

Correspondence Log 2016-17

Initiated By	Date	Responded By	Date	Topic	Phone	Letter	Email	Meeting	Other
Anonymous		Doug Copeland	8/29/2016	Sunshine Law Complaint		X			
Kim Mumm	8/26/2016	John Simpson	8/26/2016	Webster Kirkwood Times letter			X		
Kim Mumm	9/8/2016	John Simpson	9/9/2016	Adventure Club staffing			X		
Pat Zach	9/9/2016	John Simpson	9/9/2016	Tax Rate Hearing			X		
Michael Schwan	9/14/2016	John Simpson	9/14/2016	Adventure Club before/after care			X		
Patrick C. Elliott	9/16/2016	Doug Copeland	9/22/2016	Webster-Rock Hill Ministries Radio Transmitter		X	X		
Jenny Dibble	9/27/2016	John Simpson	9/28/2016	Adventure Club			X		
Kim Mumm	10/11/2016	John Simpson	10/12/2016	Demographics/Enrollment Projections Report	X				
Kim Mumm	12/4/2016	John Simpson	12/5/2016	Questions regarding the Enrollment Report			X		

***Please note: The correspondence log reflects verbatim copies of all material sent. It does not imply or represent anything that the board has approved, endorsed or agreed to.**

Shari Meyers

From: John Simpson
Sent: Monday, December 05, 2016 3:10 PM
To: kmummm@charter.net; Bruce Ellerman; Kristin Denbow; John M. Thomas; Steve Loher; Amy Clendennen; David Addison; Jean Dugan; Michael Shipley; Emerson Smith; Arnold Stricker
Cc: Shari Meyers
Subject: RE: Questions Regarding the Enrollment Report

Dear Kim,

Here are my best, succinct responses to your questions. I can elaborate more in person!

John

- *Why couldn't the District provide enrolled student records as of September 30 for any of the years required to produce a resident enrollment projection model with a cohort projection methodology?*
We produce September 30 data for total enrollment and can pull that data going back, but we can't get the **individualized data (student by grade level and address)** at any date of our choosing such as September 30. Our system would allow us to do that for our end of year data only. Thus, we had to ask Tyler SIS for the data.
- *Who is included in the data? (My words, not yours.)*
The data includes resident students (students living within our district boundaries attending our schools). Students who participate in VICC, are from Riverview or Normandy, are children of staff, are non-resident, tuition-paying students. We have all this data, but it's not contained in this report. I can share them.
- *Please could you publicly post a copy of the "Benchmark report, Webster Groves School District, Enrollment Projections Study, June, 2016" or direct me where to find it to read it?*
I answered this one in the earlier email. This is the first report that's been finalized and presented to the entire board of education.
- *Could the actual 2016-17 enrollment also be represented in these graphs, based upon the September, 2016 membership?*
Yes, but it's not. We do have that data.
- *Because, in 2016-17 the variable of free full day kindergarten has been introduced, is the 2009-10 to the future projection valid? Do you think some who would have "sat out" non-mandatory kindergarten might now enroll their children, changing the projection model?*
Charles would know better than I, but I would bet they won't change that much because the full and ½ day students are factored into this data. I don't think the number of children coming to kindergarten (public) and leaving to go to private school in 1st grade would be very high. We can track that though moving forward.
- *What is the "District's projection model", please?*
The data within the report that shows future projections of enrollment.

- *Please, is there an actual percentage reported of live births/WGSD to actual enrollment for the years already known? Maybe I am just missing it.*

We don't have this data based on overall enrollment. Charles data from the **15-16 school year only** showed that approximately 75% of resident students attend WGSD schools.

- *Where are the actual birth to kindergarten cohort figures for past years and this year, please? Maybe they are in the " Benchmark Report" or I am missing them. Would be the most accurate baseline for future projections?*

The data from Charles report coupled with our own enrollment data provides us with this information!

- *As Dr. Kofron notes, his projected ~25% forgoing kindergarten or using other services could change." Is he aware of the new, free FDK variable? I think it might change, as he states, related to the new free FDK. Given this variable, should the cohort change to birth-1st grade to be certain it is standardized w/ no major variable across time?*

I don't think free FDK will influence our data much (explanation above).

