

# SELLWOOD MIDDLE SCHOOL CONVERSATION

August 2, 2006 6:30 p.m. – 9 p.m.  
Sellwood Middle School Gymnasium

## Meeting Summary

Summary prepared by Zenn Associates

### Participants:

#### *Sellwood:*

Karen Dean  
Debbie Greene

#### *Duniway:*

Carol Samuels

#### *Grout:*

Terri Burk  
Aimee Bochsler  
Brian Baker

#### *Lewis:*

Gregory NacNaughton  
Amy Spring  
Pat Reilley

#### *Llewellyn:*

Sandy Hubbard  
Catherine Alexander  
Mike Rosen

#### *Winterhaven:*

Rita Moore  
Phil Degens

#### *City of Portland*

Jay Sugnet, city planner

#### *Portland Public Schools Staff:*

Jean Fischer  
Sara Allan

#### *Facilitators:*

Mike Dahlstrom, Zenn Associates  
Marlys Mock, Zenn Associates

### Summary

Approximately 75 community members attended the third community conversation about reconfiguration of the Sellwood Middle School cluster, including Winterhaven and Grout. Also present were teams (the Team in aggregate) representing the six schools involved: Sellwood, Lewis, Llewellyn, Duniway, Grout and Winterhaven.

After a round of introductions, the Agenda (addendum A) was reviewed. Next the Teams provided brief summaries of their community outreach activities.

Changes in the Charge were discussed with reference to the memo from Dr. Cathy Minberg, COO, Portland Public Schools (Addendum B). The Team agreed to move forward with a boundary shift option as an alternative and preferred recommendation to the School Board if the option proves viable.

The Team agreed to table the discussion on the data requests from the June 21 meeting. Principal's plans for increased enrollment will be better answered when the principals understand how the options might impact them. Staff noted that any recommendation the School Board accepts will involve gradual implementation and will not begin until the 2007-2008 school year.

Staff provided a brief update on the boundary shift option. The goal is to allow Lewis and Llewellyn to approach enrollment capacity. The option would impact Whitman and Woodmere Elementary Schools with possible impacts on Grout and Duniway. Staff is in contact with principals from Whitman Elementary, Woodmere Elementary and Lane Middle School.

Jay Sugnet, the City of Portland planner for the SE district discussed trends and impacts the City looks at in making their projections. He noted that the economy influences development, and although incomes are increasing, they are not keeping up with housing prices. In the SE area the median age is going down, population and housing have increased, and the area is not growing as rapidly as the suburbs. SE does not have a lot of new housing and the trend is larger apartment complexes and increased row-home development. More mixed use development is occurring with housing allowed in commercial zones. Portland in general is seeing increased home ownership; 53% owned in 2000 vs. 47% owned in 1990. Additional detailed information can be found in the meeting notes, Addendum C.

Some reference sites Jay referred to are:

Portland Present (trends report) and SE District Profile, available at [www.portlandonline.com](http://www.portlandonline.com)

City of Portland 2004 American Communities survey

Portland 2040 growth plan

Portlandmaps (neighborhood information)

The Team discussed the Boundary Shift Option (Addendum D) for the remainder of the meeting. The following summary is broken into the background discussion and specific proposal components:

### **Background Information:**

PPS reiterated that any changes to programs will begin with the in-coming classes of the 2007-08 school year. Staff discussed the viability of the border change option and confirmed that Superintendent Phillips and COO Dr. Mincberg are supportive of the option. Staff said the goal is to have robust schools (400-600 enrollment) and it is acceptable for the Team to agree on the basic philosophy of the option then work out specifics.

The Team discussed some concerns:

- What options might be available for parents of two elementary school children that might have to go to different schools under this option. PPS said these parents would likely receive priority transfer to keep the children together.
- What are the impacts of changes in transfer policy. PPS said a committee will start to look at the policy in the fall to identify desired outcomes and simplify the policy.
- Will there be adequate time to evaluate the changes throughout the cluster. PPS said the board is committed to a sufficient timeframe to evaluate impacts.

