



Public Input Session Survey Results

Introduction

A Public Input Session was held on December 12, 2017 during which the progress of the Great Falls Public Schools (GFPS) boundary adjustment process was made available to the public. Each option developed by the committee was displayed on large maps along with tables indicating how each met the guiding principles issued by GFPS. It is approximated that 150 community members visited the Public Input Session. The public was encouraged to complete questionnaires with their feedback regarding each boundary option, for the committee's consideration. These questionnaires were accepted via an online survey until January 2, 2018.

The data that is presented as a result of this Public Input Session should be used as a tool to help facilitate the study. **It should not be used ALONE as a decision-making tool for the Boundary adjustment process.** The committee will utilize data from the input session (in this report), and will focus on the study guidelines as the primary criteria for developing the study's plan.

Analysis Methodology

Received online surveys were exported to an excel spreadsheet. The spreadsheet tracked the date the comment was received, the Elementary School zone the respondent is associated with, and the respondent's comments on each option

In order to gain a better understanding of the responses, respondents were asked to provide their general attitude towards a comment based on the following categories: *Approve, Dislike, Like, Neutral, and Oppose*. Respondents were also asked to provide a reason for concern if they did not support an option, in order to gain a better understanding of the nature of the objection. The prominent concern themes were Enrollment, Neighborhood, Transportation, Feeder Pattern, and Demographic Concerns.

Page three provides summaries of comments based on prominent concerns, which will help the committee to determine which options to move forward with and modify.

General Summaries from Public Input Session

There were a total of 652 option attitude responses and 474 typed comments from 255 respondents collected regarding the options presented.

Comment Summary		
Total Responses to "Additional Thoughts and Observations?"		
ES Option A	197	41.6%
ES Option B	148	31.2%
ES Option C	129	27.2%
ES Total	474	100.0%

Comment Summary	
Total Responses to "What is your overall attitude toward an option?"	
Total Responses	652

In addition to these responses, the options saw a total of 290 responses to the question: *"If you dislike or oppose an option, what is your primary concern?"*

Comment Summary	
Total Responses to "If you dislike or oppose an option, what is your primary concern?"	
Total Responses	290

In order to gain a better understanding of where the majority of the respondents are coming from throughout the district, the respondents were asked *"In which elementary school zone do you live?"*

Total Respondents by Live-In Elementary		
Live-In Elementary Zone	Total Respondents	Percent of Respondents
Chief Joseph	6	2.35%
Lewis And Clark	8	3.14%
Lincoln	16	6.27%
Longfellow	2	0.78%
Loy	3	1.18%
Meadow Lark	117	45.88%
Morningside	9	3.53%
Mountain View	11	4.31%
Riverview	29	11.37%
Roosevelt	8	3.14%
Sacajawea	6	2.35%
Sunnyside	7	2.75%
Valley View	9	3.53%
West	15	5.88%
Whittier	9	3.53%
Total	255	

Option Attitude Summary Tables for All Submitted Comments

The following provides a general summary on the community’s overall attitude related to the Options. Important points to consider as you read this set of tables:

1. The majority of responses that were submitted were in regard to the most suitable Option for their particular neighborhood / subdivision.
2. As is evident in the ‘Total Respondents by Live-In Elementary School Zone’ table on the previous page, the geographic distribution of respondents is uneven, so these summary tables should not be used as the ONLY defining factor or indicator over which Options are best suited for the entire district.
3. The committee needs to maintain focus on building a solution that best meets the Redistricting guidelines.

Elementary Options Attitude Summary

When asked ‘What is your overall attitude toward an ES option?’ the largest percentage of respondents said they Approved ES Option C. ES Option A had the highest percentage of opposition.

Elementary Options Attitude Summary						
Option Attitude	ES Option A		ES Option B		ES Option C	
Approve	40	15.7%	40	19.6%	74	38.3%
Like	14	5.5%	18	8.8%	17	8.8%
Neutral	54	21.2%	49	24.0%	47	24.4%
Dislike	45	17.6%	20	9.8%	14	7.3%
Oppose	102	40.0%	77	37.7%	41	21.2%
Total	255	100.0%	204	100.0%	193	100.0%

Elementary Primary Concerns Summary Tables

The tables below show what the primary concerns were for those that *OPPOSED* a plan.

