

## 2013-14 Happy Valley/Lowell Attendance Area Committee

### January 21, 2014 – Meeting #6 Minutes

1. Rob McElroy welcomed everyone and opened the meeting at 3:30 p.m. He thanked the committee members for their participation and dedication to this work.
2. Rob presented the minutes/summary from the January 9, 2014 Parent Input Session, and they were approved by the committee.
3. Ron shared that in his past experience with other attendance area committees, there are always people who are happy with the proposed scenario and some who are not. If another proposal were to be presented, some will be happy, some will not. It would be good to keep in mind that we don't want to not make a modification to avoid the hard work of going through the process.
4. Tanya talked about the analysis of the online survey and asked if there were other themes or issues that should be included. The following are comments from the committee:
  - Happy to see the number of positive comments.
  - Positive and negative comments did not contradict themselves.
  - There were some comments that addressed topics outside of this committee's area of work and will need to be dealt with separately.
  - Interesting that if someone has something to say, even if it doesn't fall in line with the form of the question, they will find a way to state it.
  - The concerns and comments raised in the survey were a mirror of the committee's conversations, so it appears that we were considering the right things.
  - There seemed to be a lot of feedback regarding the Edgemoor and Chuckanut areas.
5. Ron asked the committee members to give feedback about what they are thinking after reviewing the input from the survey and the family input meeting at Larrabee:
  - Free and reduced lunch rates do not tell the whole story of where the socio-economic lines are drawn.
  - We have not talked a lot about projected development.
  - 4<sup>th</sup> Street has been a dividing line for many years.
  - Some families believe that this is the perfect opportunity for a fresh start, and to correct some "not great" boundaries that were previously drawn.
  - We would likely have the same passion about neighborhoods being together or divided if there were a different scenario proposed.
  - Some people were appreciative that other boundary lines were not disturbed.
  - There was some discussion about specific areas. It was asked how many students currently live in the 4<sup>th</sup> Street area, and it was stated that there are a total of 7.

- When looking at the draft proposal, if a student north of Hawthorne were to have a transfer request to Lowell approved, would they be able to ride the bus to Lowell if they could get to a normal Lowell bus stop? Rae Anne answered that for the first 45 days of school, students who are granted a transfer request may not ride the bus, they would need to have parent transportation to school. After 45 days, if it is determined by Transportation that there is room on the bus, the student could ride the bus to Lowell. It would be the parent's responsibility to contact Transportation after the 45<sup>th</sup> day of school. If enrollment changes and the bus became full, that student would then lose their bus ride to school.
- Tile 12 has thirteen current students (7 are currently attending Larrabee). Would those students walk to Lowell, and if so, what would the safe walk route be? Rae Anne indicated that the current Lowell bus would be able to transport all of the tile 12 students to Lowell. Rae Anne was asked if the bus ride was a long one, and Rae Anne answered that it is currently a 45 minute route and the bus is at the maximum amount of minutes. The bus is currently arriving at Fairhaven Middle School about 3 minutes late.
- There was discussion about access to 4<sup>th</sup> and Hawthorne.
- The question was asked where the bus stops would be for that area if adjustments were made. Rae Anne indicated that there would be no additional bus needed, and the stops would likely be the same.
- A committee member expressed concern that there would not be enough room for growth at Happy Valley. Karen Tolliver stated that if Happy Valley were approaching capacity, she would not accept as many transfers.
- The question was then asked if there was a concern that, with growth development, that Lowell's enrollment would be over capacity. Ron pointed out that Happy Valley has more developable land than Lowell does.
- A committee member asked what the plans are for a music room and for rainy day recess, when taking into consideration the higher enrollment at Lowell. Ron explained that the current remodel plans for Lowell would include a gym as well as a cafeteria (which would also contain a stage). There could be discussion about including a covered recess area if it does not negatively impact the budget for the project.
- The committee discussed a new proposal involving having students west of 21<sup>st</sup> Street attending Happy Valley rather than Lowell.
- One committee member stated she would like to think about trying to balance the parent involvement rather than socio-economic. She noted that tiles 3 and 6, which would attend Lowell under the current proposal, have some highly involved families.
- There appears to be concern from Larrabee families about big car lines and bus zones.
- It was pointed out that you can't assume, just because one family from a tile is unhappy with a scenario, that all of the families are unhappy. There could be families who were happy with the proposed scenario and did not attend the public meeting or participate in the survey.
- A committee member commented that it may have been better to submit two proposals so that a comparison could then be made. Tanya recalls that there was committee discussion about whether to submit more than one proposal. However, the committee felt strongly about only submitting one proposal for feedback. The

committee discussed it may, based on feedback received, make minor adjustments. She stated that if the committee is changing course and wants to make major changes, we would likely need to do another online survey and invite families to another public meeting. A committee member suggested making minor adjustments and then asking for feedback from only the affected families.

6. Ron said that, with only 10 minutes left, his perspective is that the committee has a good, solid proposal on the table. He stated that, if there are only a small number of families who are unhappy with the proposal, it could be that those could be resolved by the blue slip/transfer process. He reminded the committee that we need to keep the criteria in mind when considering any changes to the proposal that was presented. He believes that if there is a consensus that we need to consider another scenario, we will need to go back to the community for further feedback. Tanya stated that if making minor adjustments it could be a smaller input process than the recent feedback process. If it is the committee's decision to not make any changes, there will still need to be a communication about why no changes were made.
7. A comment was made that, no matter what the final recommendation is, some families will be satisfied and some will be unhappy. The committee is doing its best, and what will ultimately help the transition will be students and families being welcomed as a part of their new school community.
8. It was decided that the committee will meet again this Friday, Jan. 24, at 3:00 to make a decision between scenarios A, B, or a modified A.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:07 pm.