- What are the impacts of the growing Mandarin immersion program at Woodstock. PPS said it will be some time before the immersion program grows large enough to impact the neighborhood program. The Team could ask the Board to consider reserving additional capacity for growth.
- What is the impact on special-needs programs which are counted differently (under a different budget) than other enrollment. PPS said the special-needs programs would likely be kept at Llewellyn and Lewis.

The Team discussed the benefits of the “robust” capacity number of 400. The group requested that PPS adopt a standard of developing the “ideal” capacity for a building based on the percentage of capacity, rather than a specific number or range.

### **Lewis Boundary Expansion:**

The group expressed thanks to PPS for developing the new boundary change option.

Lewis representatives said they are supportive of a boundary shift. The representatives noted the Life Skills program is at Lewis and that Lewis is the best location for the program. Lewis was awarded a grant for traffic calming and to promote walking and biking. The representatives also said they are concerned about Lewis becoming crowded and that Lewis can’t accommodate 400 students. PPS talked about reserving capacity in the cluster – not necessarily in a specific school.

### **Llewellyn Boundary Expansion, Option A:**

Duniway representatives expressed concern about becoming vulnerable by giving up students through a boundary shift. They said the area under consideration is the most diverse segment of their population and that a change to the district transfer policy could impact the amount of transfers the school can accept.

### **Llewellyn Boundary Expansion, Option B:**

Grout representatives expressed similar concerns as Duniway, that Option B reduces Grout’s enrollment and makes them more vulnerable.

### **Grout Utilization:**

The Team discussed the movement of special programs including special education. PPS said the district has not started a process to look at centralized special education programs, but other programs could move around such as Head Start. Staff noted students tend to stay in the school where they begin. The Team is concerned about limiting Grout’s ability to reach 400 capacity.

Strategies to strengthen Grout might include more transfers and looking at other models and special programs. PPS said the board would welcome input on strengthening schools.

The Team expressed concern about creating a divisive environment between Duniway and Grout. The group asked PPS to allow the group to brainstorm ideas and create an new Option C rather than choosing Options A or B. PPS said additional options are welcome.

### **Next Steps**

The Team was encouraged to continue brainstorming additional options at their Tuesday evening meetings and to send any additional ideas to Sara before the August 16<sup>th</sup> meeting.

A demographer from PSU will be at the August 16<sup>th</sup> meeting to present information and address questions.

Jay Sugnet was asked to request a letter about the positive impacts of neighborhood schools on communities from the City of Portland.

PPS Staff was asked to continue to look for ways of improving Llewellyn's enrollment without harming Duniway's program. Staff also was asked to talk with the Special Education Director and Head Start for their perspectives on program re-location.

The next meeting will be Wednesday, August 16, 6:30 p.m. – 9 p.m., Sellwood Middle School gymnasium.

Enclosures:  
Addendum A – August 2 Meeting Agenda

## **Sellwood Middle School Conversation**

**August 2, 2006  
6:30 p.m. – 9 p.m.  
Sellwood Middle School Gymnasium**

### **Agenda**

- |             |   |                     |
|-------------|---|---------------------|
| <b>I.</b>   | <b>Introductions/ Agenda</b>  | <b>(10 minutes)</b> |
| <b>II.</b>  | <b>Review</b><br><b>Team community outreach activities</b><br><b>Charge update</b><br><b>June 21 requests</b><br><b>Boundary Shift Option – review and update</b> | <b>(40 minutes)</b> |
| <b>III.</b> | <b>Jay Sugnet, planner, City of Portland Q&amp;A</b>  | <b>(35 minutes)</b> |
| <b>IV.</b>  | <b>Break</b>  | <b>(15 minutes)</b> |
| <b>V.</b>   | <b>Boundary Shift Option Discussion</b>   | <b>(40 minutes)</b> |
| <b>VI.</b>  | <b>Next Steps</b>   | <b>(10 minutes)</b> |

Addendum B – Memo on charge clarification from Dr. Cathy Mincberg.



