Boundary Adjustment Committee Meeting Minutes

February 13, 2020
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Greg Forsyth  Jennifer Keck  Kevin Morrison  Michael Warnecke
Dani Galvez  Steph Lundberg  Beth Nye
Jerrall Haynes  Matt McFarland  Joe Phipps
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WELCOME AND REGROUNDING
Dr. Mark Anderson, Associate Superintendent, welcomed everyone, including School Board members in attendance, Jerrall Haynes and Kevin Morrison, and reminded everyone of the purpose of this committee – to study and recommend boundary adjustments to accommodate for three new middle schools and student growth using the guiding principles set forth by the School Board. Phil Crocker gave an overview of the ThoughtExchange tool used in the previous meeting and reviewed the responses to the question: “What are the most important things for this committee to focus on?” Equity/equal quality, creating diversity and keeping neighborhoods together were the topics that rose to the top. Haruim Martin-Morris touched on the idea of “quality,” noting that the committee will work in the next meeting to generally define what “quality” will mean to this group.
OVERVIEW OF DEMOGRAPHICS

Data-master Craig Numata presented a slide deck giving a high-level look at demographics across the district. The data showed enrollment, free and reduced lunch (FRL) rates, white/non-white student populations, special education and English language development (ELD) by school level and option schools. The data shows greater differences in demographics between elementary schools than between middle schools and high schools, however the data is not an exact picture for boundaries, with option and special education programs being available within certain schools drawing students from outside their attendance boundaries.

MAPPING EXERCISES

In table groups, the committee engaged in two mapping exercises. The first exercise used a large paper district map. Groups were asked to place red-colored dots on schools where the FRL rate was 45% or greater and yellow, blue or green dots (dependent on school level) on the schools with a lower rate. The intent of the exercise was for the committee to see the reality of poverty across the school district. The second exercise built upon the first exercise and had groups look at printed maps of the current middle school boundaries and four scenarios of example new boundaries. The maps used dots to represent every middle school student at their address of record. The boundary scenarios solved only for creating middle schools of near-equal size. But groups were also given the FRL rate data for each scenario and asked to consider the equity in poverty between schools as the boundaries changed in each scenario. Groups discussed amongst themselves which they preferred, why and what they would change if they were making their own boundary scenarios. Then the committee discussed as a group.

DISCUSSION

Phil Crocker led a large group discussion about the exercises, noting that even with just the two variables of size and poverty, this is a complex challenge the committee is taking on. The first comment from a committee member centered around the accuracy of addresses of record for students. Craig Numata noted that the data does not reflect students who have “choiced” into schools outside their boundary but is the best representation possible from the data tool. Another committee member asked how outside-the-box the committee can think about these scenarios. Phil responded that the limits are the variables being considered and natural geographic constraints, otherwise open to all ideas. The final comment was that equality and quality cannot be separated when programming is also layered on – all schools should have the same quality programming, so families don’t feel they have to “choice” their student into another school. Programming will be addressed next meeting by Dr. Adam Swinyard, Associate Superintendent, and will be part of the larger discussion on “quality.”
CLOSING NEXT STEPS

All of the scenarios and maps have been shared with the committee via BaseCamp. Committee members should share their comments under the “Base Scenario” to comment about the scenarios presented in the meeting.

The next committee meeting is on February 27th.

ADJOURNMENT:

8:00 p.m.