Boundary Adjustment Committee Meeting Minutes
February 27, 2020

START TIME:
6:30 p.m., Thursday, February 27, 2020

FACILITATORS:
Mark Anderson, SPS Associate Superintendent
Adam Swinyard, SPS Associate Superintendent
Phil Crocker, Boundary Consultant
Harium Martin-Morris, Boundary Consultant
Craig Numata, SPS data master

ATTENDING BOARD AND STAFF MEMBERS:
Andra Atwood                Dani Galvez                Steph Lundberg                Jeremy Ochse
Kale Colyar                 Jerrall Haynes             Matt McFarland               Joe Phipps
Steve Fisk                  Shawn Jordan              Theresa Meyer                Michael Warnecke
Greg Forsyth                Jennifer Keck              Kevin Morrison               Andre Wicks

ATTENDING COMMITTEE MEMBERS:
Chris Barton                Scott Harmon               Amber O'Conner               Rod Tamura
Brent Christensen           Katrina Hawker              Megan Read                  Gary Teale
Rob Dennie                 Ginny Klemman               Keith Reilly                 Jamie Traeger
Anthony Dinaro             Lacie Magin                Shelsea Ribellia             Brian Vandenburg
Aaron Dingfield            Kristin Markham             Peter Richter               
Cassidy Doohan              Kathleen Murray-          Bryan Schultz               
Corina Fletcher            Lohrmeyer                  Julie Shepard               

WELCOME AND REGROUNDING
Dr. Mark Anderson began by reminding everyone of the charge and guidelines from the School Board for the committee’s work, noting that the guidelines have been presented in alphabetical order, not order of importance. Phil Crocker added that amongst the committee, equal quality, diversity and neighborhood schools rose to the top of most important considerations. He also reminded the group of how quickly the work of drawing boundaries became complex at the previous meeting when looking at just two variables. The complexity will continue, and it will be helpful to begin making decisions about scenarios to rule out. Additionally, Mark noted that people have been commenting on BaseCamp, and Craig Numata has been responding. Please keep the committee dialogue online going!
WHAT IS “QUALITY”

Harium Martin-Morris began the conversation about “quality” by saying that quality should not be determined by zip code and that having quality schools goes beyond where boundaries are drawn, it is the vision for the education system going forward. Harium introduced the idea of indicators of quality, noting that SPS has key performance indicators (KPIs) for different grade bands. Adam Swinyard presented a slide deck covering the KPIs defined by SPS for each grade band. Most KPIs are data points, however a “perception of climate” indicator allows for more qualitative input. One question for Adam asked why the SAT is a KPI, to which he responded that the SAT continues to be a gatekeeper for post-secondary education and scholarship opportunities, but as these institutions and programs change how they use the SAT, SPS will evaluate it as well. Another person questioned where art and music were in the KPIs, to which Adam responded that there is an opportunity to discuss this – as nationally we have become so focused on academics, we have lost some wholistic perspective.

Harium then shared a teacher survey on quality indicators from the presentation deck. The number one quality indicator from the teachers surveyed is access to fine arts and other specialties. In table groups, committee members discussed what indicators they would like to see included in the discussion on quality. Reports from groups included the following:

- Balance of programs – not just academics
- Variety and number of programs – like sports, drama, etc.
- Teacher retention – helps to build community
- Balance of programs and going beyond standards – beyond qualified teachers to creative teachers, beyond standard programming to world-class programs
- Opportunity for music and the arts – should be equal from school to school
- Access to the trades – the education system should reflect the variety in the workforce

Harium also presented a quote about the perception of quality and led the group in a discussion, which centered around there being both a perception of quality and actual quality, which may not be the same. To illustrate this, committee members were given a list of unnamed SPS schools with correlating KPI data and were asked to determine which is the highest quality school. Tables discussed as a group before Harium revealed the names of each school.

MAPPING EXERCISE – SOUTH BOUNDARIES

In table groups, the committee looked at three updated scenarios for boundaries on the south end of Spokane. Several variables were part of the discussion – feeder patterns both to middle and high schools, transportation, school size, diversity, geography. After some discussion about ruling out Scenario B, it was decided to continue the discussion on the south side boundary scenarios at the next meeting in order to give the committee time to think on it and for Craig to prepare additional data to help answer questions and ideas brought up at this meeting.
CLOSING AND NEXT STEPS

All scenarios and maps have been shared with the committee via BaseCamp. Committee members should please continue to review and leave comments on the scenarios.

There will be a training on how to use the GuideK-12 data software tool ahead of the next meeting on March 12th at 5:45 p.m. for all committee members who would like to attend.

The next committee meeting is on Thursday, March 12th.

ADJOURNMENT:
8:00 p.m.