## PORTLAND PUBLIC SCHOOLS

501 North Dixon Street / Portland, OR 97227  
Mailing Address: PO Box 3107 / Portland, OR 97208  
Phone: (503) 916-3363 Fax: (503) 916-2123  
BUSINESS & FINANCIAL SERVICES

**Dr. Cathy Mincberg**  
Chief Operating Officer

### MEMORANDUM

To: Cleveland cluster community teams

Cc: Vicki Phillips, PPS Board of Education

From: Cathy Mincberg, COO

Date: June 26, 2006

Re: Reconfiguration options currently under discussion

---

Thank you all for your participation in the community facilitated planning process currently underway to assess options for building reconfigurations/closure in the Cleveland cluster.

As you know, the district has put forth an alternative option for consideration in the Cleveland cluster community conversations which could involve expanding and shifting boundaries to allow schools to better utilize their capacity and build to over 400 students. This option could avoid a school closure in the area if it allows us to meet the district objective of 400-600 students per building at the elementary and middle level.

Since this new option could impact schools beyond the Cleveland cluster, we will assess its feasibility based on current and forecast enrollment and transfer trends across the entire southeast. For it to be workable, the option must clearly demonstrate that the schools in the area have strong potential to grow to 400 students without causing other schools to fall below that threshold. It must also result in revised neighborhood boundaries that are logical in terms of size, proximity to school buildings and traffic patterns.

Should this option prove infeasible based on the assessment, the original charge that this process must result in a building closure will stand.

We look forward to working with the community over the next few months to establish a robust set of facts in order to complete the assessment of all of the options currently on the table. As previously stated, the community is requested to submit its recommendation to the Superintendent by October 15<sup>th</sup>, 2006.

Addendum C – Raw notes from August 2 meeting

### Agenda

#### **Review:**

**Team community outreach activities report**  
**Lane has a listserve; PTa email; email list**  
**Winterhaven list serve includes conversation information and PTA information**  
**Duniway has email list and sends email updates. Notes sent to group**  
**Grout list serve for updates, bulletin board**  
**Lewis has a list serve includes kids, parents and teachers. Love Lewis website has updates as well as the Lewis website.**  
**LLewellyn has bulletin board, weekly “blue” letter, meeting in June, info to smile board and email updates**

#### **June 21 Requests:**

Maps of boundaries  
Principal’s plans on how to deal with 120 – 150 more students

**If closure option is pursued what would happen to displaced kids...since focus has changed, let’s table this.**  
**Changing boundaries would be a gradual process.**

**Boundary Shift Option – brief staff review and update**

**Goal is to allow Lewis and LLewellyn to reach 400 enrollment; would impact Whitman and Woodmere. Affect Grout.**

**Expand Lewis boundary eastward. Expand LLewellyn also. Move programs to better utilize Grout and increase its capture rate.**

**Lewis is forecast to grow. Draw from them, then rebalance boundaries to provide balanced enrollment.**

**Jay Sugnet, Q&A**

**“District” Planner for this area of Portland.**  
**“Portland Present” provides trends – on portlandonline.com**

**Economy influences development. Tied to national economy. Incomes increasing, but not keeping up with housing prices. Captured “creative class.” Median age in SE has gone down. Population and housing has increased, but not growing as quickly as suburbs.**

**Portland has worked to retain residents. City of Portland has a lot of affordable housing compared to other cities in the region.**

**Jay will find map that shows affordable housing and send the link to the group.**

**Not a lot of new housing built in inner SE Portland. Most new housing east of 39<sup>th</sup> Ave.**

**SE District Profile – information specific to SE. Trends are consistent with city-wide averages.**

#### **Trends:**

**Fewer large apartment complexes. Lots of families live in these complexes.**  
**Row houses are increasingly being built. Families less likely to live in row houses.**

