

Feedback Comments	Themes
<b>Meeting Evaluation 10/22/2020</b>	
I appreciated the ability to address a more focused topic. I felt that conversations were more focused on phase 1 considerations.	Phase 1
Great decision to uncouple the DLI discussion from Kellogg Boundary. Presentation from Scott Bailey was helpful.	DLI
I appreciate the review of the goals and objectives and the much more streamlined and focused approach to last night's mtg.!	Goals/Objective
I appreciated the clearly defined goal of last night's meeting. Is there a way that we could know next steps before we leave our Thursday evening meeting? It would give us a week to define our individual perspectives.	Goals/Objective
Continue to explain rationale for decisions. Present scenarios in a way that we can see what has been prioritized and what the trade-offs are. Have brief set-aside time for questions during presentations, or else give the expectation that questions should be asked in the chat and stop occasionally to address what's been asked there more thoroughly. It was good to have a longer chunk of time for small group discussion, especially with more clarity around targets. Still, our group spent a lot of time going in circles on DLI locations. It would be good to have a better sense of what input we are being asked to give on this. Has it been decided that we must eliminate co-location, so we are strictly looking for buildings to house standalone DLI programs? Are we still weighing the benefits of co-location? Clear guidelines on what FLO will and won't model. Also, if there was some way to see real-time adjustments, at least to enrollment numbers (with more demographic details to follow), during our meetings that would be extremely helpful. I want to see what happens if we suggest an alternate feeder pattern or boundary to what's in the scenario so we can have a better sense of what's realistic.	Rationale
try to directly apply the community feedback to these scenarios	Community Feedback
I appreciated having members of the board of directors present as well as the many data requests that were met.	Board
I appreciated the clarification from FLO and PPS on what they wanted us to work on specifically this last meeting. I also very much appreciated our small group time, as I find my fellow group members (and the coalition members as a whole) to be very thoughtful, and small group time allows us to truly dig into ideas in a way that is near impossible when we are attempting to communicate altogether. Working out ideas in small groups, then benefitting from all groups sharing their work, allows us all to share comfortably and gain insight from one another. I would hope we can continue with this format going forward, as at least speaking of my personal experience and that of my small group (Flavel), I find it to be a highly constructive way to work as we have built up rapport and trust with one another. I still think this process would be greatly improved if coalition members were provided with a better means of sharing ideas and communication between meetings. Relying on long, dense, email threads is complicated and hard to follow, and hinders us from continuing the work we've done in the meeting.	Goals/Objective
The last meeting went very well because there was clear guidance around the final goals and what restrictions we needed to work with. As a parent, I am disappointed that the scope was not clearly defined from the beginning. Earlier meetings gave me the impression we could address the larger systemic issues involved. While I understand that would be a very large and difficult target, we could at least start the process. Scaling back the scope to the feeder schools should streamline the rest of the process.	Goals/Objective
Yes, realistically we need more time for small group discussion and to workshop findings of the small groups with the whole group. It would be awesome to have this experience be interactive with a GIS specialist focusing on one or two maps, seeing impacts of ideas and trying to gently and thoughtfully advance a solution that can be presented.	Small Group Discussion
At the beginning of the meeting set clear expectations on why the coalition members are there as a reset and what the goals are for the evening's meetings. This week was much better as there was a very concerted effort to get everyone on the same page before we dove into the bulk of the meeting. It was appreciated.	Goals/Objective
Please do real-time changes to scenarios so we can get a sense of how these suggestions play out instead of having to guess what may or may not work. It takes too long before new ideas get modeled. This process is really slow and inefficient.	Scenarios
Provide rationale for scenarios and changes that have been made to scenarios.	Rationale
<b>Meeting Evaluation 10/29/2020</b>	
We need more time to collaborate with small groups. Also, moving forward it would be really helpful to receive scenarios at least 3 days before the meeting so that we have time to offer thoughtful, useful ideas and recommendations.	Collaboration
Materials need to be sent out to us at least a day ahead of time so that I can review, print. We should be able to collaborate on documents not have someone control the documents. This evening it was very frustrating to have only one person controlling the spreadsheet. Use Google so that we can collaborate! Don't have people change groups. Consistency of groups helps team build upon our thinking.	Consistency

Feedback Comments	Themes
