

SCHOOL BOARD SUB-DISTRICT PLAN SUMMARY

At a working meeting of the Urbana School Board on November 22, 2011, three map alternatives (Plans) were created interactively. This was a collaborative effort between the School Board and staff from the Champaign County Regional Planning Commission (CCRPC) and Champaign County GIS Consortium (CCGIS). School Board members made suggestions regarding the modification of district boundaries. As adjustments were completed during the meeting, population statistics were updated allowing Board Members to understand the impact of their decisions on total district population, minority majority, and college aged students (18-24).

All three plans meet the seven criteria identified by the School Board.

1. Sub-districts that are substantially equal population based on the 2010 US Census
2. Sub-districts that are contiguous in territory
3. Sub-districts that are compact
4. Sub-districts maintain proper minority balance in compliance with voter rights act
5. Sub-districts that exhibit minimal disruption to the current board districts
6. Sub-districts that exhibit equitable distribution of University of Illinois students
7. Sub-districts where at least 2 BOE representatives are attached to a current elementary school attendance area

Summary statements

- The average difference in district population is:
 - 187 for Plan 1
 - 187 for Plan 2
 - 217 for Plan 3
- The difference in population between the largest and smallest district is:
 - 535 for Plan 1
 - 495 for Plan 2
 - 551 for Plan 3
- Federal standards are met for equal population with an overall range percent variance of below 10% with:
 - 7.98% for Plan 1
 - 7.38% for Plan 2
 - 8.22% for Plan 3
- The sub-districts comply with the voter rights act with District 2 achieving a minority majority for ages 24 and over. District 3 achieves a majority for Plan 1 and Plan 2.

1. POPULATION CHARACTERISTICS – SUBSTANTIALLY EQUAL POPULATION

The following population characteristics show a substantially equal population having a low Mean Deviation and meet federal standards with an overall range percent variance below 10%.

Population Statistics

	Plan 1	Plan 2	Plan 3	<i>A good performer will have...</i>
Average District Population	6,706	6,706	6,706	
Standard Deviation	215	217	248	<i>lower numbers</i>
Mean Deviation	187	187	217	<i>lower numbers</i>
Mean Deviation (%)	2.79%	2.79%	3.24%	<i>lower percentages</i>
Absolute Overall Range	535	495	551	<i>lower numbers</i>
Overall Range Ratio	1.08	1.08	1.09	<i>a ratio of 1</i>
Overall Range % Variance	7.98%	7.38%	8.22%	<i>Less than 10%</i>
Smallest Majority (%)	55.75%	55.75%	55.52%	<i>percentages greater than 50% and closer to 57%</i>

2. CONTIGUOUS IN TERRITORY

No statistical measure is available, for this criterion. However, the maps illustrate contiguous districts.

3. COMPACTNESS

The following tests compare the shape of the districts to a circle, which is considered the most compact shape. Plan three scores the best compared to the others, however the values are all quite similar indicating comparable compactness across all alternatives.

Statistical Tests for Compactness

	Plan 1	Plan 2	Plan 3	<i>A good performer will have...</i>
Polsby Popper	0.44	0.44	0.45	<i>a value of 1</i>
Roeck Test	0.42	0.40	0.45	<i>a value of 1</i>
Ehrenburg Test	0.37	0.36	0.39	<i>a value of 1</i>

4. MINORITY BALANCE

Utilizing the criteria established by the School Board, CCGISC staff was unable to create a minority majority district for total population or voting age population. However, District 2 in each plan achieves a minority majority for the population ages 25 and over, with 56.2 % being Black and African American. District 3 achieves a minority majority for the population ages 25 and over in Plans 1 and 2. Technically, District 3 in Plan 3 does not achieve a minority majority, but is very close at 50% Black and African American.

Black and African American Population for District 3

	Plan 1	Plan 2	Plan 3
Total Population 25 and Over	1,987	1,987	2,046
Total Black and African American Population 25 and Over	1,016	1,016	1,023
Percent Black and African American 25 and Over	51.1%	51.1%	50.0%

5. MINIMAL DISRUPTION TO CURRENT BOUNDARIES

A visual review of the maps will show that the least disruptive alternatives are Plans 1 and 2, while plan three is the most disruptive.

6. EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION OF UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS STUDENTS

U.S. Census Data does not provide statistics specifically for the local student population. This criterion was estimated using the 18 to 24-year age cohort. Districts 4 and 5 in each of the plans contain residential areas adjacent to campus with a larger share of the 18 to 24-year age cohort. The remaining districts have fairly equitable distribution of this age cohort.

Population for 18 to 24-year Age Cohort

	Plan 1	Plan 2	Plan 3
District 1	2,884	2,884	2,855
District 2	4,207	4,207	4,207
District 3	3,042	3,042	3,077
District 4	5,267	5,267	5,267
District 5	5,428	5,541	5,541
District 6	3,083	3,079	3,076
District 7	3,448	3,342	3,336

7. AT LEAST 2 BOARD OF EDUCATION REPRESENTATIVES ATTACHED TO CURRENT ATTENDANCE AREAS

The table below shows the number of representatives by attendance area for each plan. All three plans meet the criterion of having a minimum of 2 representatives for each attendance area.

Number of Representatives by Attendance Area

	Plan 1	Plan 2	Plan 3
King	3	3	3
Leal	5	6	6
Prairie	2	2	2
Thomas Paine	4	3	3
Wiley	4	6	6
Yankee Ridge	2	2	2