Enrollment Demographics Task Force
January 8, 2026 | 5:00 - 7:00pm | Virtual
Meeting 3 Minutes

There were 21 members in attendance.

Agenda

- Welcome & Housekeeping
- Guiding Principles
- Program Deep Dive
- Development Overview
- Next Steps & Exit Ticket

Welcome & Housekeeping

Welcome, Norms, & Scenario Development Working Group,

Ashley Davies, Task force facilitator, welcomed the group, reviewed the agenda and goals for the meeting. She reviewed the use of the parking lot for questions and follow-up items, noting that questions from the December meeting had been addressed. The group also revisited meeting norms, emphasizing respect for diverse perspectives and the importance of grounding discussions in shared norms throughout the meeting. Ashley also reminded members about the upcoming scenario planning working group and described its role in supporting deeper analysis of enrollment data and scenario development. She encouraged interested members to follow up with the planning team.

The facilitator also shared feedback from the exit tickets at the December meeting. She emphasized the importance of balancing airtime in large-group discussions and using hand-raise and chat features to support equitable participation. She also clarified that while some constraints exist around the scope of the task force's work, the purpose of the task force is to help shape considerations and inform decisions as the work progresses and everyone should share their perspectives.

Guiding Principles

Ashley reviewed proposed updates to the instructional guiding principles that had been made between the December and January meetings. She explained that revisions were made to better reflect current instructional realities and allow for program changes that respond to student needs while advancing equity and access. Updates clarified the intent to strengthen high-quality instructional programs and align boundary decisions with intentional program placement to ensure equitable access to specialized academic programs. These edits were informed by feedback that prior language felt unclear or misaligned with current practice.

Individual & Small Group Discussion

Before moving into small groups to provide specific feedback on the guiding principles, members completed a brief individual reflection on what boundary changes should never do and key risks to actively guard against. The task force then broke into previously assigned small groups for 15 minutes, with each group focusing on refining one of the four guiding principles They were asked to identify unclear or underdeveloped areas, potential equity impacts, and suggest language improvements, with the goal of returning proposed edits to the full group for review and sign off.

Large Group Discussion

The task force reviewed each of the four guiding principles one at a time. For each principle, the small group assigned to that pillar shared proposed revisions and rationale, followed by clarifying questions and discussion with the full task force. The large group then indicated approval of the revised language before moving on to the next guiding principle. Two principles led to extensive discussion and a survey was provided to the group post meeting to provide feedback. More details on the discussion on each pilar is below.

Group 1: Instructional Considerations

Small Group Share Out - Group 1 reported that the first two instructional bullets received minimal feedback and were generally supported as written. Most discussion focused on the third and fourth bullets, which the group felt overlapped and could be clarified. The group proposed merging these two bullets and adjusting language to emphasize accommodating program changes while preserving instructional quality, responding to student needs, and advancing equitable access. The intent was to simplify the principle and ensure it could be applied clearly when evaluating scenarios.

Revision

The group recommended retaining the first two bullets and replacing the final two with a single statement aligning boundary decisions with accommodating program changes to support student needs and equitable access. The large group indicated approval through a thumbs-up vote, and the revised instructional guiding principle was approved by the task force.

Group 2: Demographic Considerations

Small Group Share Out - Group 2 reported that the first demographic bullet received minimal feedback. Most discussion centered on the third bullet, which the group felt did not clearly reflect the intent of anticipating future growth and avoiding frequent re-boundarying. The group proposed revising the language to emphasize evaluating demographic trends and projections to minimize the need for future boundary changes. The group also began discussing whether the word ***current*** should be removed from language related to minimizing disparate impact, noting concerns that it could unintentionally reinforce the status quo, but did not reach full consensus.