- *What data does Dr. Kofron refer to when he writes, "(following the) addition of "these data" will change the cohort survival ratios that were used to project enrollments and the enrollment projections"?*

This is the 2015 birth data that wasn't a part of the initial data collection.

From: kmummm@charter.net [mailto:kmummm@charter.net]

Sent: Sunday, December 4, 2016 8:50 PM

To: John Simpson <Simpson.John@wgmail.org>; Bruce Ellerman <Ellerman.Bruce@wgmail.org>; Kristin Denbow <Denbow.Kristin@wgmail.org>; John M. Thomas <thomas.johnm@wgmail.org>; Steve Loher <WGSD.Loher@gmail.com>; Amy Clendennen <Clendennen.amy@wgmail.org>; David Addison <daddison@rgare.com>; Jean Dugan <jbdugan@gmail.com>; Michael Shipley <wgdsdshipley@gmail.com>; Emerson Smith <emersonsmith10@gmail.com>; Arnold Stricker <stricker.arnold@wgmail.org>

Cc: Shari Meyers <Meyers.Shari@wgmail.org>

Subject: Questions Regarding the Enrollment Report

Hi, all,

I hope you each have had a relaxing and enjoyable weekend. I have attached a letter to you in which I've asked some questions about the District Enrollment Report, which is posted (thank you!) and will be presented tomorrow evening at the BOE meeting. I suspect the data in the report will guide the District and its planning for a decade or so into the future. It is such an important document.

I'm hoping it may be helpful to you to see the questions I have in advance of the meeting. Some of them may be answered by my reading the "Benchmark Report" which is referenced in the Enrollment Report. I've asked if it can be posted publicly, so other citizens interested can also read it.

Thank you for your time and all you do for our community's students.

Kim Mumm

Shari Meyers

From: kmummm@charter.net
Sent: Monday, December 05, 2016 3:37 PM
To: John Simpson; Bruce Ellerman; Kristin Denbow; John M. Thomas; Steve Loher; Amy Clendennen; David Addison; Jean Dugan; Michael Shipley; Emerson Smith; Arnold Stricker
Cc: Shari Meyers
Subject: RE: Questions Regarding the Enrollment Report

Shari,

I am not trying to make this a nightmare for you to scan into the correspondence log, but I noticed a major typo I made. I wrote, "In the Summary section, the statement, "Over 31% of District resident student enrollments are transfer students." is one I don't understand. In my letter to you all, in the table I constructed, in the shaded section, the maximum # of what I would term "transfer students" in recent years was in 2009-10, 435 students, which would be a bit over 1% for that year's total reported enrollment."

I meant to say, "..... 2009-10, 435 students, which would be a bit over 10% for that year's total reported enrollment."

Thank you!

From: kmummm@charter.net
To: "John Simpson", "Bruce Ellerman", "Kristin Denbow", "John M. Thomas", "Steve Loher", "Amy Clendennen", "David Addison", "Jean Dugan", "Michael Shipley", "Emerson Smith", "Arnold Stricker"
Cc: "Shari Meyers"
Sent: 05-Dec-2016 16:33:52 +0000
Subject: RE: Questions Regarding the Enrollment Report

Thank you for clarifying about the "Benchmark Report", John. My questions about the Enrollment Report, entitled, "Enrollment Projections Study Student Record Update 2015 Birth Update" then, are still relevant. I was hoping the earlier study referenced might clarify for me to answer some of them.

I also have many questions about the "Student Transfer Status 2015 Enrollments" Report, the results of which, I realize, will also be presented tonight.

In the Summary section, the statement, "Over 31% of District resident student enrollments are transfer students." is one I don't understand. In my letter to you all, in the table I constructed, in the shaded section, the maximum # of what I would term "transfer students" in recent years was in 2009-10, 435 students, which would be a bit over 1% for that year's total reported enrollment.

I think I understand the definition of transfer students Dr. Kofron's is using is: "In this study, transfer students are defined as students that came into the district and reside in the District after Kindergarten. Non transfer students are students that reside in the District and started in Kindergarten."

