



School Board Briefing/Proposed Action Report

Informational (no action required by Board) **Action Report** (Board will be required to take action)

DATE: October 28, 2016
FROM: School Board Directors Rick Burke, Scott Pinkham, Jill Geary

Directors Burke, Pinkham and Geary are putting forward two separate options regarding several cascading North Seattle boundary changes for public input and Director consideration. Please review this with corresponding Amendment 6.A.

I. TITLE

Amendment 6.B to Growth Boundaries: Allow Grandfathering for Elementary School Boundary Adjustments in Areas 18, 128, 117, 90, 93, 101, 122 and 120

For Introduction: November 2, 2016
For Action: November 2, 2016

II. WHY BOARD ACTION IS NECESSARY

Board action is necessary for any formal amendments to another proposed Board action.

III. FISCAL IMPACT/REVENUE SOURCE

The precise impact of this amendment on school capacity issues and transportation costs is difficult to determine at this time. This amendment could potentially create additional capacity constraints and additional transportation costs. Schools that face capacity constraints either have to repurpose existing space or add portables, where possible. Each additional portable costs the District approximately \$160,000. Each additional bus needed for transportation costs the District approximately \$68,000.

If the result of this action is larger class sizes at some schools, the District faces some risk of losing state funding for smaller class sizes depending on class size averages at other schools.

The revenue source for this motion is N/A.

Expenditure: One-time Annual Other Source

IV. POLICY IMPLICATION

Board Policy No. 3130, Student Assignment, states that students shall have the opportunity to attend an elementary, middle, or high school in a designated attendance area based upon home address, unless the school designated by a student's home address does not have the appropriate services for the student's needs, as determined by the District.

Any changes to boundaries, geographic zones, or assignment rules subsequent to implementation of the Student Assignment Plan require Board action.

V. RECOMMENDED MOTION

I move that the School Board amend the proposed 2017-2018 Implementation Amendments to the 2013-2020 Growth Boundaries Plan to implement grandfathering at the elementary school level for the following areas:

1. Area 18 students in Broadview-Thomson Elementary School;
2. Area 128 in Whittier Elementary School;
3. Area 117 in Viewlands Elementary School;
4. Area 90 in Olympic View Elementary School;
5. Area 93 in Olympic View Elementary School;
6. Area 101 in Sacajawea Elementary School;
7. Area 122 in Wedgwood Elementary School; and
8. Area 120 in View Ridge Elementary School.

VI. BOARD COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

This motion was not discussed by a Board Committee.

VII. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Under the 2013-2020 Growth Boundaries Plan, a number of boundary changes are scheduled for the 2017-18 school year with the purpose of redistributing capacity and aligning entire elementary school attendance areas with middle school feeder patterns. Directors have heard concerns with the amount of disruption these changes cause to families and school communities.

This amendment would mean that all existing students in the following areas would be able to continue through 5th grade at their current 2016 elementary assignment school:

AreaID	2016 Assignment	Proposed 2017 Assignment
18	Broadview-Thomson	Viewlands
90	Olympic View	Olympic Hills
93	Olympic View	Sacajawea
101	Sacajawea	Olympic Hills
117	Viewlands	Olympic View
120	View Ridge	John Rogers
122	Wedgewood	John Rogers
128	Whittier	Viewlands

VIII. STATEMENT OF ISSUE

Whether to implement the proposed 2017-18 implementation amendments for elementary school attendance areas 18, 128, 117, 90, 93, 101, 122 and 120 with grandfathering of current students.

IX. ALTERNATIVES

1. Proceed with previously approved boundary adjustments for the 2017-18 school year. This is not recommended as these boundary changes would create significant disruption by reassigning families.
2. Retain these elementary school areas within the attendance area for their 2016 assignment. This option would lessen disruption for families with current students and

create a more gradual transition for school communities, but also create more elementary schools where students do not all move to the same middle school.

3. Proceed with previously approved boundary adjustments for the 2017-2018 school year, but allow grandfathering for all 4th and 5th grade students at their current elementary school. This option would have slightly more disruption than alternative 2 above, but would come with a lesser cost impact.
4. Create alternate boundaries which would be more consistent with Cedar Park as an Option School. This is not recommended, because the scenario for populating an Option School cannot be accurately modeled and the most reliable enrollment patterns will be determined after the first year of enrollment. Additionally, any boundary adjustments which depart from the current or proposed attendance areas would not have sufficient time for public engagement.

X. RESEARCH AND DATA SOURCES / BENCHMARKS

None.

XI. TIMELINE FOR IMPLEMENTATION / COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

Upon approval of this motion, the underlying Board Action Report for the 2017-2018 Implementation Amendments to 2013-2020 Growth Boundaries Plan would be amended.

XII. ATTACHMENTS

- 2013 Board guiding principles for boundary decisions:
http://www.seattleschools.org/UserFiles/Servers/Server_543/File/District/Departments/Enrollment%20Planning/Growth%20Boundaries/GB_guiding-principles-050813.pdf

Guiding Principles

- Ground decisions in data.
- Create boundaries that reflect equitable access to services and programs.
- Maximize walkability.
- Enable cost-effective transportation standards.
- Maintain key features of New Student Assignment Plan (e.g. opportunities for creating diversity within boundaries, choice, option schools, feeder patterns)
- Minimize disruptions by aligning new boundaries with current attendance area boundaries when feasible.
- Be mindful of fiscal impact (costs and savings).
- Be responsive to family input to the extent feasible.