<p>This was very frustrating; it was unclear how to work with the scenarios we were presented with. We did not have enough information or priorities to understand reasonable ways to site DLI programs, we did not have enough time to sort through so much information and figure out where to go with it. Is it possible to schedule any extended weekend work sessions?</p> <p>I like the focus on feeder patterns, but there were WAY too many moving parts to try and figure out DLI within this. The proposals we work with need to already have suggested locations for the DLI programs so we can see how they would work and possibly suggest shifting them from the proposal, not have to figure all of that out from scratch as we go (especially with such limited information about DLI).</p> <p>PPS needs to provide some targets for DLI program locations. Is reducing/eliminating co-location for K-5 still a goal? How many strands need to be at a middle school to be successful? How many DLI programs can be in one middle school? There are so many moving parts in this process, we will never get anywhere if some of them are not pinned down so we can start making decisions.</p>	<p>Scenarios Targets</p>
<p>The lag time between scenario ideas and enrollment/demographic projections that could tell us which ideas are even plausible is really bogging down this process. I feel like there must be some way to at minimum give coalition members the data they need to analyze and refine scenarios between meetings. Just a spreadsheet that combines enrollment for the K-5, 6-8, and 9-12 strands of each school (breaking out neighborhood and DLI) would be a HUGE help, since we could then ballpark enrollment in different scenarios. A spreadsheet or other tool set up to make those calculations automatically as we assign programs to different buildings would be even better, but I'd settle for just having all the data in one place.</p> <p>Also while I understand PPS or FLO was shorthanded this past week, it was beyond frustrating that we didn't have time to review the survey data or scenarios well in advance of the meeting, and that the data accompanying the scenarios from last week was so incomplete as to give us zero picture of total building utilization (it would've been easy to just assume in the absence of anything else that teams were pegging DLI program locations to the springboard proposal, for example, since we were not even given clear instructions last week to place DLI programs). That delay pretty much ensured we weren't able to make enough use of our limited time together in the meeting. It was also a little insulting to the many (unpaid!) hours I know coalition members are putting toward this work between meetings, in addition to the hours of official meetings.</p>	<p>Scenarios Targets</p>
<p>Set realistic expectations. None of the groups were able to complete even one feeder pattern for neighborhood and DLI programs.</p>	<p>Expectations</p>
<p><b>Meeting Evaluation 11/5/2020</b></p>	
<p>Please start on time...especially when you lengthen the mtg time. Last night the one big fuzzy part for me was were we working on a feeder pattern or a scenario...the answer was vague all night. Also, I would ask that PPS as a district talk some about the HUGE impact of moving CSS to an unknown location in order to open either a new neighborhood or DLI...I feel like that should be off the table as there is NO WHERE to move CSS. As a principal who has been impacted by ACCESS needing a space every year for a few years and then being co-located I can speak to the realities of making such a decision...It just isn't wise and in this case not necessary from any angle. I will give a ZERO to any scenario that moves CSS without a concrete plan of where ti would go...</p>	<p>Impacts</p>
<p>Clearly specify the outcome objectives for each breakout session</p>	<p>Objectives</p>
<p>What's really needed is even more extended time. It was a good decision to extend the meeting and focus on work time and we got a lot more accomplished this week. I'm not sure what the options are in terms of longer work sessions, and I'm sure that would be a barrier to participation from some people, but if there was an extended weekend session that might allow us to get even further. Otherwise, I will reiterate a need for a structure (even just a google doc) that allows us to communicate between meetings, especially now that small groups are putting together scenarios.</p>	<p>Timeliness</p>

Feedback Comments	Themes
<p>Hi there, not sure if this is the right place to put this, but not sure how we can have an honest discussion of feasible plans when there are several contingents in the group refusing to accept the original tasking/criteria (equity, consolidation of DLI programs) of the coalition and putting forth solutions very obviously designed to create minimal impact to their individual community and that carelessly place the other lower SES school communities and programs in random, mostly undesirable spots (i.e. placing lents/spanish dli at harrison park so that woodstock/chinese dli goes to kellogg, which completely ignores the heat maps indicating where the native speaking populations are concentrating. I feel like the chinese dli proponents are treating the spanish dli program like second class citizens who don't deserve the same consideration in terms of proximity, convenience and other factor.</p> <p>It is becoming increasingly difficult to move forward when groups are still spending their time trying to reshape/reevaluate the focus/intent of the process and not looking for meaningful, impartial and future-thinking proposal and scenarios. I fully support anyone's right to question the criteria, but i think there should be a broader forum involving district staff and the entire district (n/ne/se/sw/s) to reshape these initial goals and it most certainly should include a focus on understanding why certain goals are prioritized (dli function/efficacy, equity) so that the participating members have a good understanding of the intent behind the districts goals as they work to focus them. It is extremely frustrating that the data presented about the DLI programs, particularly with their intended use and focus is either going unheard or ignored as groups lobby to keep the focus programs as what they have currently evolved into: primarily enhancement programs that disproportionately seem to benefit higher SES non-native speakers.