I think of the helpful definition of "transfer students" as those who would be "superimposed" on the student residents living here and attending at the time of analysis. I think of these as Normandy, Riverview Gardens, Voluntary Transfer Students (VICC) and the few who come to WGSD and pay tuition. As I asked in my letter, I am not seeing where the non-resident children of staff are being included.

Per Dr. Kofron's summary section, he writes: "The non-transferring resident student enrollment base comprises 65.4% of District students. There were 145 students from the Normandy/Riverview and VICC programs that were included in the District's resident student base."

I interpret this as meaning, the Normandy and Riverview Gardens students were considered as resident students.

Dr. Kofron's analyses, using his definitions are helpful to know the flow of families into the district over time. I think it would also be useful to know the "baseline" residents, total and by building, then the "superimposed" added sums of the "transfer students" as I'd define them, plus the non-resident staff students, and then a drill down to know the numbers of students in elementary buildings not living within those schools' internal boundaries.

In my opinion, the addition of what I would want to know in the reports would provide a better projection of how crowded buildings are, will be, why they have been, are and will be, how this can be adjusted, how boundary lines might be useful (some day) to consider (if needed), and a guide for the administration and board to make informed, educated decisions when they are deciding how many students to add/allow each year from groups like Normandy, VICC, non-resident staff children and, perhaps, others about which we are not aware.

Finally, it concerns me that the District did have demographic data on hand for 2007-2015. Thank goodness Tyler Technologies was able to help to retrieve these. How, then, were the data accurately coded that are provided to DESE each fall?

Thank you, again, John. I will listen intently tonight to try to understand the presentations. I suspect many of my questions will be answered then. :)

Take care,

Kim

From: "John Simpson"

To: "kmummm@charter.net", "Bruce Ellerman", "Kristin Denbow", "John M. Thomas", "Steve Loher", "Amy Clendennen", "David Addison", "Jean Dugan", "Michael Shipley", "Emerson Smith", "Arnold Stricker"

Cc: "Shari Meyers"

Sent: 05-Dec-2016 16:01:09 +0000

Subject: RE: Questions Regarding the Enrollment Report

Dear Kim,

I don't have time to respond to all your questions at the moment, but did want you to know that I had communicated with Charles (consultant) early last week regarding removing the language of "benchmark report" or "earlier study." While district administration did receive an original draft report last June, the board never has. As it happens,

this turned out for the better. This allowed for some important corrections in the data to occur and allowed us to capture birth data for 2015 which hadn't originally been collected.

As I see it, this is the "benchmark report."

Take care,
John

From: kmummm@charter.net [mailto:kmummm@charter.net]
Sent: Sunday, December 4, 2016 8:50 PM
To: John Simpson <Simpson.John@wgmail.org>; Bruce Ellerman <Ellerman.Bruce@wgmail.org>; Kristin Denbow <Denbow.Kristin@wgmail.org>; John M. Thomas <thomas.johnm@wgmail.org>; Steve Loher <WGSD.Loher@gmail.com>; Amy Clendennen <Clendennen.amy@wgmail.org>; David Addison <daddison@rgare.com>; Jean Dugan <jbdugan@gmail.com>; Michael Shipley <wgdsdshipley@gmail.com>; Emerson Smith <emersonsmith10@gmail.com>; Arnold Stricker <stricker.arnold@wgmail.org>
Cc: Shari Meyers <Meyers.Shari@wgmail.org>
Subject: Questions Regarding the Enrollment Report

Hi, all,

I hope you each have had a relaxing and enjoyable weekend. I have attached a letter to you in which I've asked some questions about the District Enrollment Report, which is posted (thank you!) and will be presented tomorrow evening at the BOE meeting. I suspect the data in the report will guide the District and its planning for a decade or so into the future. It is such an important document.

I'm hoping it may be helpful to you to see the questions I have in advance of the meeting. Some of them may be answered by my reading the "Benchmark Report" which is referenced in the Enrollment Report. I've asked if it can be posted publicly, so other citizens interested can also read it.

Thank you for your time and all you do for our community's students.

