

Present: Larry Otos, Henk Kruihof, Basilia Quiroz, LuAnne Burkhart, Grace Arnold, Bill Nutting, Spencer Welch, Jim Hinckle, Amelia Guerra, Pam Lammon, Michelle Reneau, Jennifer Larson, Anna Hoxie, Tosha Phillips, Mary Polley

Spencer welcome the committee and expressed his appreciation for their participation; introductions by committee members.

Following a review of the January 22 minutes, LuAnne made a motion to approve the minutes, motion seconded by Pam, unanimously approved.

Bill introduced Mary Polley, transportation dispatcher and router who played a large part in developing the map for committee review.

The committee looked at two (2) maps—one which represents the current district boundaries and the second map which represents a first proposal for consideration and evaluation through the lens of the three (3) guidelines—safety, equity and efficiency.

Bill and Jim provided an overview of the Option #1 map which captures attendance areas that keep the overall enrollment balanced. Geographically, the Washington Elementary and Centennial Elementary show modest boundary changes—the largest changes are to Jefferson Elementary and Little Mountain Elementary which need to incorporate Lincoln Elementary boundaries and identifies a new area for Rowley Elementary.

Option #1 boundaries are strictly based on enrollment numbers; the boundaries do not reflect demographics. Pam noticed that an area between Division Street and Fir Street is split between two schools—Bill explained this is a high density population area. Jim and Mary identified geographic ‘pods’ within the city that represent a neighborhood easily transported by bus—as the committee reviews the maps, a pod could shift from one elementary school to another to balance enrollment/ demographics.

Bill added that part of the demographic review is the desire that the school reflect the community as a whole in terms of ethnicity and socio-economics; he shared a summary of Latina/Latino and Caucasian ethnic percentages based on Option #1 map, however, additional work is needed for accurate data. Jim reported that the enrollment numbers on the map do not include special needs students nor 70 McKinney Vento students who do not live in the district.

Larry asked how expansion of the dual language program at Madison to another elementary will impact the boundary work. Bill replied that expansion of a dual language program would progress grade by grade and could be on a dual track with an existing elementary program.

Bill asked Anna, Jim and Mary to look at gathering demographic information related to Free & Reduced lunch, students eligible for the transitional bilingual program (English language learners who need ELL support) as well as Special Education students. The Free & Reduced data is the best source of information related to the socio-economic status of students/families.

The committee divided into small groups to review the maps, identify specific questions, consider the Option #1 map in terms of safety, equity and efficiency as well as decide if more information needed.

Jim added that there is some efficiency built into Option #1 map related to the one-mile walk zone.

Following small group review, the teams identified the following general questions:

1. Is there a way to view just the boundary differences rather than the whole map—this would help to identify and track changes? How many students are represented by the changes? This information will meet one of the committee’s considerations which is ‘minimal amount of impact’.
2. What are the safety issues? Will any students have to cross a main street (Division, College Way)—can those be highlighted on the map?
3. Are we able to determine the costs associated with the boundary changes?
4. Is there a way to show the one-mile walk zone for each school (Jim noted that the one mile walk zone is superseded if there is a major street crossing)?
5. There is a small section between Division Street and Fir Street (red/blue boundary line)—what if those areas were swapped? Parents are going to want an explanation why one side of the street attends one school and the other side, another school. Why singled out?
6. On 30th Street (south of College Way) there is a little section that is allocated to Centennial which would mean a number of students cross College Way...Jim noted that those students are currently (and would remain) bussed.
7. Is the middle school system going to change? Feeder schools?
8. Is there any area that is already Madison ‘heavy’ or are they spread out?
9. Are private schools in Mount Vernon affected by MVSD boundary changes? Does it matter?

What additional information is needed?

1. Demographic information

The committee expressed interest in looking at the geographic pods - how many students are in the pod? Demographics tied to the pod? If a pod is moved from one attendance area to another, what is the impact?

Bill and Jim will provide a response to the questions at the next committee meeting. The committee applauded the work by Jim and Mary.

A presentation of the Boundary Adjustment Committee work to date will be given to the School Board on Wednesday, March 7 and to the Citizen’s Advisory Committee on March 12.

Next committee meeting dates -

- Monday, March 26, 6-8 pm, District Office/Large Conference Room
- Monday, April 9, 6-8 pm, District Office/Staff Development Room

At the March 26 meeting, the committee will analyze the proposal further; the district team may also provide some modifications/options to the map. The goal is to identify two options that can be taken to community meetings so parents and the community can provide feedback. Community meetings will be open to all parents/community and held at three (3) school sites in April (April 23-25).

The committee also asked for district guidance regarding the transition period - will waivers be granted? Will students/families be grandfathered? What is impact to out-of-district students?