaded to Dropbox for review by the committee.

It was moved and seconded (Last/Cramer) to approve the January 15, 2013 GLC meeting minutes as presented. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

4. Consider, Revise, and Approve Definition of the Problem – Final Draft
Connie Negaard, Principal presented a draft narrative of the Definition of the Problem. The committee reviewed and discussed changes, additions, and deletions resulting in the revised narrative below.

The Grade Level Configuration Study Committee determined that a significant District challenge is to configure grade levels in a manner that will address students' academic, emotional, social, and developmental needs. This configuration is intended to resolve the District's facility space issues that are projected to continue for the next ten to fifteen years. Enrollment numbers alone are not the cause of the District’s current space dilemma. Expansions of federal and state mandated programs contribute equally, if not more, to the District’s situation.

Research is inconclusive on prescribing an optimum grade configuration. Studies indicate that alterations in grade level configuration are typically compelled by a lack of facility space and/or by financial considerations. This Committee seeks a grade level configuration that relieves the District’s space problems and does the following:

- Provides more space in elementary schools without shifting the space problem to the secondary level
- Incorporates research based instructional practices including technology
- Provides additional educational opportunities
- Addresses sports programs and extra-curricular activities
- Recognizes issues such as safety, security, staffing, transportation, public perception, and funding
- Recognizes non-classroom facility issues in current cafeterias, gymnasiums, bathrooms, special education spaces, food prep areas, and content appropriate spaces.

It was moved and seconded (Fuehrer-Manc/Leahy) to approve and adopt the Definition of the Problem. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.
5. Begin/Continue Brainstorming Alternatives
   a. Break Into Work Groups – Create Bullet Points on Flip Charts
      i. Describe Alternatives Without Considering Pros & Cons
         Work groups brainstormed and began listing all possible alternatives other than
         those already identified by the Facility Study Committee.

6. Committee of the Whole Reconvene - Share Work Group Thoughts
   a. Consensus on Alternatives
      The committee agreed on the following list of possible alternatives which includes the
      alternatives (1-4) previously identified in the 2012 Facility Study Report.
      1) Realign Grades – (K-5) (6-7) (8-9) – Middle School & Jr. High
      2) Redistrict – Realign all elementary Boundary Lines
      3) Reopen Jackson Elementary School
      4) Build a new school
      5) District wide kindergarten center at Jackson site (with or without Kennedy)
      6) 6th Grade middle school at Jackson site
      7) 6th Grade middle school at new construction site
      8) 6-7 Middle school at Jackson site and a 6-7 Middle school at a new construction
         site
      9) Move 9th grade to SPASH (with expansion to SPASH); 6th grade to Ben Franklin
         and PJ Jacobs
      10) 2 Kindergarten centers (south and north); Grades 1-6 at other 7 schools (K-6 at
          Kennedy and reopen Jackson)
      11) Implement year-round school or trimester schedule
      12) K-5 at the elementary schools; 6-8 at the Jr. High’s; 9-12 at SPASH; 9-12 at new
          Plover high school
      13) 3 grades K-1; 3 grades 2-3; 3 grades 4-5; 1 grades 6-7; 1 grades 8-9;
          1 grades 10-12; reopen Jackson; no Kennedy
      14) 3 Jr. High’s grades 6-9 (new site for 3rd Jr. High)
      15) 5 grades K-3 centers (north and south); 4 grades 4-6 centers (east and west); open
          Jackson; 2 grades 7-9 (keep Jr. Highs the same); 1 grades 10-12 (SPASH); no
          Kennedy
      16) Add on to Plover Whiting and Bannach, and re-district
      17) Make one Jr. High grades 3-5; one Jr. High grades 7-8; move 9th grade to SPASH
          (add on to building); open Jackson

   b. List Pros & Cons
      Work groups began the task of listing the pros and cons for each alternative. This task was
      not completed and will continue at the January 29, 2013 meeting.

7. Prioritize Alternatives & Select Optimum Alternative – Time did not allow for this activity.

8. Your concerns – No concerns were voiced.

9. Next meeting date:
   January 29, 2013
   Professional Development Center, Bliss ESC
   5:00 p.m.

10. Adjourn at 7:05 pm
Grade Level Configuration
Study Committee
Bliss Educational Services Center
Professional Development Center
January 29, 2013
5:00 p.m.

MINUTES

1. Call to Order

2. Roll Call
   Committee members were asked to sign in.

3. Approve Last Meeting Minutes
   The minutes from the January 22, 2013 were uploaded to Dropbox for review by the committee.

   It was moved and seconded (Rothmann/Cramer) to approve the January 22, 2013 GLC Committee minutes as presented. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

4. Continue with Alternatives Pros & Cons Activity
   Dr. Owens assisted the work groups complete listing all the pros and cons for each of the identified alternatives.