Kim Mumm

December 4, 2016

Dear John, Bruce, Kris and John and BOE members,

I am so happy to see Dr. Kofron's enrollment report posted. You are the experts on all this, as is, of course, Dr. Kofron. I have been, like you, awaiting this report to read Dr. Kofron's findings and methodologies. Having read the report, I understand the delay in completing it may have been related to the discovery of "year -end", rather than "September 30 membership report" data usage initially, and the report was revised

If you/he would allow it, I am happy to ask him my questions, directly, if that is easier for you, if they are not answered after tomorrow night. I hope you having my questions in advance of tomorrow might help you to anticipate some questions at least one citizen has. ☺ As you know, I had done some limited looking into enrollment last year: internal subgroupings of students and variables that may affect enrollment, hence crowding, hence resource needs, which I have shared with you. I recognize the magnitude and significance of the findings in this report and how they will likely guide the district in its planning for the many years into the future.

I have three basic questions, listed, below, then several additional questions related to Dr. Kofron's report. I have tried to make my additional questions as clear as I can by numbering them and first, citing Dr. Kofron's report, in quotations in advance of me asking each question, in italics. I think if I have these questions, it is possible, others who are certainly more skilled and knowledgeable than I am, might have questions, as well. I'm sure the board of education has been also been thoroughly reviewing this report, asking its own questions and that modifications/expansion of the data reporting, if indicated, will be performed before the report is finalized/approved to use it as a guide the future of the district.

Thank you so much for your help!

Kim

My "Basic Questions"

1. Data on Hand

Dr. Kofron wrote, "It was also discovered that the District could not provide enrolled student records as of September 30 for any of the years required to produce a resident enrollment projection model with a cohort projection methodology. Accordingly, the District reached out to Tyler Technologies to access their student information system for records of students enrolled in District schools as of September 30 from 2007 through 2015. Tyler Technologies provided the records of students that included full address information, grade, and school year."

Why couldn't the District provide enrolled student records as of September 30 for any of the years required to produce a resident enrollment projection model with a cohort projection methodology? I know the September 30 membership reports were formulated because I requested them last fall for the past 10 years and was provided them.

2. Total WGSD Student Enrollment

Dr. Kofron writes, he was asked to “update of the District’s enrollment projections with resident 2015 birth counts”.

I am not seeing a report of TOTAL enrollment projections, including the formal, as defined, non-resident students (VICC, Normandy and Riverview Gardens students). The many varied presentations of resident enrollment are amazing (for you to know the “basic enrollment”, upon which the other students will be superimposed), but what about the TOTAL enrolment? It is what will guide all decisions, I would think. Maybe it is in the “Benchmark Report” or I am not correctly reading the report, or, perhaps you add additional data to these numbers reported. If so, what are they, please?

I am making the assumption Dr. Kofron has included all non-resident staff children as “residents”, however, he doesn’t specify this and his data are based upon “address location” of the children, which leads me to believe the non-resident staff children are not included in his “resident enrollment” figures. If these children are not reflected in the district “resident enrollment” totals, are they detailed in the “non-resident” group? I don’t see them detailed in the reported definition in the report. To help, I constructed this table for you to explain what I mean.

Note- As far as I know, “non-resident children of staff” are coded as “residents” for DESE, so are they included in the “resident student enrollment” in Dr. Kofron’s report for the table I constructed? The source for the # of non-resident children of staff is the WGSD, as replied to my request for them.

Year	09-10	10-11	11-12	12-13	13-14	14-15
TOTAL enrollment, per the superintendent report to the board of education, Nov 9, 2015	4249	4271	4327	4366	4395	4386
Total Resident Enrollment, Dr. Kofman’s report, Graph 1 “Total Resident Enrollment”	3814	3862	3972	4021	4085	4145
Difference between TOTAL reported by WGSD and total Resident Enrollment reported by Dr. Kofron This would =NON -resident enrollment, as defined in Dr. Kofron’s report	435	402	355	344	310	241
Nonresident children of staff are coded (I think) as residents, and attending for free as a staff benefit, so are a subcategory of resident students, listed above (source, WGSD)	62	54	53	67	65	82 (14 new)
Combination of staff non-resident children + formal non-resident student count	497	456	408	411	375	323

To equal the TOTAL Enrollment of WGSD, should just the "Non-resident students "(VICC+ Normandy+ Riverview Gardens) be added (I am assuming the shaded column numbers do = the actual VICC, Normandy and RVG numbers) OR, should the non- resident children of staff members also be added?

