## Identify Identify plus / delta for each of our 3 scenarios

Continue to provide feedback for our dashboards and identify connections to Policy 3130 to Policy

## Norms

## Be Respectful

Hear and consider all opinions and perspectives
Acknowledge that all participants bring with them legitimate purposes, goals, concerns and interests whether or not you agree with them

Ensure all voices are heard/everyone gets a chance to share their thoughts and feelings

View disagreement as a constructive and important part of the problem-solving process

Be Productive
Respect time constraints
Be forward-thinking, anticipate future needs
Use "parking lot" for additional issues/questions
Bring a sense of humor and have fun - judiciously

Be Stewards of the Process
Seek creative ideas and solutions that address student-centered interests

State concerns and interests clearly, listen carefully to and assume the best in others

Balance advocacy with inquiry
Work towards consensus and expect compromise
Seek input from those most impacted

## Policy 3130

The following factors shall be considered when the district develops and adjusts attendance areas, boundaries, and considers student transfers:

Minimize disruption of student's established learning programs. Keep siblings in the same elementary, middle or high school, whenever possible.
Provide overall balance of student enrollment related to facility size, taking into account future growth patterns.
Provide a reasonably balanced socio-economic relationship in all schools.
Provide the most efficient and feasible means for student transpportation to and from school, including whether safe routes to school might exist, minimizing travel time and transportation costs.
Keep neighborhoods together, whenever possible.
M aintain feeder schools patterns so that elementary/middle/high school attendance areas coincide and students stay with the same cohort as they progress through school levels, whenever possible.
Follow natural boundaries and utilize existing physical boundaries such as major roadways to delineate boundaries, whenever possible.

## Review and Approve January M inutes





-



| M iddle School | Enrollment | Percent <br> Free/Red | Students M oved <br> From |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Fairhaven | 632 | $27.4 \%$ | 57 | To |  |



|  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Enrollment | 63 | 2 |
| Splits | 30 | 3 |
| Equity | 71 | 2 |
| Disruption | 74 | 3 |

- Because of Tile mergers, all of tile 41 at SMS in this scenario.
- Roosevelt split looks worse
- Enrollment targets look worse (more students at SM S)
- Equity and disruption relatively unchanged


| M iddle School | Enrollment | Percent <br> Free/Red | Students M oved <br> From | Students M oved |  |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: |
| Fairhaven | 678 | $27.3 \%$ | 11 | 85 |  |
| Kulshan | 648 | $27.2 \%$ | 79 | 136 |  |
| Shuksan | 647 | $45.0 \%$ | 134 | 44 |  |
| Whatcom | 622 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |



|  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FM S | 678 | $27 \%$ |
| KM S | 665 | $27 \%$ |
| SM S | 623 | $46 \%$ |
| WM S | 638 | $28 \%$ |


|  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Enrollment | 63 | 2 |
| Splits | 66 | 1 |
| Equity | 61 | 3 |
| Disruption | 85 | 1 |

- Because of Tile mergers, all of tile 104 at KMS in this scenario.
- Enrollment score improved
- Equity took slight dip (SM S up 1\%, KM S/WM S down 1\%)


|  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| FM S | 649 | $27 \%$ |  |  |
| KM S | 649 | $27 \%$ |  |  |
| SMS | 629 | $42 \%$ |  |  |
| WMrollment | 96 | 1 |  |  |
| WMS | 668 | $33 \%$ |  |  |

- Because of Tile mergers, all of tile 87 at KMS in this scenario.
- To use data it was necessary to put
- Enrollment score improved
- Equity took slight dip, but remains best overall
- Splits took slight dip (worse at Roosevelt, Silver Beach)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FMS | 610 | 21\% | Enrollment | 0 |
| KM S | 591 | 38\% | Splits | 6 |
| SMS | 709 | 50\% | Equity | 0 |
| WM S | 686 | 19\% | Disruption | 100 |

M easuring Policy 3130

## Enrollment Score

How close does a scenario come to meeting enrollment goals?

|  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FMS | 650 | 603 | 47 |
| KMS | 650 | 607 | 43 |
| SMS | 625 | 709 | 79 |
| WMS | 670 | 686 | 11 |
|  |  |  | 180 |

A score of 100 represents all schools with exactly target population.

A score of 0 represents 180 students away from enrollment goals, which matches current levels.

For example, if a scenario was 90 students away from enrollment goals,

## Split Score

How well does a scenario reduce splits, especially uneven splits?
A score of 100 represents no splits, while a score of 0 represents 2017-18
Each split costs 10 points, uneven splits are exponentially penaliz

Proportion of Smaller Split

Split Score

## Individual School Equity Scores 2017-18 (Theoretical)

FRL\%


## Individual School Equity Scores 2017-18 (Actual)

FRL \%


## Disruption Score

## How many students will be affected by the scenario?

This score is simply the percent of middle school students who would stay in their current school.

Example: If all students changed schools, the score would be 0. If no students moved, the score would be 100. If half of students moved, the score would be 50 .