5. Committee of the Whole Reconvene - Share Work Group Thoughts
   a. Consensus on Alternatives and Pros & Cons

      Time did not allow for the completion of this part of the process. This activity will continue at the February 5, 2013 meeting.

6. Review, Revise, and Approve Recommended Grade Level Configuration Model
   a. Discussions on Recommendations to School Board
   b. Consider, Revise, and Approve Outline for Final Draft

    Time did not allow for this part of the process. This item will be placed on a future agenda.

7. Discuss Who Will Make Presentation to Finance Committee/School Board

    Time did not allow for discussion to take place. This will be placed on future agenda.

8. Your concerns

    No concerns were voiced.

9. Next meeting date:
   February 5, 2013
   Continue Review, Revise & Approve Grade Level Configuration Model
   5:00 p.m.

10. Adjourned at 7 p.m.
Grade Level Configuration
Study Committee
Bliss Educational Services Center
Professional Development Center
February 5, 2013
5:00 p.m.

MINUTES

1. Call to Order

2. Roll Call
   Committee members were asked to sign in upon arrival.

3. Approve Last Meeting Minutes
   The minutes from the January 29, 2013 meeting were uploaded to Dropbox for review by
   the committee.

   It was moved and seconded (Rothmann/Ries) to approve the January 29, 2013 GLC
   meeting minutes as presented. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

4. Resume Building List of Pros and Cons for Alternatives #10-17
   Dr. Tom Owens, Director of Business Services guided the committee members through
   the task of reaching consensus on the pros and cons for alternatives 10-17.

5. Begin Discussions to Select Top Three Alternative Solutions of #1-17
   Six committee member work groups began reviewing all 17 alternatives and pros & cons
   to determine their top three choices to recommend to the school board.

6. Reach Consensus on Alternatives by Priority #1-3
   The committee reconvened as a whole and each work group revealed their top three
   choices. The results are as follows:

   Alternatives 9 and 15 each received four votes. Alternatives 1, 8, and 10 each received
   votes and were discussed at length the reach a consensus. The committee agreed that
   more time was needed to revisit alternatives 1, 8, and 10 before making a final decision.
   The committee will continue their discussion at the next meeting.

7. Discuss Who Will Make the Presentation to the Finance Committee, to the Student
   Achievement Committee, and to the School Board
   Time did not allow for discussion to take place. This will be placed on a future agenda.

8. Your concerns
   No concerns were voiced.

9. Next meeting date:

   February 12, 2013
   Professional Development Center, Bliss ESC
   5:00 p.m.

10. Adjourned at 7:05 p.m.
MINUTES

1. Call to Order

2. Roll Call
   Committee members were asked to sign in upon arrival.

3. Approval of Minutes of Last Meeting
   The minutes from the February 5, 2013 meeting were uploaded to Dropbox for review by the committee.

   It was moved and seconded (Rothmann/Leahy) to approve the February 5, 2013 GLC meeting minutes as presented. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

4. Approval of Alternative Solutions 1-17 and Pros and Cons for Alternative Solutions 1-17
   The complete list of alternatives and their pros and cons was uploaded to Dropbox for review by the committee.

   It was moved and seconded (Fuehrer-Mancl/Basala) to approve Alternative Solutions 1-17 and the Pros and Cons for Alternative Solutions 1-17. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

5. Resume Discussion and Consideration of Top Three Alternatives
   Dr. Owens and Jen Zach explained that as part of phase 2 of the Sentry 11 Initiative, the District is considering utilizing the Jackson School site as a Technology/Professional Development Center, and Expeditionary School this fall. If the use of Jackson as a Technology Center is approved by the Board, the alternatives that included reopen Jackson as an option would be eliminated. The committee agreed that in light of this news, additional review of the alternatives and discussion was needed to determine their top choices.

6. Reach Consensus on Alternatives by Priority
   Committee members voted and agreed to recommend to the Board the follow two choices, not in any priority.

   Alternative 9 - Move 9th grade to SPASH (expansion to SPASH); 6th grade to Ben Franklin and PJ Jacobs

   Alternative 15 - Configure district with K-3 Schools; 4-6 Schools; no change to Jr. Highs, SPASH, or Kennedy

   It was moved and seconded (Rothmann/Zach) to approve alternatives nine and fifteen as the
committee’s top choices. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.
Further discussion was held to determine whether or not to include alternative number 1 – Realign grades (K-5) (6-7) (8-9) – Middle School & Jr. High in the recommendation to the Board.

It was moved and seconded (Okray/Young) to include alternative one as one of the choices presented to the Board. The motion failed by a majority of no votes.