3. Out of Boundary Elementary Children (for the Elementary Building Enrollment Reports)

I also didn't see in the report, a "drill down" to the elementary school students who are attending each school as residents within the WGSD boundaries, yet are attending elementary schools outside their internal elementary school boundaries in Dr. Kofron's Tables 5-9, which are the data that make up Graphs #18-27 in his report. These tables appear to be using data based upon address location. So the numbers are very helpful in knowing "basic resident capacity potential". However, actual capacity of each building includes out of boundary children, in some cases, many. For instance, how many children have been each year/are now attending Avery who live in the Bristol, Clark, Edgar Rd or Hudson boundary, with this analyzed for each school building?

Have you collected those data? If so, please could you post them or could I receive them, please? Thank you! ☺

My additional questions, please, in italics, following Dr. Kofron's report citations, in quotations:

1. "The District's enrollment projection model and birth series, from 2004 through 2014, are provided in the benchmark report, Webster Groves School District, Enrollment Projections Study, June 2016"

Please could you publicly post a copy of the "Benchmark report, Webster Groves School District, Enrollment Projections Study, June, 2016" or direct me where to find it to read it? It is referenced in Dr. Kofron's enrollment report, so is important for anyone interested, to read it. Thank you. ☺

2. "Accordingly, the District reached out to Tyler Technologies to access their student information system for records of students enrolled in District schools as of September 30 from 2007 through 2015.These data were geocoded and assigned to District attendance areas based on address location."

Regarding the resident enrollment figures cited in "Graph 1: Total Resident Enrollments and Projections" and in "Graph 4: Elementary Enrollments and Projections", I understand, the years 2016-17 and beyond are represented as projections, based upon the 2015 actual births, w/ low, medium and high estimates, as are the enrollment projections in "Table 4: Total District Resident Enrollments and Projections"

My questions are:

- a. *Could the actual 2016-17 enrollment also be represented in these graphs, based upon the September, 2016 membership?*

- b. *Because, in 2016-17 the variable of free full day kindergarten has been introduced, is the 2009-10 to the future projection valid? Do you think some who would have "sat out" non-mandatory kindergarten might now enroll their children, changing the projection model?*
3. "These data were inserted into the District's projection model which overwrote the input base data used previously to generate cohort survival ratios and enrollment projections."

What is the "District's projection model", please?

4. "The District obtained 2015 births under a continuing (protocol) agreement with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services (MoDHSS). These data included birth month and maternal addresses within zip codes intersected by the District's boundary. A total of 2,461 birth records were processed. A total of 2,461 birth records were processed. Of the total, 2,405 were matched to St. Louis County address points and street centerlines. These data were spatially joined to the District's boundary and attendance area map. There were 434 address locations within the District's boundaries. The remaining 56 addresses were manually reviewed by District staff and 7 records were found to be District addresses. These records were added to the Charles Kofron, Ph.D. Page 5 appropriate attendance areas and Kindergarten cohort counts. The final results are shown in the table below.

Table 1: Geocoding Summary for 2015 District Birth Records Attendance Area * Cohort
 Crosstabulation*with manual review results Count Cohort 2020 2021 Total Attendance Areas Avery
 41 39 80 Bristol 42 40 82 Clark 40 38 78 Edgar Road 67 46 113 Hudson 61 27 88 Total 251 190 441"

I understand the 441 live births in 2015 within the WGSD boundaries. I don't see, however, any report of the actual percentage of these children who eventually entered WGSD at kindergarten, or, perhaps, more importantly, at first grade, since some parents forgo district kindergarten/use private kindergartens.

Please, is there an actual percentage reported of live births/WGSD to actual enrollment for the years already known? Maybe I am just missing it.

5. "Using the mid projection cohort survival ratio for birth to Kindergarten, roughly 75% of the District's households enroll their children in District Kindergarten classes and about 25% either forego and use other Kindergarten services."

This is related to my question in #4, above. I interpret; the "survival ratio for birth to Kindergarten" was estimated to be at about 75%. What were the actual numbers/percentages for years past, please?

