



Boundary Adjustment Committee Meeting Minutes

June 9, 2020

START TIME:

6:15 p.m., Tuesday, June 9, 2020

FACILITATORS:

Mark Anderson

Phil Crocker

Harium Martin-Morris

Craig Numata

ATTENDING COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

The meeting was attended by over 40 committee members, including SPS staff and a School Board director, via Zoom.

WELCOME AND SCENE-SETTING:

Dr. Mark Anderson welcomed everyone and began by reminding the committee of its purpose and guidelines. Phil Crocker then moved right in to previewing the work ahead in the meeting. Craig Numata developed four scenarios – 76, 77, 78 and 79. In this meeting, the committee looked at scenarios 76 and 77. Craig provided an overview of both maps and the associated demographic data. The facilitators then answered questions and provided some additional context.

- At this point, no elementary boundaries have changed in the prepared scenarios, though some elementary to middle school feeder patterns have been split.
- The data assumes all students stay in their geographic boundaries and does not account for students who chose option programs or choice into other schools.
- Capacities at all high schools are similar (1,750-1,900), with the exception of North Central, which is a bit smaller.
- Capacities at all middle schools are similar (750-825), with the exception of Garry, which is smaller as well and which is physically unable to be made any larger.
- There is not currently a scenario that keeps the West Hills area in the south region but one will be brought forward at the next meeting.



DISCUSSION OF SCENARIOS 76 AND 77

The committee broke into small groups and was asked to look at scenarios 76 and 77, answering four questions about each scenario and accompanying data focused on alignment with the Boundary Guidelines. When the committee came back together, each small group reported highlights of their discussions and answers to the question posed. Each group came back with different perspectives and areas of focus. Some focused on school size and feeder patterns from middle to high schools. Some focused on geography and transit issues. Others focused on the demographics and creating a balance between schools' free and reduced lunch rates.

- Many groups reported that they had concerns with both scenarios, and they both need some tweaking.
- A few groups said they felt the demographic data in scenario 77 was more balanced.
- Many groups noted the large swing in enrollment at Glover from one scenario to the other.
- One committee member, who is also an administrator, noted that in the pursuit of smaller schools we need to keep in mind enrollment numbers drive staffing and funding. So reducing enrollment could potentially reduce elective programming. Additional conversation noted that LC was significantly smaller in both scenarios while high schools with higher free and reduced lunch percentages were much larger and this imbalance ran counter to research about how best to size schools.
- Another member pointed out that in both scenarios North Central had the highest enrollment, however it has the lowest capacity of all the high schools.
- There was also some concern about WIAA classification for high schools as their sizes change.
- One group said they thought scenario 76 was better on the south side geographically for keeping neighborhoods together, but had a large variance in free and reduced lunch rates.
- The same group thought scenario 77 was better on the north side for neighborhoods, noting in scenario 76, the new NE middle school spans across the city and creates long transportation times.
- Groups also expressed thoughts on which middle school is better for Holmes students to feed into based on geography, with one group saying they will likely be bused either way as there is no school within walking distance for most students.
- One committee member commented that dropping LC enrollment to the point of being the smallest high school in the District would be hard to communicate to the community and unwelcomed news due to recent expansion of the building.



Craig said the committee would talk further about the goal enrollment at each school. Phil also said the West Hills area needs additional conversation. He also said there is a plan to make adjustments for projected growth in the District later in the process. Finally, the committee was polled on which scenario they preferred – 80% preferred scenario 77, and 20% were in favor of 76.

CLOSING NEXT STEPS

The committee has one more meeting before taking a break for summer and will review scenarios 78 and 79 as well as additional scenarios generated from this meeting's feedback. The next meeting will be **TUESDAY, June 16 – 6:15-8 p.m.**

Maps and demographical data are available on Base Camp as well as the scenario review form. Please review ahead of the next meeting. Please post ideas and questions to BaseCamp for Craig to potentially take action on prior to the meeting.