7. Discuss Who Will Make the Presentation to the Finance Committee, to the Student Achievement Committee, and to the School Board
It was suggested to have a parent, student, and teacher part of the presentation team. The student presenters will be Maggie Pozorski and Matt McHugh; the staff presenters will be Jeff Tepp and Heather Cramer; and the parent presenters will be Kim Basala, Jennifer Young, and Wendy Fix.

Dr. Owens thanked the volunteers and offered assistance in preparing the presentation for committees and board.

8. Begin Discussions on Recommendations to School Board (if Time Permits)
Dr. Owens explained that he will continue working on the final report and include the committee’s top two choices to recommend to the board. A draft of the final report will be presented at the next meeting for review and approval by the committee. The committee may suggest changes at that time.

9. Your concerns
No concerns were voiced.

10. Next meeting date:
    February 19, 2013
    Approval of Final Report Document
    5:00 p.m.

11. Adjourn
Grade Level Configuration
Study Committee
Bliss Educational Services Center
Professional Development Center
February 19, 2013
5:00 p.m.

MINUTES

1. Call to Order
2. Roll Call
   Committee members were asked to sign in upon arrival.
3. Approval of Minutes of Last Meeting
   The February 12, 2013 GLC meeting minutes were uploaded to Dropbox for review by committee.
   
   It was moved and seconded (Rothmann/Zaske) to approve the February 12, 2013 GLC meeting minutes as presented. The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

4. Discussion and Revision of Final Report Document
   Draft copies of the final report were provided to the committee members to review.
   Dr. Tom Owens, Director of Business Services instructed the members to read through it carefully and voice any changes, additions, or deletions they feel need to be made to the document.
   Committee members agreed as a group on the revisions suggested during discussion of each page.

5. Approval of Final Report Document
   Committee members agreed that the revised report was ready for final approval.
   
   It was moved and seconded (Tepp/Leahy) to approve the Final Report as revised by the committee.
   The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

6. Meeting of Those Who Will Make the Presentation to the Finance Committee, to the Student Achievement Committee, and to the School Board
   Staff reps Heather Cramer and Jeff Tepp; student reps Maggie Pozorski and Matt McHugh; parent reps Kim Basala, Jennifer Young, and Wendy Fix met as a group to discuss and develop their presentation to committees and board.

7. Presentation Dates:
   March 5, 2013
   Finance and Facility Committee
   5:00 p.m.
   
   March 6, 2013
   Student Achievement Committee
   5:00 p.m.
   
   March 11, 2013
   School Board Meeting
   5:00 p.m.

8. Adjourned at 6:35 pm
Wisconsin’s Guiding Principles for Teaching and Learning

1. Every student has the right to learn.
   It is our collective responsibility as an education community to make certain each child receives a high-quality, challenging education designed to maximize potential, an education that reflects and stretches his or her abilities and interests. This belief in the right of every child to learn forms the basis of equitable teaching and learning. The five principles that follow cannot exist without this commitment guiding our work.

2. Instruction must be rigorous and relevant.
   To understand the world in which we live, there are certain things we all must learn. Each school subject is made up of a core of essential knowledge that is deep, rich, and vital. Every student, regardless of age or ability, must be taught this essential knowledge. What students learn is fundamentally connected to how they learn, and successful instruction blends the content of a discipline with processes of an engaging learning environment that changes to meet the dynamic needs of all students.

   Assessment is an integral part of teaching and learning. Purposeful assessment practices help teachers and students understand where they have been, where they are, and where they might go next. No one assessment can provide sufficient information to plan teaching and learning. Using different types of assessments as part of instruction results in useful information about student understanding and progress. Educators should use this information to guide their own practice and in partnership with students and their families to reflect on learning and set future goals.

4. Learning is a collaborative responsibility.
   Teaching and learning are both collaborative processes. Collaboration benefits teaching and learning when it occurs on several levels: when students, teachers, family members, and the community collectively prioritize education and engage in activities that support local schools, educators, and students; when educators collaborate with their colleagues to support innovative classroom practices and set high expectations for themselves and their students; and when students are given opportunities to work together toward academic goals in ways that enhance learning.

5. Students bring strengths and experiences to learning.
   Every student learns. Although no two students come to school with the same culture, learning strengths, background knowledge, or experiences, and no two students learn in exactly the same way, every student’s unique personal history enriches classrooms, schools, and the community. This diversity is our greatest education asset.

6. Responsive environments engage learners.
   Meaningful learning happens in environments where creativity, awareness, inquiry, and critical thinking are part of instruction. Responsive learning environments adapt to the individual needs of each student and encourage learning by promoting collaboration rather than isolation of learners. Learning environments, whether classrooms, schools, or other systems, should be structured to promote engaged teaching and learning.
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