

Minutes of the Elmbrook Enrollment  
Balancing Task Force Meeting

Present: Bill Aslin, Andrew Farley (arrived later), David Frank (arrived later), Mark Hansen (left earlier), Kori Hartman (arrived later), Erik Kass, Jean Lambert, Bridget Mangan, Lisa Mellone, Paul Neumeier, Franklin Onwubuariri, Heather Paradis, Silvia Paquini, Lisa Rettler, Sarah Sagert, John Schnabl, Jeanne Siegenthaler, Stephen Taipala, Danny Thomas, Daniel Westfahl, Scott Wheeler, Karen Wolff, and Jeff Wurster

Absent: Thomas Schaefer and Liz Zmuzinski

Also: Deborah Nustad and Mike Thompson

The meeting begin at 6:07 p.m. in the Board Room of the Central Administrative Offices. Mark Hansen explained a change to a critical success factor (secondary schools now at 80 percent) to match Eppstein Uhen Architects' work. He also explained the Task Force information that is posted on the District's webpage, encouraged efforts to address one of the night's objectives on consensus building, and again thanked everyone for their time and commitment.

Mike Thompson, the Task Force facilitator, presented an overview of working styles and explained the need for a win-win style to reach the group's goals.

Assistant Superintendent Erik Kass reviewed the last meeting and requested that members update their binders with new elementary data sheets.

### Meeting Objectives

This meeting's objectives were to discuss a decision-making process, weight the critical success factors, address communications expectations, and review secondary school data profiles.

### Decision-Making Process

Deborah Nustad apprised members of the pros and cons of group decisions and the variety of approaches (Andy Farley and David Frank arrived). She stressed the benefits of a consensus approach where no one strongly objects to the final outcome and every person has the power to make changes to areas that they find to be unacceptable. A common goal, a commitment to reach consensus, patience, a willingness to shift positions or to be open to alternative solutions, trust and openness, sufficient time, a clear process, and active participation were listed as some items needed for this process to allow for synthesis of ideas that will need to pass through the filter of the group's critical success factors. Small work groups are expected to allow for greater creativity, permit the identification of common ideas among groups, and encourage iteration to prepare a recommendation supported by all. The 70-percent criterion approach lets one support a decision even if some uncertainty continues to exist. Participation guidelines to help in the consensus process were also highlighted (Kori Hartman arrived and Mark Hansen left).

### Critical Success Factors

Members individually weighted the critical success factors, assigning a total of 10 points per person across all of the factors. This points will be combined to develop a group baseline rating that may be refined later as additional data and stakeholder input are received.

### Communications Expectations

Mike Thompson asked each table to prepare a list of external and internal communication do's and don'ts (summary attached). Questions included passive vs. active communication, how to encourage meaningful input from stakeholders, and if a narrative should be prepared around documents as they are posted. Requests were made to consider updating the Task Force website with new documents, to allow the community to submit questions/concerns through the website, and to include an invitation to provide input through school e-mails and press releases.

### Review Secondary School Data Profiles

Data profiles for four secondary schools were handed out. Their format is slightly different than those for the elementary schools because of the greater use and availability of elective courses. Also, intradistrict transfers are permitted (not always done at elementary schools with high enrollment). Average class sizes are shown by department. There is no Fairview South profile due to its unique function as a special education cooperative school. What determines the schools students attend (where they live), if private school students are included in projections (yes), and square footage differences at the high schools (field house and design layout) were questioned. Members split into groups to review the secondary school data, and each group reported on their findings. Concerns included when the current Swanson enrollment surge would arrive (also from new families moving in, and from private schools without secondary grades), Brookfield East's high and low capacity numbers, and some market share numbers.

### Behind-the-Scenes Data Efforts

Deborah Nustad showed some of the data work that has been happening in regard to census numbers to help the Task Force in their decision making. This involves going from a municipal look to census tracts to block groups to neighborhoods and applying "what-if" scenarios. The larger-picture numbers are more recent, while the finer numbers are not populated as often. Whether there are census numbers since 2014 (yes), availability by bedroom number, if scenarios could happen live (yes), how the process differs from what was done in 2011 (higher level versus neighborhood level and independent of Applied Population Laboratory). and how grandfathering would affect results were questioned. Requests were made to have bus information (time and capacity) available and to let parents who are making choices know that the current tract structure may change.

### Next Meeting's Objectives

- (1) Share Tract/Subtract Level Data/Modeling Approach
- (2) Generate Ideas
- (3) Potential Solutions
- (4) Refine Stakeholder Survey

The meeting ended at 9:12 p.m.

Attachment: [Communication Expectations](#)