



Mount Pleasant Community
School District

School Board Work Session

January 26, 2026

Agenda

1. Purpose, Charge, and Process
2. Shared Values and Decision Guardrails
3. From Ideas to Board-Ready Scenarios
4. Scenario Analysis and Board Considerations

Purpose of Tonight's Work Session

The purpose is to:

- Review the committee's process and guardrails
- Understand four board-ready facility scenarios
- Explore strengths, concerns, and tradeoffs
- Identify what additional information the Board may need



How to Use This Session

What tonight is designed for:

- Open questions
- Testing assumptions
- Naming tensions
- Clarifying implications

What tonight is not:

- Selecting a preferred option
- Debating funding mechanisms
- Making closure decisions



Superintendent Opening

- *Thank committee and community*
- *Reinforce advisory role*
- *Emphasize Board authority*
- *Acknowledge emotion without defending outcomes*



The Committee's Charge

What the Committee Was Asked to Do

- Engage community and stakeholders
- Identify shared values
- Explore multiple future scenarios
- Present implications clearly to the Board

Report reference: Sections 2.1-2.3 (pp. 6-7)

What the Committee Was NOT Asked to Do

The committee did not:

- Recommend a preferred scenario
- Rank or eliminate options
- Conduct cost modeling
- Make decisions on closures or consolidation

Report reference: Sections 2.1-2.3 (pp. 6-7)

Engagement Process at a Glance

October–December Engagement Process

- Community meeting
- Visioning and values
- Facility and comparative tours
(attendance centers, Fort Madison,
Central Campus)
- Current reality analysis
- Scenario development

Report reference: Sections 3.1-3.6 (pp. 8-10)



Shared North Star

Elementary Facilities North Star

Every Mount Pleasant Community School District elementary student learns and grows in safe, secure, and welcoming spaces designed to support curiosity, belonging, and equitable opportunities, reflecting our community's shared care, commitment, and stewardship today, and for generations to come.

Report reference: Section 4.1 (p. 11)



Decision Guardrails Identified

Non-Negotiables Identified by the Committee

- Safety and security
- Dedicated, functional learning spaces
- Equity across student experiences
- Operational viability
- Long-term stewardship

Report reference: Section 3.7 (p. 10)

Tensions the Committee Did Not Resolve

Acknowledged, but not resolved

- Neighborhood schools vs. equity
- Incremental change vs. transformational change
- Distributed sites vs. centralized campus
- Stability vs. long-term sustainability

Report reference: Section 4.3 (p. 12)

What the Committee Consistently Heard

Across all meetings and data

- Safety and space limitations are real
- Student experience varies by building
- Staffing and operations are strained
- Maintaining multiple buildings has consequences

Report reference: Sections 5.1-5.5 (pp. 13-15)

From Ideas to Scenarios

How scenarios were generated

- Plain-language descriptions
- No cost or feasibility filtering
- Focus on structure, not details
- Committee-created, not consultant-driven

Report reference: Sections 6.1-6.3 (pp. 16-17)



Voting Results

Scenarios advanced for deeper analysis

- Top two vote-getters: 30 votes each
- Next two: 16 and 14 votes
- Significant drop after four scenarios

The following four scenarios are presented in the same order and structure as the committee report; no scenario is preferred or ranked

Report reference: Appendix E (p. 30)

Scenario A: PK–5 Central Campus with Daycare

What Works Well

- Unified student experience
- Dedicated spaces and services
- Operational efficiencies

Concerns & Tradeoffs

- Scale and logistics
- Loss of neighborhood schools
- Implementation complexity

Board-Level Question

- Does the educational and operational benefit outweigh the scale and disruption of full centralization?

Report reference: Section 7.1 (p.18) & Appendix G.1. (p. 32)



Scenario B: Close Three Elementary Buildings and Operate Two Elementary Schools

What Works Well

- Improves equity of experience
- Reduces staffing inefficiencies
- Creates more dedicated spaces

Concerns & Tradeoffs

- Closure impact on communities
- Transportation adjustments
- Transition complexity

Board-Level Question

- Is the community prepared for school closures in exchange for improved equity and efficiency?