Revision

The full task force engaged in significant discussion about how to frame demographic considerations without reinforcing inequitable systems or implying fixed quotas or preservation of existing school composition. Members raised concerns that language focused on maintaining current demographic composition could limit opportunities to advance equity or rebalance access across schools. Several members emphasized shifting the focus from school composition to impacts on students, communities, and belonging, particularly for historically marginalized groups.

Other members cautioned against overextending the scope of the task force by attempting to solve broader systemic inequities beyond the boundary process. The group discussed tensions between protecting communities, supporting diversity, avoiding unintended consequences (such as impacts on the free-reduced lunch status of a school), and ensuring the principle remained actionable and measurable. There was also discussion about framing the principle in more positive, goal-oriented language rather than language focused on avoidance or minimization.

Refined Proposal

Through discussion, several alternative phrasings were proposed in the chat, with growing support for language that:

- Centers impacts on communities rather than school composition alone
- Explicitly considers underserved or historically marginalized groups
- Emphasizes belonging and equitable outcomes
- Avoids language that implies preserving inequitable status quo conditions

Due to the complexity of the discussion and lack of consensus on final wording, the task force did not vote on a final version of the demographic guiding principle during the meeting. Ashley committed to sharing a follow-up poll with proposed language options for members to review and select after the meeting.

Group 3: Operational Considerations

Small Group Share Out - The group reported leaving the first operational bullet unchanged. For the second bullet, the group proposed replacing the word ***maximize*** with ***optimize*** when referring to operational efficiency. The change was intended to reflect that efficiency must be balanced with other guiding principles and that it may not always be possible to maximize efficiency across the district while addressing competing priorities.

Discussion then focused on the bullet related to school infrastructure and enrollment. Group members noted that the existing language could be interpreted as prioritizing buildings over students.

Revision

The group proposed revising the language to center students more explicitly, emphasizing that school populations should be supported by their infrastructure rather than defined as appropriate for it. This revision was intended to acknowledge that infrastructure includes more than classroom space (e.g., cafeterias, playgrounds, shared spaces) and to avoid subjective judgments about student populations. The proposed revisions were shared with the full task force. With no additional concerns raised, the group indicated approval through a thumbs-up vote, and the revised operational considerations were approved as final.

Group 4: Geographic Considerations

Small Group Share Out - The group reported no recommended changes to the existing geographic considerations language. Discussion focused on reinforcing existing concepts, including the use of natural boundaries and maintaining a sense of community, while acknowledging that natural boundaries can sometimes result in families living close to a school being assigned elsewhere.

Revision

The task force reached agreement that the existing geographic considerations were generally sound. No final decision was made on adding a new bullet related to minimizing distance or travel time. The facilitator noted that the proposed geographic addition, along with the unresolved demographic consideration, would be included in a post-meeting survey to allow members additional time to reflect and provide input.

Program Deep Dive & Development Overview

Due to time constraints, the task force did not complete the planned program deep dive or development overview. These items will be addressed at the next meeting. Ashley introduced a newly shared spreadsheet (available in the task force folder) that includes October 2025 enrollment, capacity, utilization data, and special education and highly capable enrollment. She encouraged members to review the overview tab explaining the data definitions prior to exploring the spreadsheet and noted that this data will inform upcoming boundary scenario development discussions.

Next Steps & Exit Ticket

The group reviewed the agenda items for the next meeting:

- Finalizing Guiding Principles
- Program Deep Dive
- Development Overview
- Updated Demographers Report
- Scenario Development

Exit Ticket
Members completed an exit ticket which asked to share feedback on the meeting. A summary of the feedback received is below.

- Members appreciated the thoughtful discussion and overall facilitation of the meeting.
- Significant time was spent on guiding principles, particularly equity language; while some found the depth necessary, others noted the need to balance wordsmithing with forward progress.
- Feedback highlighted the importance of clarifying whether minimizing change is an explicit goal of the task force.
- Members supported using a follow-up survey to finalize outstanding language edits.
- Members valued receiving enrollment and capacity data in advance of the next meeting.