6. "Differences in projections between the benchmark report and this update are due to the use of the September 30 resident enrollment counts and the 2015 birth data which effect the last two years of the projection interval"

Please could I receive a copy of the "Benchmark Report", or, better yet, could you post it publicly tomorrow? Others reading this enrollment report will also see it referenced and may also wish to read it. Thank you! ☺

7. "District-Level Findings The addition of 2015 births to the District's projection model and the adjustment of student enrollment records in all academic years to September 30 increased the total resident enrollment projections in the mid and 5yrAve series between 2015-16 and 2021-22 by more than 7% and by more than 2% in the snapshot projection series. The trend lines of the 5 series of projections are shown in the graph below".

It appears to me, there is a great variation in the resident student enrollment, even between the "high" and "mid" estimates, and even more so between the "high" and "low" estimates. Even the 2017-18 total enrollment, projected "Graph 1: Total Resident Enrollments and Projections", which is fairly predictable, I would think, since it is next year, shows a large difference of 464 children between the high estimate of 4481 and the low estimate of 4017. This is about 10% of the current enrollment, much higher than the not even ~1% increase in total enrollment we have been seeing for the past few years and ~2-7% increase above the "midpoint"

Table presented in the superintendent's November, 9, 2015 Enrollment report to the WGSD BOE- TOTAL WGSD Enrollment

K-12 Student Enrollment over Time												
	04-05	05-06	06-07	07-08	08-09	09-10	10-11	11-12	12-13	13-14	14-15	15-16
Enrollment	4107	4068	4106	4132	4183	4249	4271	4327	4366	4395	4386	4417
Increase from Previous Year		-39	+38	+26	+51	+66	+22	+56	+39	+29	-9	+31

How can any projections help that don't show the total enrollment? Again, maybe these are all contained in the "Benchmark Report, or I am missing them. Isn't knowing the total resident enrollment a good "baseline", but the "total district enrollment" the real "bottom line" you need?

Summary Section Question

"Births in the District generally correspond to changes in Kindergarten enrollments. Birth counts by Kindergarten cohort year are typically higher than respective Kindergarten class totals which indicates that a portion of the District's households are using other than public Kindergarten

services. Such a trend is more typical of District's with stable populations and also is indicative of greater confidence in using births to project Kindergarten enrollments. Using the mid projection cohort survival ratio for birth to Kindergarten, roughly 75% of the District's households enroll their children in District Kindergarten classes and about 25% either forego and use other Kindergarten services. These observations may change with the addition of resident 2016 Kindergarten fall enrollments."

- a. *Where are the actual birth to kindergarten cohort figures for past years and this year, please? Maybe they are in the "Benchmark Report" or I am missing them. Would be the most accurate baseline for future projections?*
- b. *As Dr. Kofron notes, his projected ~25% forgoing kindergarten or using other services could change." Is he aware of the new, free FDK variable? I think it might change, as he states, related to the new free FDK. Given this variable, should the cohort change to birth-1st grade to be certain it is standardized w/ no major variable across time?*

Recommendations Section Questions

1. "As data become available from the official fall resident counts as of 30 September 2016, the District should incorporate these counts into the enrollment projections model which may require geocoding or address matching to place students within attendance areas. The addition of these data will change the cohort survival ratios that were used to project enrollments and the enrollment projections".
 - a. *What is the "enrollment projections model", please? Thank you. ☺*
 - b. *What data does Dr. Kofron refer to when he writes, "... (following the) addition of "these data" will change the cohort survival ratios that were used to project enrollments and the enrollment projections"?*
2. "The District should consider comparing the 2009-15 resident enrollment counts with the enrollment counts reported by MoDESE for September 30. This comparison will show the differences in enrollments due to a variety of administrative actions."

What does this statement, above, in #2, mean, please? Thanks.

Thank you very much for your help. Perhaps my questions will help prepare Dr. Kofron, the board members or those of you in administration for answering questions I have a "lay person" reading the

report. Perhaps all my questions will be fully answered tomorrow night. If it is possible to post the "Benchmark Report" or send it to me in advance of the meeting, that, too, may answer my questions.

Have a great day tomorrow and thank you all for your time.

Sincerely,

Kim Mumm, citizen