## Enrollment/Capacity Data Set: 5-year Enrollment Projections by School

### What caught your attention about this data?

- Elementary schools projections all reduced slightly, senior highs all increased.
- FB five-year growth capacity stuck out the most being 44.60%. Over capacity, due to new construction predictions.
- BW projecting smaller – down to 997; FB up 44%; RL stabilizes; only 3.75 overall district growth.
- BW (53) – 5%; FO – 7%; RC down 2%; FB up 44%; GC up 14%; CI up 8%; PB up 12%
- BW under by 53; Middle schools under by 98; high schools over 395; K-12 over by 799 -3.9%
- Elementary trend seems to be within tolerance, except FB, GC, PB. The concern is secondary schools, specifically high schools.
- FB 44.6% growth; GC 14.55%; PCSV 7.15%; MGSH 6%; PB 12.54%
- FB Projection.
- Most are very flat.
- High schools, while the numbers are high they are very stable.
- BW will decline a bit, FB will increase a LOT. Most increases/decreases are less than 10%.
- 502 students in elementary (9289 – 9791). MGMS down. Lots of students distributed at high schools.
- FB’s growth of 44%
- MGSH is projected as overcapacity 140/610 3% in five years.
- Growth in FB is very high. Does this include the planned community/housing development?
- BW doesn’t seem to be trending as a capacity concern; FB is a concern; GC is a concern; high schools are a concern; RL concern.
- It’s a lot of numbers and assumptions.

### What is really clear about the data?

- Fernbrook could be looking at serious space issue.
- We are growing, but slowly. Variances are small. Fast decline – how do we look at this.
- HS projections are all 5% up.
- Need to resolve high school issues.
- The building with concerns
- Overall, slight increase over five years.
- Elementaries will be over in five years, middle schools will decline except for Osseo
- What is clear about this information is based on the middle school projection and the population of the city.
- Some of our current concerns are 5-year concerns. Not going away.
- The numbers.

### What is not clear?

- It’s a prediction, anything is possible.
- Why are all the MS projections down except OMS
- Growth doesn’t match this by school #
- Why?
- Would be helpful to have capacity on this chart.
- This will always change.
Enrollment/Capacity Data Set: 5-year Enrollment Projections by School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How does this data lead to new thinking around enrollment and capacity?</th>
<th>Which observations are most important for ECMAC to consider as it develops recommendations to administration?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• New development can cause lots of growth, however the market does generally control this.</td>
<td>• To monitor this development, stay informed of the real estate market.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• We need to look at FB, RL for action</td>
<td>• Do sites at capacity stabilize or decline?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• East side decline needs to be addressed</td>
<td>• Keep eye on future vs. present numbers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Are we looking at the right schools? Does the district need a full overhaul? HS – what are we doing?</td>
<td>• Need to consider long-term implications of changes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Our system has capacity in some buildings</td>
<td>• Observation and recommendation could be based on new location because of space of current high school locations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• May need to lighten up on capacity concerns at BW – may work out in time. GC and PB may need attention. Many changes are relatively flat.</td>
<td>• High need sites – FB, RL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• It will require boundary changes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• New addition or new location</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• BW doesn’t seem to be a concern.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### What caught your attention about this data?

- Relatively steady, but low total growth
- The big increase from middle school to high school
- High school growth
  - 2020 = 20,760; 2025 = 21,083; increases gradually
- Big jump in students from 6-8 to 9th grade by the hundreds.
- Increase between 8th and 9th grade; 2023 overall down by 19; 2025 overall by 15
- Estimates have been updated and there is a swing both ways.
- Reduction in capacity is more than increase.
- Overall good news, except MGSH
- Need a new elementary in NW Maple Grove.
- The enrollment projections look flat until you reach high school (9-12). There is a steady increase.
- Minimal enrollment changes over five years; FY 2021: 124 student change; FY 2025: 15 student change; 21,083 highest enrollment.
- It is amazing that we pick up 200 students from middle to high school.
- 9th grade jumps
- Very little change over 10 years at elementary and secondary. More change (growth) at 9-12. Five year decline at middle schools.
- Kids are aging out of system. Elementary steady, secondary growing. Only number up significantly is grade 5 (2016 – 2025).
- K-5 enrollment is flat; 9 – 12 growth.
- Inconsistency
- Biggest growth in high schools.
- Elementary – minimal change; middle schools – up 150; high schools up 800; biggest change is high school

### What is really clear about the data?

- Data is suggesting an increase.
- Our projections are really close so the model is working.
- Grades 9-12 will increase by 300; 6-8 decrease by 150; K-5 increase 70
- Able to come up with a median.
- If projections are true, there has to be emphasis on secondary schools.
- Elementary up 9289 – 9358
- 9 – 12 is where enrollment growth.
- Over and under capacity.
- The change.