**City of Portland 2004 American Communities survey**  
**Majority of families make \$50,000 or less – can they afford to live in Portland**  
**15% have incomes of 100,000 and above**

**“Creative Class” – 25-34 year olds. 15% of Portland’s population is this “creative class”**

**More and more mixed use development; Housing is allowed in all commercial zones.**

**Brooklyn Yards could convert to housing.**

**Projections are a tool.**

**Certain things impact population; we know if schools close, families move out. Schools are important to building a strong community. Closures are not good for the community.**

**Planning projections; region has a 2040 growth concept. Discusses how to handle added growth with the existing growth boundary.**

**Current option is based on current population. More infill in Sellwood? Number of building permits issued is consistent. Infill slots will continue to fill; vacant lots will continue to be converted to housing for the most part.**

**Brooklyn Yards and S. Waterfront development**

**How likely is that it will attract families? Trying to attract families. Adding amenities for families and adding affordable housing. It’s not a significant amount. Typical family with kids won’t be able to afford the housing.**

**Yards are railway at Holgate down McLoughlin (east of McLouglin). Looking at trends for freight and rail. SE is built out except for infill. Yards in Grout area.**

**Vacant lots taxed at a higher rate? How would that affect SE Portland? Comes up but not a lot of support for it.**

**No actual plans to redevelop Yards.**

**Light Rail – more infill density expected? Areas rezoned around stations to accommodate higher densities.**

**Portland affordable compared to other west coast cities? In migration is a factor. Let’s ask demographers. 1990-2000 census is most reliable.**

**2010 is next census.**

**Rezoning lots for higher density has been happening for last few years, but wouldn’t be included on census. An increasing trend that wouldn’t have shown on 2000 census. Would be included on building permit map.**

**Developers could tear down and rebuild; but now only if no house on lot for five years.**

**Late 90’s strong growth; early 2000 was recession. Housing market is strong. No decline in housing prices. Commercial and office development has flattened out.**

**2040 growth – what’s the age mix?**

**City hopes to capture creative class. Average age in SE has gone down.**

**Permits counted as units built. Future development is tracked by permits issued. 100 added with Trolley Barns; 150 multi-family. Within 60 blocks, 33 houses had built in last year. Find out if housing units are large enough. Track renovations of existing housing to make them larger homes? Permits are required for additions. Not easy to track. Census will provide better information in 2010. Not sure that it has a significant impact on enrollment.**

**Strong link between affordable housing and families. Focus on Grout region. Grout is projected for the most decline in enrollment which doesn't make sense. Housing stock is small. Housing permits in the Grout area? Not a lot.**

**City-wide policy to attract families to the city? Potter and Sten want to encourage and support families. I.e. give tax breaks to families. Don't allow conversions of housing to commercial or industrial uses. Ask for tools.**

**PSU uses births and catchments to show trends. Reality hasn't matched forecasts. The more closely they forecast for a school, the more variables there are.**

**Mortgage turnovers tracked at all? Some groups may be tracking that, but not the city. If a mortgage is held for thirty years, then changes, it's not likely an old person moving in.**

**The trends and enrollment projections are predicted for district-wide, but see more variation at the school level.**

**Portlandmaps shows some neighborhood information. Work can be done to draw conclusions about areas.**

**Rental vs. home ownership  
Portland in 1990 47% owned  
2000 53% owned**

**Large apartment complexes are mostly in suburbs that house a lot of kids.**

**John Horn new area director.**

**Boundary Shift Option Discussion  
Option 16: "Boundary Shift" - Analysis**

### **Background Information**

**Will provide input to principals. Process would begin in 2007-08 school year and would be a six year phased in process.**

**How viable is this option? Concern that if we work on this, and it's not viable, then we're back to looking at a closure. What is the likelihood that the board would accept the scenario? In general, PPS wouldn't spend the time if it didn't want it to work. Board will ask questions about schools losing boundary. Find out which boundaries make the most sense. Ok from Superintendent and Minberg. The goal is to have robust schools. 400-600 for fte for programs that schools need to be "robust."**