Report reference: Section 7.2 (pp.18-19) & Appendix G.2. (p. 33)



Scenario C: Close All Elementary Schools and Reconfigure the Middle School

What Works Well

- Maximizes consolidation
- Reduces facility footprint
- Potential cost efficiencies

Concerns & Tradeoffs

- Age-appropriateness
- Space limitations
- Community acceptance

Board-Level Question

- Is reconfiguring existing secondary facilities appropriate for elementary learners?

Report reference: Section 7.3 (pp.19-20) & Appendix G.3. (p. 34)



Scenario D: Maintain All Elementary Schools with Incremental Improvements

What Works Well

- Preserves neighborhood schools
- Minimizes disruption
- Familiar to families and staff

Concerns & Tradeoffs

- Safety and space limitations remain
- Ongoing staffing inefficiencies
- Long-term sustainability questions

Board-Level Question

- How financially feasible is it to remodel and maintain all elementary buildings long term?

Report reference: Section 7.4 (p.20) & Appendix G.4. (p. 35)

Comparing the Scenarios

Across all four scenarios

- No option solves everything
- All involve trade offs
- All require community trust
- All demand long-term stewardship

Report reference: Appendix H. (p. 36)



<i>Decision Lens</i>	<i>Scenario A PK–5 Central Campus + Daycare</i>	<i>Scenario B Close Three, Operate Two</i>	<i>Scenario C Reconfigure Middle School</i>	<i>Scenario D Maintain All Elementary Schools</i>
<i>Student Experience</i>	Unified experience for all PK–5 students	More consistent across students	Consistent, but dependent on redesign	Varies by building; familiar environments
<i>Equity Across the District</i>	High consistency and equity	Improved equity across remaining schools	High consistency, with fit concerns	Differences persist between schools
<i>Facilities & Space</i>	Purpose-built or adaptable centralized space	Better use of fewer buildings	Repurposed space not designed for elementary	Incremental improvements within existing

<i>Decision Lens</i>	<i>Scenario A PK–5 Central Campus + Daycare</i>	<i>Scenario B Close Three, Operate Two</i>	<i>Scenario C Reconfigure Middle School</i>	<i>Scenario D Maintain All Elementary Schools</i>
<i>Safety & Security</i>	Centralized design allows comprehensive approach	Improved through consolidation	Dependent on extent of reconfiguration	Improvements possible, structural
<i>Staffing & Collaboration</i>	Strong collaboration through centralization	Improved collaboration and efficiency	Centralized, but with grade-level complexity	Ongoing challenges across
<i>Operations & Logistics</i>	Highly centralized operations	Simplified operations	Centralized, but with transition impacts	Complex, distributed operations

<i>Decision Lens</i>	<i>Scenario A PK–5 Central Campus + Daycare</i>	<i>Scenario B Close Three, Operate Two</i>	<i>Scenario C Reconfigure Middle School</i>	<i>Scenario D Maintain All Elementary Schools</i>
<i>Community Identity</i>	Shift toward system-wide identity	Mixed: loss of some neighborhood schools	Significant shift away from neighborhood model	Strong neighborhood
<i>Transportation Impacts</i>	Increased for many families	Increased for some families	Increased for most families	Minimal change
<i>Flexibility for the Future</i>	High flexibility for growth and adaptation	Moderate flexibility	Limited by original building design	Limited by existing buildings

<i>Decision Lens</i>	<i>Scenario A PK–5 Central Campus + Daycare</i>	<i>Scenario B Close Three, Operate Two</i>	<i>Scenario C Reconfigure Middle School</i>	<i>Scenario D Maintain All Elementary Schools</i>
<i>Scale of Change Required</i>	High	Moderate	Very high	Low
<i>Primary Tradeoff</i>	Flexibility vs. scale and disruption	Equity vs. neighborhood presence	Efficiency vs. developmental fit	Stability vs. long-term sustainability

What the Board Is Being Asked to Do

At this stage

- Consider the four scenarios
- Identify strengths and concerns
- Clarify what additional analysis is needed
- Determine what paths merit further exploration

Questions for the Board

- What feels clear?
- What feels unresolved?
- What information do you need next?





Stephen F. Murley
Managing Partner
sfm consulting group, llc
4426 Tempe Place
Iowa City, IA 52246
715-212-5107

sfmurley@gmail.com

[Schedule](#) a time to meet with me