### What is not clear?

- How to use total numbers from schools
- What is the driver of this.
- Why the drop in middle school?
- Why does it say “fall and spring” when there’s only one number per year?
- Why is K-5 flat?
- Graph showing if we are retaining from year to year
**How does this data lead to new thinking around enrollment and capacity?**

- Plan that natural reductions will not occur.
- Middle school to high school needs to be addressed. Is there some gaps?
- We need more secondary space.
- Keeps updated
- Does there need to be a different model applied to secondary schools vs. elementary schools?
- Focus on secondary schools.
- Shows the impact of private K-8.
- High schools have pressure now but more in the future based on projections.
- Overall not much change, so why is there so many ups and downs in the other charts?

**Which observations are most important for ECMAC to consider as it develops recommendations to administration?**

- How can we bridge the gap with families in terms of what’s happening with students coming back, why are they leaving?
- Understanding swings
- Can we use under capacity media center for other uses e.g. flex learning; do something about MGSH cafeteria
- There is a lot of overcapacity
- Action must be taken for under capacity schools (MGSH).
- High school will be a future problem that needs to be accounted for.
**What caught your attention about this data?**
- Reductions in projections over many schools
- Brooklyn Park middle school estimates. Decline at BMS and NVMS and PCSH increases.
- Nothing really stuck out.
- BW – 4.25%; PB up 6.6%; NV up; MGMS & HS down; OAK down 13%; FO down 12%; GC up 10%
- OAK (77) over 13-18% from previous estimate
- OMS under by 43; OSH over by 53; OAK over by 77; PCH over by 79
- Outliers: FO (12.98%); BG (9.48%); OAK (13.18%)
- Overall, year over year seem to be consistent.
- Most projections within 5% change except GC (+10.78%); NVMS (+8.23%); FO (12.8%); BG (9.48%); EC (8.77%); OAK (13.18%)
- Large variation between previous and current
- Relatively low level of change except for FO and OAK
- Biggest changes – Brooklyn Park
- RL was underestimated much as we’ve been concerned about.
- Projections 4-0-4 vary
- Projection analysis
  - Big variance in projections. Most schools had a variance of plus or minus 20 students.
- OAK – 80 students less; FO – 50 students less; NVMS – Over previous projections by 79
- That BP enrollment generally is down, what actions are we taking to improve test scores and what many would perceive as inequities.
- Many red numbers – FB 0 change. In the end, projections (total) are very close!

**What is really clear about the data?**
- Changes from year to year
- There’s something driving the middle school change.
- New estimates are lower than previous
- Using the updated assumptions gives more relief.
- Variance is very little with exceptions.
- The projections were approx. 5% or more off
- Inconsistent

**What is not clear?**
- What is the cause.
- Since this is my fourth chart, I’m starting to get confused about all the change percentages from chart to chart.
- Why inconsistent
- What drove the changes?
- What is the overall percent change (combined)?
- It’s clear.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How does this data lead to new thinking around enrollment and capacity?</th>
<th>Which observations are most important for ECMAC to consider as it develops recommendations to administration?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Reprioritizes how important elementary schools are in problems; couple are big problems, others aren’t</td>
<td>• Try to get in front of this, is this a trust issue for BMS?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What’s driving this prediction, are kids expected to come back to district?</td>
<td>• What’s the percent change that you should be concerned with? 7% - 8% - 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Model definitely changes as you refine/get new data.</td>
<td>• Understand which variables impacted the decline in numbers between data sets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Better to be over than under</td>
<td>• NV has consistently been low. I’m surprised the projection increased.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• We don’t appear to need a new school. We need to consider making adjustments before building.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There was data that was not accurate or needed clarification between the two data sets.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Changes every year.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Are we doing anything to attract students to our district?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prepared for ECMAC meeting on October 21, 2019
Enrollment/Capacity Data Set: Enrollment vs. Capacity

**What caught your attention about this data?**

- Many elementary schools will be under capacity
- FO and FB are opposite of each other in terms of predictions
- North View – under unrolled; FB and RL over 20%; MGSH 12%
- All schools are down 2025 except FB up 25%; RL up 24%; ZW down 31%; RC down 20%; BG down 18%; OAK 17%; Woodland down 22%
- Using October 1 data moving forward most schools will be under capacity.
- MGSH over by 276; OSH under by 225; RC under by 195; OMS under by 129; MGMS under by 121
- FB – 24.65%; RL – 23.42%; MGSH – 12.63%
- Most schools going down in five years.
- All but two elementary and one high school will be under capacity by FY 2024.
- New targets applied create space in most schools.
- What is changing at BW that they go back to capacity
- The shifting of population.
- Most schools will be under capacity.
- A lot of red - under capacity.
- BW, RL, MGSH – over capacity.
- Most sites are under capacity.

**What is really clear about the data?**

- These schools may be the ones that need some boundary changes.
- MG up 12.63%, only secondary school enrollment /capacity.
- Using the assumption draft gives massive relief.
- Brooklyn Park schools seem to be under.
- Capacity will ease up in five years.
- MGSH is the remaining school to focus on.
- Red. RL and BW and MGSH.
- Population shifting.
- Using target capacity has really changed the story.