**Doesn't want collaborative process to turn into alienating each other. Group can come to consensus then work further on specifics. Group can agree on basic philosophy. Have variations on specifics.**

**If a kindergartener and third grader, would they go to different schools? If they want to keep the younger child in old school, they can usually get a transfer. Shouldn't be a problem here. Sibling would get preference (more points). It's a high priority. Fairly easy to do.**

**Looking for win-win. The board has mentioned the transfer policy and may be changing it. Hard to make a decision without knowing. Board hasn't formalized a process. A committee will start to look at it in the fall. Audit showed that transfers need clear desired outcomes instead of random or conflicting objectives. Policy is unnecessarily complex for different areas. Need general policy for common issues. Maintain choice, but identify objectives. Want to be sure work doesn't get "undone" by transfer committee.**

**Hoping each school is better off. Will boundary changes be considered and modified when it makes sense.**

**Timeframe – six year phase in starting in 2007. Will board give it six years to play out? Thinks we'll see impacts sooner than that. It will take three or four years to see impacts. Board is committed to three year timeframe to see impacts.**

Woodstock neighborhood program. If immersion expands, what happens to neighborhood program? It will be six years before they get to a growth pattern where she wouldn't have room for the students.

Woodstock is evenly split (Chinese/neighborhood). Chinese will add one class per year. Plenty of room in the building. Building is large enough to accommodate growth. Moving neighborhood kids out would leave a small school. In five years, you'll need space for 130 kids. PPS will be looking at boundaries more often. Programs that draw from across district are harder to predict. Not ready to make any changes at Woodstock today. But should be kept in the back of our minds. Waiting list? 2005 52 applicants for 30 slots for Mandarin.

PPS wouldn't want to take students from Woodstock N'd program.

Maybe talk about moving the Mandarin program. Could ask the board to consider reserving some capacity in this area.

Changes aren't going to happen all at once. Things will be rebalanced. Special needs programs would like to be kept at Llewellyn and Lewis.

Can special needs space count towards a "virtual 25". Counted differently because they're covered under a different budget. 400 are based on current funding.

Capacity – 400 is goal and if we're close; we're functioning. 380 is a good place to be. Would like PPS to adopt a standard of a percentage of capacity rather than a specific number. PPS does look at a range. 400 is a target.

Proposed approach:

- LEWIS BOUNDARY EXPANSION:

Grateful for this option. PPS came up with this option. Lewis supportive of increasing boundary to east. Important program at Lewis – Life Skills. No better location than Lewis. Concerned about Lewis becoming overcrowded. Would welcome Woodstock to come to process. Wants more time to work out specifics.

Capacity for 350 – but 400 number. 400 with general Ed kids. Not sure the building can accommodate 400. PPS talked about reserving capacity in the cluster – not necessarily in a specific school. Recommendation that PPS consider percentage of capacity for enrollment.

More likely a range for full capacity.

25,000 traffic calming, promote walking, biking. Made some decisions. Crosswalk across 52<sup>nd</sup> at Rural; Also a crosswalk to Woodstock.

LLEWELLYN BOUNDARY EXPANSION:

Option A:

Duniway is concerned. Think they are a model. Have almost 450 kids. An effort to reduce enrollment area makes Duniway vulnerable. Doesn't want to give up diverse segment of population for Duniway. Try to get Llewellyn what they need without harming Duniway.

Duniway gets transfers and could take more. Weren't so concerned with Duniway's ability to get transfers. Transfer policy change could curtail their ability to get transfers.