</p> <p>I walked away from Michael Bacon's presentation feeling like it is essential and our duty if we are truly prioritizing equity in this process to refocus/move these programs to locations where they best serve the intended native speaking populations and their needs. I also think it's important to prioritize/acknowledge the recommendations of the professionals that work in the DLI programs and not get caught up in individual school community preferences that are using limited (and frankly selfish and self-preservation motivated) anecdotal experiences to validate maintaining the status quo.</p> <p>I think we all know that the reality of participation in processes like this is that the poorest, most disenfranchised community members do not choose to allocate their limited time and resources to these kinds of procedural exercises that never seem to serve them. I would love if we could show those communities that they matter and benefit from this kind of process and hope that this kind of demonstration of care will serve as an invitation to participate and proof that their voices matter, that their needs are truly being held central in the decision making processes and that we are creating spaces for them to have meaningful participation and voice. I too bemoan that we are not seeing more of our lower SES and non-native speakers represented in this process, but want to at least take this opportunity to engender a system that can truly welcome them.</p> <p>Moving forward here are my suggestions/requests:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. District staff with expertise in dli and familiarity with the heat maps should chime in and reinforce/remind/reinforce our discussions when they veer away from or try to reshape the original goals. I would like to see district staff and flo have a stronger voice and to be unafraid to challenge (in an honest, genuine and compassionate way) elements of any scenario that ignores the equity/resj lens.</li> <li>2. I think it would be a very productive exercise for the emerging scenarios (and those who put them forth) to be asked to put forth an honest pro/con list and be prepared to "defend" the scenario under the lens we have been charged with (enrollment balancing, dli consolidation and equity, all through an RESJ lens). Maybe a good exercise would be to have each group present the pros/cons of the scenario they are working with and then submit additional pros/cons for the other scenarios...I think it's time for us to start having more forthright conversations about the scenarios. It is our duty to challenge our scenarios ourselves just as they will be challenged by the community during the open house so that we can be sure to provide all the documentation, reasoning and transparency possible to help our community understand both the proposed changes and the underlying need for the changes.</li> <li>3. Thank you, thank you, thank you. I feel so grateful to get to be a part of this process. My kids are thriving in the rich, diverse and meaningful school experience they are getting and our family has so greatly benefited benefited from the strong community we have at Bridger. I remain excited and energized to work towards a plan that will allow future families in our cluster a similarly positive experience. Obviously the questions are hard and sometimes achieving equity and excellence seems like an impossible goal, but we feel so lucky to be a part of a district where the highest levels of administration are obviously committed to these lofty goals. We might not get it perfectly right the first time, but I'm confident that we are asking the right questions, identifying the right problems and working our way towards a better outlook for our kids and communities.</li> </ol>	<p>Objectives</p>

Feedback Comments	Themes
Narrow down the scenarios. We seem to be moving towards a few so eliminating some would help to simplify our process and move us forward.	Scenarios
<p>Thank you for this weeks meeting. In my small group especially I feel like we really worked through a lot. I also feel that there are other small groups out there who we could work well with to continue to formulate a good plan, and of course there are others that I cannot understand their reasoning or logic other than not having to make much change to their specific school communities. Without change we cannot make our schools better, if we stay the same nothing will get accomplished and the students will lose out on the possibilities of greatness.</p> <p>I would like the district to be more open with information in some cases. At times it feels like as a coalition member I am spinning my wheels for something that has already been decided or is a definite no-go. While I respect the sharing of information between coalition members some things are just not feasible.</p>	Small Groups
For this week's meeting, can we start out by spending time in the main room going over the proposals/scenarios that groups moved forward during the last meeting? It would really help the conversation to have some initial data/ trade-off analysis for those new group scenarios the day before the meeting so people can see what effects the changes have on the different schools and programs. It would also be great if members can suggest real-time changes during that whole group time so we can try to build some consensus among the groups. I know some groups weren't able to get as far as moving a proposal forward, but I think everyone's group could benefit from hearing people's thoughts and concerns with the ones that have already been shared out.	Large group discussion
It would be helpful to have more clear decision-making tools. How are we evaluating each of the scenarios moving forward? It feels as if each group, sometimes each individual, is using their own lens to determine what is the best path forward which makes it difficult to come to a shared decision.	Decision Making