**What is not clear?**

- The colors don’t align with the parenthesis for over/under.
- Where the FO prediction is coming from.
- Red wording negative (over)
- Over/under (red)
- Where are the students going?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How does this data lead to new thinking around enrollment and capacity?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Problems are very specific to a few areas, GC, RL, FB, MGSH.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Some changes need to be made/recommendations. Studying data, closer look.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• It gives the staff and principal a chance to be creative on how to utilize the school based on yearly enrollment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Makes sense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Capacity will ease up in five years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Do we sit out/wait out everything but RL, FB and MGSH?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What actions may be needed at FO and CV? Close schools?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Maybe we don’t need expansions discussed for BW – disruption not worth it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Only over capacity on some west side schools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Which observations are most important for ECMAC to consider as it develops recommendations to administration?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Focus on those that will be growing over capacity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Important to keep closer watch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Focus on the school that need massive amounts of relief.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Same question – as capacity decreases, what’s the percent threshold.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Long-term capacity vs. capacity “now” thinking.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Enrollment/Capacity Data Set: MDE Recommended Capacity based on Core Area Square Coverage

What caught your attention about this data?

- Senior highs have serious cafeteria issues. PCSH needs Media Center increase
- FB, OSH, MGSH, PCSH issues with cafeteria
- FB over 144+ at MGSH – wow. OSH 50% over.
- BW’s cafeteria is too small; FB cafeteria way too small; PCSH needs bigger media center and cafeteria; MGMS and MGSH need bigger cafeteria; OSH needs bigger cafeteria
- PCSH Media Center over capacity 724 – 46.09%. Cafeteria over 1225.60%. MGSH cafeteria over 1456 - 144%
- Cafeterias: MGSH over by 1456; OSH over by 746; FB over by 279; BW over by 78
- MGSH Cafeteria – 144.77%; OSH Cafeteria – 50.13%
- MGSH over capacity (145%) in cafeteria; OSH over capacity (50%) in cafeteria; FB 30% over capacity in cafeteria
- Maple Grove 144.77% over for cafeteria but 2.85% for media
- High school cafeterias are a concern, especially at MGSH.
- Only PCSH media center is over capacity; others have plenty of media center capacity.
- Fits past data – MGSH is over capacity and the trend is expected to continue.
- FB and BW need addressing
- Overcapacity in Maple Grove and Osseo
- Most core areas will be under capacity by 2025.
- MGSH café will be over capacity by an enormous amount by 2025.
- MGSH café 144% over; OSH café 50% over; FB café 30% over; PCSH Media Center 46% over
- Where are these numbers coming from; these are significantly different than previous projections.
- A lot of red – over capacity.
- Elementary: Only BW, FB over capacity – Cafeteria. High schools all three over capacity.

What is really clear about the data?

- There’s an issue with the space predicted.
- For the most part, core is working
- Target capacity does not represent all building spaces
- Six schools are over capacity
- Four schools over 30% cafeteria
- For the most part media and cafeteria have capacity for growth through 2025 except MGSH and OSH
- Media and cafeteria is oranges to apples.
- OSH and MGSH need cafeteria space.
- We have major issues at cafeterias at some of our sites.

What is not clear?

- How difficult it is to solve cafeteria issues
- What the options are with the Media Center and Cafeteria; is there space that could help alleviate this issue?
- BW (672) – 40% for media. What does this mean?
- Why some schools have so much space (50%)
- How these assumptions were created.
- I can’t tell what this is. For example, if BG is 391, capacity is 513. Why is the different in red when it’s under?
How does this data lead to new thinking around enrollment and capacity?

- Lunch/breakfast is very important. Kids need fuel therefore cafeteria is important.
- The three high schools need core adjustments
- We can fit kids into spaces, but not feed them properly.
- How does cafeteria and media center capacity indicate true enrollment/capacity issues?
- Does this provide any potential indicators?
- I wonder how schools can be over capacity overall, yet way under the MDE core space capacity calculations.
- Focus on our high schools more.
- Expansions to these areas.
- I think these assumptions need some tweaking. Cafeteria at BW is only projected to be over 8.5%, but kids are eating at 1 pm and 10:45 – doesn’t seem reliable.
- Someone needs to figure out why we were so bad at the projections.

Which observations are most important for ECMAC to consider as it develops recommendations to administration?

- Focus on cafeterias for senior highs
- How can we utilize space better?
- Even though target capacity is okay, general spaces are not.
- Need to focus on cafeteria and capacity overall.
- Need to focus on media center capacity at PCSH
- What’s the capacity percent that should raise concerns?
- Just keep outliers in mind as we make recommendations
- So we have elementary schools with media center capacity of 1700?
- Makes it seem like we are poorly utilizing space.