AND/OR

## **Option B:**

**Grout has same concerns as Duniway. Option B makes Grout even more vulnerable.**

- **GROUT UTILIZATION:**

**Transfer of special Ed programs include: life skills with nursing (significant physical disabilities). Self contained programs. Special Ed discussion district-wide? Not yet. Long process needed to find out if it's optimal. Other programs could move around.**

**Would adding programs to Grout be detrimental? They don't "count" in the same way; would have to look at it differently to make sure Grout remains viable. Kids tend to stay in the schools they start in. If Head Start was at Grout, its likely those kids would stay there. Could increase population at Grout. One or two classrooms may not be what Head Start want. The more special programs would limit Grout's ability to get to 400.**

**PPS is more concerned about the Grout scenario vs. the Duniway scenario.**

**How do we strengthen Grout? Do we know why they leave/transfer in? Would that help the board? Is there a model (Atkinson)? Atkinson has Spanish immersion. Special programs help. Board would welcome input on strengthening schools.**

**Don't want a Duniway vs. Grout battle. Ask PPS to allow group to brainstorm ideas. Think about Grout be K-8 or develop a special program. Likes option C rather than choosing Duniway or Grout. Group has time to talk about it. If there's an Option C, PPS wants to hear it.**

**Need to increase enrollment through capture rate or some other way. If that's what Option C means, it will require more tolerance from the board. Capital is commitment and good work together. Need to continue looking at tweaking boundaries.**

**Group meeting every Tuesday.**

Addendum D.

## Option 16: "Boundary Shift" - Analysis

***Draft: July 27, 2006***

The district has put forth an alternative option for consideration in the Cleveland cluster community conversations which could involve expanding and shifting boundaries to allow schools to better utilize their capacity and build to over 400 students. This option could avoid a school closure in the area if it allows us to meet the district objective of 400-600 students per building at the elementary and middle level.

### **Background Information**

***Lewis:***

Currently Lewis has an attendance area with 217 students K-5, of which it captures 145 or 68%. Its total enrollment in 2005 was 301, with 156 incoming transfers. Of the 156 incoming transfers, 101 came from the nearby neighborhoods of Whitman, Woodmere, Woodstock and Arleta, and 3 from Duniway. Lewis lost 32 students to Duniway and 11 to Winterhaven. The other 29 outgoing transfers attended a variety of schools.

Lewis' enrollment has fluctuated modestly in the last 5 years between 290-300 in most years, with the exception of a drop in 2004 to 271. The PSU forecast for Lewis projects a very modest decline in enrollment.

***Llewellyn:***

Currently Llewellyn has an attendance area of 320 students K-5, of which it captures 233 or 73%. Its total enrollment in 2005 was 301, with 68 incoming transfers. Llewellyn lost 18 students to Duniway, and gained 17 students from Duniway –a net neutral effect. Of the other 70 outgoing transfers, 51 attended focus options. The other incoming transfers are from Grout (15) and a variety of other neighborhoods.

Llewellyn's enrollment has declined by about 30 students in the last 5 years and is forecast to remain flat.

***Duniway:***

Currently Duniway has an attendance area with 377 students K-5, of which it captures 332 or 88%. Its total enrollment in 2005 was 443, with 111 incoming transfers. Of the incoming transfers, 49 came from the nearby neighborhoods of Lewis (32) and Llewellyn (17). The rest came from a variety of schools. Outgoing transfers attended a variety of schools.

Duniway's boundary encompasses the area west of McLaughlin around Sellwood Middle School (96 students) and the area east of McLaughlin, south of Reed College (281 students). Duniway's enrollment has increased modestly in the last 5 years and is forecast to remain steady.

***Grout:***

Currently Grout has a boundary area encompassing 498 students K-5, of which it captures 273, or 55%. Its total enrollment in 2005 was 311, with 38 incoming transfer. The incoming transfers came from a wide variety of schools, with the largest number from Abernethy (7 students). Of the 225 outgoing transfers, 100 attended focus options. 89 attended other neighborhood programs with the largest numbers transferring to Abernethy (22), Llewellyn (15), Creston (12) & Duniway (8).

Grout's enrollment has been flat for the past 3 years but is forecast to decline by about 60 students over the next 10 years.

