



Portland Public Schools: High School System Design Parent Advisory Group Meeting Summary

Date & Time: October 28, 2010, 6p – 8p

Location: L1, BESC

MODERATOR: Judy Clarke

DISTRICT REPRESENTATIVES IN ATTENDANCE: Carole Smith (Superintendent), Robb Cowie (Executive Director, Community Involvement and Public Affairs), Sara Allen (Executive Director, System Planning and Performance), Reiko Williams (Manager, Family and Community Support), Andrea Wade (Family Engagement/ School Choice Coordinator), Alena Guggemos (Analyst, High School Design)

PARENT/COMMUNITY REPRESENTATIVES IN ATTENDANCE: Liz Miller, Sally Kimsey, Nancy Adolphson, Monique Hermann, Shawna Williams, Floyd Spears, Eliza Erhardt-Eisen, Shelly Simmons, Joyce Olivo, Mike Rosen, Bonnie Calnek, John Cuen, Jeff Hammond, Teresa Osborne

MEETING OBJECTIVE

The desired outcome of the meeting was to achieve a greater understanding of the proposed boundary changes and establish next steps for HSPAC.

MEETING SUMMARY

1) SuperSac

SuperSac representative Terry Proctor introduced SuperSAC and invited HSPAC members to join their meetings. Future dates will be announced.

2) Superintendent Carole Smith

Superintendent Smith introduced herself and thanked HSPAC members for their involvement in the high school design process. She stated that she will check in with the committee at key intervals over the next few months. The committee should feel free to request her attendance at meetings if necessary.

3) Role Call and Introductions.

District staff and parent/community representatives performed roll call. New HSPAC members were introduced.

4) Review of minutes from October 18th, 2010, meeting

Minutes from the previous meeting were reviewed and approved.

5) Liaison to Benson, Jefferson, and Marshall Design Teams

- a. Robb Cowie stated that it has been requested that HSPAC provide member representation on the Benson, Jefferson, and Marshall Design Teams.
 - i. The teams' focus will be as follows:
 1. Benson = redesign of program;
 2. Jefferson = implementation of middle college;
 3. Marshall = all topics surrounding closure.
 - ii. Design Team meeting schedule and interested HSPAC members:



1. Benson will meet four times; the next scheduled meeting is on November 9th, 2010. Interested members: Nancy Adolphson, Floyd Spears
2. Jefferson will meet monthly between now and the end of the school year; no dates set. Interested members: Bonnie Calnek, Jeff Hammond.
3. Marshall will meet monthly between now and the end of the school year; the next scheduled meeting is on November 8th, 2010. Interested members: Liz Miller, Sally Kimsey, Shawna Williams.

6) Marshall Boundary Assignment Discussion

- a. Sara Allen delivered a presentation on the process, timeline, and criteria surrounding boundary reassignment(s) of Marshall feeder schools.
 - i. Overarching question: How should student attendance be drawn to assign the Marshall students to new community high schools?
 - ii. Timeline:
 1. Now - November 17th, 2010: Input gathering
 2. November 17th, 2010: Board Committee meets to review recommendations
 3. November 30th, 2010: Board votes on new boundaries
 - iii. Criteria:
 1. Proximity to new school
 2. Enrollment diversity
 3. Enrollment stability
 4. Student impact
 - iv. Guide question for HSPAC discussion and feedback: How should we prioritize these criteria in making student assignment/boundary changes?
 1. Some recommendations already in place. Up for discussion was where to assign Whitman and Woodmere.
 2. Three scenarios were provided to HSPAC along with their related criteria impact:
 - a. Whitman/Woodmere to Franklin, Creston/Woodstock to Cleveland (option 1)
 - b. Whitman/Woodmere to Cleveland, Creston/Woodstock to Franklin (option 2)
 - c. Whitman/Woodstock to Cleveland/Creston/Woodmere to Franklin (option 3)
 - v. Committee broke into four smaller groups to discuss and provide feedback to two focus questions (consensus not necessary).
 1. Based on your prioritization of the criteria, which is your preferred boundary option?
 - a. Group One (two criteria equally important for each prioritization): (1) Proximity and Diversity, (2) Enrollment and Stability, (3) Proximity and Student Impact, (4) Diversity and Student Impact
 - b. Group Two: (1) Proximity, (2) Impact, Diversity, and Stability, (3) Stability, (4) Diversity and Impact
 - c. Group Three: (1) Proximity, (2) Diversity, (3) Stability, (4) Impact



- d. Group Four: (1) Proximity, (2) Stability, (3) Diversity, (4) Impact
- 2. Based on your prioritization, which is the preferred boundary option? The response to this was taken as a vote.
 - a. Seven (7) votes for Option #2. Some comments: Socio-economic diversity is best served in this option. Creston makes more sense. The few extra minutes on the bus would be worth the outcome.
 - b. Five (5) votes for Option #1. Some comments: Proximity is most important to student and parent involvement. Diversity isn't that much different than in the other options.
 - c. No votes for Option #3.
 - d. Some members abstained from voting.

7) Overview of Jefferson Dual Assignment

- a. This was tabled until the next meeting.

8) Concerns

- a. The following concerns surrounding boundary were presented during the meeting:
 - i. More information from the district is needed in order to make a decision. Pros and Cons to each scenario would be helpful.
 - ii. How will affected parents receive this information? How will the district assure that information received by parents is informative and understandable?
 - iii. How do these three scenarios help in accomplishing the HSSD goal of providing an equitable high school experience for each student?
 - iv. How does the district plan on addressing the imbalance of socio-economic diversity in the schools?
 - v. Can HSPAC examine boundary beyond Marshall/Jefferson/Roosevelt?

Next meeting: November 15th, 2010, from 6p – 8p, at BESC (exact location to be announced)

Agenda for November 15th Meeting:

No agenda set.