

Present: Michelle Reneau, Amelia Guerra, Dave Riddle, Jennifer Larson, Bill Nutting, Spencer Welch, Pam Lammon, Jim Hinckle, LuAnne Burkhart, Mary Polley, Grace Arnold

Spencer welcomed the committee; Annie Reiss, Little Mountain parent, was introduced. The purpose of the meeting is to work through the boundary option shared at the March 5 meeting as well as review demographic information.

Following a review of the March 5 minutes, Jennifer made a motion to approve the minutes, motion seconded by Michelle, unanimously approved.

In response to the questions posed at the March 5 meeting, Bill shared that additional demographic information will be shared in correlation to the Option 1 boundary map as well as a secondary map developed by Jim and Mary which breaks the community into 'pods' (i.e., neighborhoods/smaller pieces of the city) with enrollment, ethnic, socio-economic and migrant demographics which may be useful as tool to make adjustments to Option 1

Jim clarified that Special Education students are included in the enrollment numbers for Option 1 as well as 70 students that attend Mount Vernon schools from out-of-district or are identified as McKinney Vento students.

Bill distributed the demographic breakdown information for Option 1 and the pod map.

The enrollment size of Rowley Elementary is 550 - the number of general ed students will be reduced to accommodate the two (2) life skills classrooms currently housed at Little Mountain shifting to Rowley in September.

LuAnne asked if we will have a school year without portables. Bill responded that is the plan, however, one exception might be a portable requested by Head Start.

The committee broke into small groups to review the Option 1 map, pod map and demographic information.

Following review, Bill and Jim responded to questions.

- *How do we respond to requests for variance?*
- *How is the demographic information derived?* When children register for school, we collect data from parents. A child is identified as migrant because of mobility in pursuit of certain kinds of employment. This makes them eligible for enhanced funding to support their educational needs - the funding follows them as they move from district to district.

Originally looked at ethnic breakdown in all schools; Hispanic and white are predominant with very small percentages in other ethnic groups. The economic factor looks at free and reduced lunch percentages (which is a pretty common data point that drives funding for the district from the state and federal level). Another area is the percentage of students that are eligible for special education or bilingual support (home language other than English)—these factors also drive funding.

When looking at the data, it was noted that there aren't significant changes for the newly created school student body. A primary consideration is equity—are we comfortable with the equity created in Option 1? Is it good enough because it closely mirrors current or is this an opportunity to move the schools to be more equitable? The percentages from school to school are close—what is equitable? 15%, 25%, 10%? Dave added that the idea of 100% is aspirational—striving for balance and equity means closer to balance.

- *Does Option 1 meet the efficiency and safety standards—how do we decide if safe? efficient?* Option 1 was created keeping in mind the one-mile walk zone, efficient bus routes; and safety considerations. Some students live on the wrong side of a busy street, but those student will always be bussed—they won't have to cross a busy street.
- *Madison School area is designated as Rowley attendance area - are any of those students in the Dual Language program? Will this affect Rowley's enrollment?* Dave suggested **Option 2** which would involve pod 10 and pod 105 - currently pod 10 is scheduled to attend Centennial. **Could pod 10 students attend Rowley and pod 105 (which is the neighborhood around Madison) attend Centennial?** This could balance Centennial and Rowley demographics. Pam asked about looking at the **percentage of school size capacity? Current to projected with the Options** would be helpful information for parents to see.
- **Another suggested change - divide pod 12 into pod 12 and pod 13.**
- **Stanford Drive - 4 schools coming out of that area (Block 17-180 students)—could it be reduced to 3 schools?**

For the April 9 meeting, Mary and Jim will incorporate the committee's suggestions regarding pods 10, 105 and 12 to help the committee review how the changes affect equity, safety, efficiency; however, with the short timeline, workload and spring break, the April 9 meeting may need to be delayed.

Spencer reminded the committee that the goal is to provide the community with two options that could be adjusted following community input; final decision is the School Board. Community meetings are tentatively scheduled for April 23, 24 and 25, but depends on April 9 meeting information.

Bill closed the meeting to report that Spencer, Pam and Bill provided an update to the School Board on March 7 and Amelia, Bill, Spencer and LuAnne provided the same update to the Citizens Advisory Committee on March 12. The CAC provided helpful feedback that will help the district package and organize the information for parents (address questions on the front end, what about special needs/special education programs, what are the talking points besides the plus/minus of the options?).