***Summary***

- Combined neighborhood population of Duniway, Llewellyn, Lewis, Grout: 1412
- Combined enrollment of Duniway, Llewellyn, Lewis, Grout: 1356
- Target number students required to get to 4 schools of 400: 1600 (244 additional)

**Overview of the "Boundary Shift" Option:**

The goal of the boundary shift option is to allow Llewellyn and Lewis to reach 400-600 students by rebalancing students across Llewellyn, Duniway, Grout, Lewis, Whitman and Woodmere schools through boundary adjustments, and by moving some students/programs into Grout to utilize its capacity. It would require shifting some students currently in the Marshall Cluster zoned to Whitman and Woodmere into the Cleveland cluster. The supporting rationale for this option is that:

- 1) Growth is forecast for the neighborhoods of Whitman, Woodmere and Kelly and those schools are already near capacity in their buildings
- 2) Many students in the western area of the Whitman and Woodmere area attend Lewis on transfers due to the relative proximity of Lewis vs. Whitman/Woodmere.
- 3) More than half of middle school students in the western area of the Whitman and Woodmere area choose to attend Sellwood and other schools, so the impact on Lane of this shift would be modest and potentially mitigated by growth in the rest of the Lane boundary area.

**Proposed approach:**

- **LEWIS BOUNDARY EXPANSION:** Expand the Lewis boundary eastward, from 49<sup>th</sup> to 57<sup>th</sup> St, assigning approximately 142 additional students to Lewis over time (24 per grade). Approximately 35 of these (25%) already attend Lewis on transfers. The expected impact of this would be to expand the Lewis K class by 13-18 students each year. Over time this would allow Lewis' enrollment to grow to approximately 375-410 students.

- **LLEWELLYN BOUNDARY EXPANSION:** Several options exist to shift students to Llewellyn so that its enrollment grows over time. These are not mutually exclusive:

**Option A:** Expand the Llewellyn boundary by shifting some portion (exact portion TBD) of the students west of Mclaughlin from Duniway to Llewellyn. The expected impact would be to shift up to 65 students from Duniway to Llewellyn over time, and potentially attract 10-15 other students who are currently attending charters and focus options. This could potentially reduce Duniway enrollment to approximately 400 and increase Llewellyn's enrollment to approximately 380.

#### **AND/OR**

**Option B:** Shift some portion of the Brooklyn neighborhood to Llewellyn from Grout. There are currently 112 students (average 19 students per grade) who live in the area of the Grout boundary that comprises the old Brooklyn neighborhood. Of these 49 attend Grout (44%), 23 attend Winterhaven (21%), 12 attend Llewellyn (10%) and the other 25% attend a variety of other schools. Shifting this area to Llewellyn has the potential to increase Llewellyn's kindergarten from 8 to 14 students per year, depending on the capture rate. This would have the effect of increasing Llewellyn's enrollment over time to 350-385. However, it could possibly reduce Grout's enrollment by 45-50 students to 260-265, unless Grout's capture rate in the rest of its boundary area increases considerably. As such, shifting the entire old Brooklyn neighborhood to Llewellyn would have a significantly negative impact on Grout. To be considered feasible, we could only consider shifting a smaller section of the Brooklyn neighborhood.

- **GROUT UTILIZATION:** As Lewis grows, move some special education programs currently housed at Lewis to Grout to help utilize the excess capacity in the Grout building. Consider moving some Headstart classrooms or the dental clinic from Creston to Grout over time to help relieve crowding at Creston as it goes K-8. In addition, work with the broader southeast community to pursue strategies to increase the capture rate at Grout.

#### **Impact on Whitman/Woodmere/Lane/Marshall**

The area between 49<sup>th</sup> and 57<sup>th</sup> adjacent to the Lewis neighborhood contains 142 current PPS students between K-5. Of these 59 are currently in the Whitman boundary and 83 in the Woodmere boundary. Whitman captures 33/59 students (53%) and Woodmere captures 39/83 or 47%. The rest attend Lewis and a variety of other schools.

