

FACTS  
Student Assignment

---

I. Neighborhood Schools Concept

- Term “neighborhood” school is a misnomer
- Size of District will not easily allow this concept
- Location of schools will not easily allow this concept – new schools would need to be built in “neighborhoods” which would necessitate condemnation of homes and property (example: Cape Coral Elementary)
- Minimum of two years needed to draw/approve boundaries, hold public hearings for each boundary, etc.
- No savings due to grandfathering – neighborhood concept would actually cost more to implement (approximately \$6 million with grandfathering)
- Approximately 70% of families do not choose the school closest to their home
- Approximately 52,000 students would have to move schools with implementation of neighborhood concept (first year of implementation)
- During growth years, 12,000 to 15,000 students would be moved annually due to boundary changes (four to 10 boundary lines)
- Concerns with safety since no transportation is provided to students living within two miles from their home to school (sexual predators, no sidewalks in some areas of the county, sparse populations in areas of county, etc.)
- Requests for courtesy busing would increase, thus increasing costs associated with transportation
- Constant (annual) boundary changes due to growth, mobility - (approximately 40% mobility)
- Need for constant movement of staff, teachers, etc. due to growth, mobility, etc.
- Concept would require need to place portable facilities on our properties to accommodate class size amendment.
- Results in little or no socio-economic and racial diversity
- Causes political pressure to gerrymander boundaries
- Will likely abandon proto-type school designs, as sites will be less uniform and smaller.
- May require boundaries to be located/drawn away from the school since more than one “same level school” is located on or near each other (example: Patriot Elementary and Skyline Elementary)
- Concept will not relieve the District from allowing choice based on AYP/NCLB

## II. School Programs

- Location and delivery of ESE services will require a complete overhaul. The savings achieved by clustering will be lost
- The competitive benefits of varied offerings among schools will be costly. Pressure will mount to have popular programs/academies in every school (example: I.B, arts, etc.)

## III. Class Size

- To accommodate shifting demographics and class size, annual boundary changes would occur.
- During growth years, 12,000 to 15,000 students would be shifted due to redistricting of neighborhood boundaries.
- Rather than assigning new students to schools where capacity and resources exist, the District must accommodate growth by redistributing resources.
- School utilization will become unequal and inefficient. School-to-school reallocation of resources will be continuous throughout the year.
- A disconnect will develop between boundary assignments and FISH/facility planning. Process will become reactive as opposed to proactive.
- Class size reduction would make it nearly impossible to grandfather.
- Each school would have to have someone assigned to manage class size compliance.
- A new dependence on portables would emerge.

## IV. Transportation

- Multi-tier busing will still be required due to AYP, ESE, Choice and program placement.
- Courtesy busing will return as a significant issue in conflict with safe routes to school.
- We have reduced the number of buses each year since 2005 while our number of riders has increased.
- We are comparable to other mega districts that have no school choice or limited school choice.
- We are reimbursed more using Choice than the old boundary system due to reduced courtesy busing.
- Many new schools do not have safe walk zones (sidewalks).
- Sexual predator numbers are up from 10 years ago which causes busing issues (courtesy busing).