Elementary School Options Primary Concern Summary						
Prominent Theme	ES Option A		ES Option B		ES Option C	
Enrollment	14	10.0%	11	11.6%	10	18.2%
Neighborhood	50	35.7%	14	14.7%	12	21.8%
Transportation	58	41.4%	54	56.8%	22	40.0%
Feeder Pattern	3	2.1%	3	3.2%	5	9.1%
Demographics	15	10.7%	13	13.7%	6	10.9%
Total	140	100.0%	95	100.0%	55	100.0%

Options Attitude Summary by Respondents Live-In Elementary Zone

The tables below show the options attitude summaries broken out by the Live-In zones of the survey respondents.

Elementary Option A Attitude Summary by Respondent Live-In Elementary Zone								
Live-In Zone	Approve	Like	Neutral	Dislike	Oppose	Total	Percent Approve	Percent Oppose
Chief Joseph	1	1	1	1	2	6	16.7%	33.3%
Lewis And Clark	3		2	1	2	8	37.5%	25.0%
Lincoln	3		5	5	3	16	18.8%	18.8%
Longfellow				1	1	2	0.0%	50.0%
Loy	2				1	3	66.7%	33.3%
Meadow Lark	10	7	20	18	62	117	8.5%	53.0%
Morningside	1		7		1	9	11.1%	11.1%
Mountain View	2	1	4	2	2	11	18.2%	18.2%
Riverview	1	2	3	4	19	29	3.4%	65.5%
Roosevelt	7	1				8	87.5%	0.0%
Sacajawea	2		2	1	1	6	33.3%	16.7%
Sunnyside	1		1	4	1	7	14.3%	14.3%
Valley View	1	1	3	2	2	9	11.1%	22.2%
West	3	1	4	3	4	15	20.0%	26.7%
Whittier	3		2	3	1	9	33.3%	11.1%

Elementary Option B Attitude Summary by Respondent Live-In Elementary Zone								
Live-In Zone	Approve	Like	Neutral	Dislike	Oppose	Total	Percent Approve	Percent Oppose
Chief Joseph	2		3	1		6	33.3%	0.0%
Lewis And Clark	1		3		1	5	20.0%	20.0%
Lincoln	2	1	3	2	4	12	16.7%	33.3%
Longfellow		1		1		2	0.0%	0.0%
Loy	2		1			3	66.7%	0.0%
Meadow Lark	19	8	16	7	47	97	19.6%	48.5%
Morningside	1		4		1	6	16.7%	16.7%
Mountain View	3	2	2	1	1	9	33.3%	11.1%
Riverview	1	2	3	4	16	26	3.8%	61.5%
Roosevelt	4	1	2			7	57.1%	0.0%
Sacajawea	1	1	1	1	1	5	20.0%	20.0%
Sunnyside		2	2		1	5	0.0%	20.0%
Valley View	1		3		1	5	20.0%	20.0%
West	1		4	1	4	10	10.0%	40.0%
Whittier	2		2	2		6	33.3%	0.0%

Elementary Option C Attitude Summary by Respondent Live-In Elementary Zone								
Live-In Zone	Approve	Like	Neutral	Dislike	Oppose	Total	Percent Approve	Percent Oppose
Chief Joseph	1	1	2	1	1	6	16.7%	16.7%
Lewis And Clark	1		3		1	5	20.0%	20.0%
Lincoln	1		4	3	4	12	8.3%	33.3%
Longfellow	1			1		2	50.0%	0.0%
Loy	2		1			3	66.7%	0.0%
Meadow Lark	54	11	15		10	90	60.0%	11.1%
Morningside	1		4		1	6	16.7%	16.7%
Mountain View	3	2	3	1		9	33.3%	0.0%
Riverview	1	1	3	5	14	24	4.2%	58.3%
Roosevelt	4		2		1	7	57.1%	14.3%
Sacajawea	2	1	2			5	40.0%	0.0%
Sunnyside			2	1	2	5	0.0%	40.0%
Valley View	1	1	2		1	5	20.0%	20.0%
West	2		3	1	4	10	20.0%	40.0%
Whittier			1	1	2	4	0.0%	50.0%

Conclusion

To summarize, the data presented in this summary report will be utilized as a tool to help the committee prioritize the options. However, the results of the Public Input session should not be the only deciding factor when reviewing the options due to the uneven distribution of respondents across the district.