Assigning this area to Lewis could cause the Kindergarten class at Whitman to lose 5-6 students and the Kindergarten class at Woodmere to lose 7 students per year. Both Whitman and Woodmere are forecast to grow by 3-5 students per year over the next 5 years adding total growth of 55-65 students

over the next 10 years in each school. So assuming this growth forecast holds, the impact on total enrollment at Whitman and Woodmere of shifting 5-7 Ks per year to Lewis will be limited. It is also worth noting that Kelly Elementary on the eastern side of the Whitman and Woodmere boundary, is forecast to grow by almost 100 students over this timeframe, which would render it quite crowded. Therefore it may be advisable in future to consider adjusting the boundary between Whitman, Woodmere and Kelly to balance incoming Kindergarten classes across the three schools if/when this growth takes place.

The area between 49<sup>th</sup> and 57<sup>th</sup> adjacent to the Lewis neighborhood contains ~ 80 students in grades 6-8. Of those, 16 (5-6 per grade) currently attend Sellwood, and 34 (11-12 per grade) attend Lane. The rest attend a variety of other middle schools. Lane’s capture rate in this area is 43%.

Lane currently has an enrollment of 553. Assigning the area between 49<sup>th</sup> and 57<sup>th</sup> to Sellwood for middle school could cause the Lane enrollment to drop to ~520 with a loss of 11-12 students per grade. However since the area is closer to Lane than to Sellwood, a portion of the students in this area may choose to attend Lane anyway as it is closer to home, particularly as the Lane program improves.

Should all of the students in this area shift to Cleveland to high school, the maximum impact on Marshall would be the loss of ~ 22 students per grade in its attendance area. Since Marshall currently has a capture rate of 42%, it is assumed that only 9 students per grade on average in this area are attending Marshall currently. So the potential loss to Marshall would be ~ 36 students grades 9-12. This reduction would hopefully be counteracted by Marshall’s increase in capture rate in the rest of its boundary area as its program improves.

**Overall impact:**

School	Current Neighbrhd Population	Current Enrollment	Impact of boundary shift	Expected Neighbrhd growth	Projected Neighbrhd Population	Potential Enrollment
Lewis	217	301	+ 142	-25	330-359	375-410
Llewellyn – Option A	320	301	+96	N/a	415	365-385
Llewellyn – Option B	320	301	TBD	N/a	TBD	TBD
Duniway (Llewellyn option A)	377	443	-96	+10-15	275-290	390-410
Grout (Llewellyn option B)	498	311	-45	-50	403	220-265 plus special programs
Whitman	465	405	-59	+55	460	405
Woodmere	530	449	-83	+63	510	440
Lane	721	553	-86	N/a	641	520
Sellwood	463	564	+86	N/a	543	590-610
Marshall	1861	955	-88	-90	1680	Undetermined
Cleveland	1378	1449	+88	-325	1140	Undetermined

### **Key Outstanding Issues for Discussion**

- Safety/traffic/transportation issues with shifting Lewis boundary to 57<sup>th</sup>
- Pros/Cons of Llewellyn Expansion Option A vs. Option B
  - Impact on Duniway and Grout communities
  - Traffic/safety/transportation issues
  - Cost/impact of moving special education & other programs
- Community strategies for boosting Grout capture rate
- Other?

### **Key Outstanding Issues for Discussion**

- Safety/traffic/transportation issues with shifting Lewis boundary to 57<sup>th</sup>
- Pros/Cons of Llewellyn Expansion Option A vs. Option B
  - Impact on Duniway and Grout communities
  - Traffic/safety/transportation issues
  - Cost/impact of moving special education & other programs
- Community strategies for boosting Grout capture rate
- Other?

### **Next Steps**

**Continue dialogue. Tuesday meeting might provide more alternatives. Demographer will attend next meeting.**

**Plan to redistribute special option programs throughout the district. No current plan, but will likely come up.**

**City of Portland draft a letter about the benefits on the local economy on neighborhood schools.**