



**Enrollment & Program Balancing: Final SE Proposal Survey
May 20, 2022**

This memorandum summarizes responses to the Final Enrollment and Program Balancing survey for the South East Guiding Coalition. The survey elicited feedback from community members regarding the final proposals to balance enrollment in South East Portland schools.

Data were collected and reported in two rounds. Data collected up to April 18th were reported on April 26th in a previous memorandum. This memorandum contains an update with all responses collected between April 18th and May 20th. This narrative report is a companion to the data presented in the supplemental [workbook](#).

Languages

This survey was translated in all five languages supported by PPS (Spanish, Russian, Vietnamese, Chinese, and Somali). There were 104 responses to the English language version of the survey and one response to the Vietnamese version.

Racial and Ethnic Identity

Survey participants were asked to provide their racial and ethnic identity. The majority of respondents were white (61%), followed by Latinx and Multi-racial (both 12%). Table 1 displays participant and PPS Student race/ethnicity.

Table 1. Race/ethnicity

Race/ethnicity	Survey Participants		PPS Students
	<i>n</i>	%	%
Black	1	1.1	8.6
Asian	1	6.7	6.0
Hispanic – Latin/x/a/o	11	12.2	16.6
Native American or Alaska Native	1	1.1	0.5
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	1	1.1	0.8
Multi-Racial	11	12.2	11.8
White, non-Hispanic – Latin/x/a/o	54	60.0	55.8
Other	4	4.4	NA
Total	90	100.0	100.0

Note: some participants did not report race/ethnicity

Schools

More participants indicated they were associated with Glencoe (18 responses) than any other school, followed by Bridger (11), Hosford (10), and Atkinson (9).

Table 2 displays schools.

Table 2: Schools

Schools	Count
Glencoe	18
Bridger	11
Hosford	10
Atkinson	9
Kellogg	7
Lent	7
Mt. Tabor	7
Woodstock	7
Creston	6
Lewis	4
Community member	3
Sellwood	3
Creative Science	1
Harrison Park	1
Lane	1
Total	97

Respondents were asked which programs they were associated with. The majority of respondents were associated with Mt Tabor Neighborhood (13), followed by Bridger Spanish (9), and Atkinson Neighborhood (8).

Table 3 displays programs.

Table 3: Programs

Programs	Count
Mt. Tabor Neighborhood	13
Bridger Spanish	9
Atkinson Neighborhood	8
Hosford Chinese	7
Woodstock Neighborhood	6

Table 3: Programs

Programs	Count
Woodstock Chinese	3
Lent Neighborhood	3
Kellogg Spanish	3
Mt. Tabor Spanish	2
Kellogg Neighborhood	2
Lent Spanish	1
Bridger Neighborhood	1
Total	58

Reactions to Proposals

Students Most Benefited

The survey asked participants, “Who might benefit MOST from the proposed changes? Please consider other school communities as well as your own school in your response.” This was a closed-choice item, respondents were asked to choose just one option. “Students in Dual Language Immersion Programs” was the most frequently selected option with 35% of respondents so reporting, followed by Students who are Not in Historically Underrepresented racial or ethnic groups (21%), and “Students in who are in Historically Underrepresented racial or ethnic groups” (14%). The [Most Benefit chart](#) in the supplementary workbook displays results for this item.

As a follow up to this question, community members were asked why they felt this group benefited the most from the final proposal. The most commonly reported themes with 16 comments each were that white, higher income, or more privileged kids will benefit most and that students in Dual Language Immersion programs would benefit most. Nine comments indicated that students in neighborhood programs would benefit most. Table 4 presents the themes around why those students benefit most.

Table 4: Why will these students benefit most?

Theme	Count
White, higher income, more privileged students benefit	16
Students in DLI programs benefit	16
Students in neighborhood programs benefit	9
No one benefits	6
All students benefit	1

Students Least Benefited

The survey asked, “Who might benefit LEAST from the proposed changes? Please consider other school communities as well as your own school in your response.” This was a closed-choice item, community members were asked to choose just one option, the most frequently selected option was “Students in Neighborhood Schools” with 47% of respondents so reporting. The next most frequently selected options were “Students who are in Historically Underrepresented racial or ethnic groups” (26%), followed by “Students in Dual Language Immersion programs” and “Students in Special Education Programs” (both 7.7%). The [Least Benefit chart](#) in the supplementary workbook displays the results from this item.

As a follow up to this question, community members were asked why they felt this group benefited the least from the final proposal. Community members most frequently commented that students in neighborhood schools would benefit least (29 comments). The next most frequently reported theme was students that must change schools would benefit the least (24 comments).

Table 5 presents the themes around which students benefit least.

Table 5: Why will these students benefit least?

Theme	Count
Historically Underserved students benefit least	15
Students in neighborhood schools benefit least	29
Students in DLI programs benefit least	10
Students that must change schools	24

Improved Student Outcomes

Community members were asked: “In your opinion, will these changes lead to improved student outcomes, especially for our Black, Native American, and Emerging Bilingual students?” The majority of respondents reported No (60%), followed by Maybe (33%), with just 7% of respondents reporting yes. The [Improved Outcomes](#) chart in the supplementary workbook displays results for this item.

As a follow up to this item, community members were asked: “How will we know if these changes have improved student outcomes, especially for our Black, Native American, and Emerging Bilingual students?” The most frequent theme was around data (12 comments), followed by other suggestions around how to monitor progress. Table 6 presents the themes from this open-ended item.

Table 6: Improved Outcomes

Theme	Count
Ask the community	5
Data (attendance, discipline, test scores, etc)	12

Theme	Count
Improved equity (racial, economic)	4
Other	11
We won't or can't or it won't	10

Eased Transition

Community members were asked, “When a plan moves forward, how could we ease the transition for students, families, and staff?” The most common theme from this open-ended item was to allow legacies, “grandfathering”, or other slow transition planning (36 comments). Many community member expressed that they felt PPS should not make any changes (13 comments). Table 6 presents the themes from this open-ended item.

Table 6: How to Ease the Transition

Theme	Count
Allow students to stay in their current schools, slow transition, stay on track with MIP, siblings	36
Transportation	9
Don't make any changes	13
More support to schools	5
More support for students	5
More communication/ clarity/ information about the impacts of the changes	9
More support for families	3

Additional Feedback

As a last item on the survey, community members were asked, “Do you have additional feedback for PPS about this proposal or the process?” The majority of responses expressed frustration (42), particularly about the process (11). There were many comments about equity concerns (28) or income inequality (13). Many community members commented that they desired better communication from PPS about the process and more input in the decision. Table 7 presents themes from this open-ended item

Table 7: Additional Feedback for PPS

Theme	Count
Redistricting creates greater income inequality	13
Better outreach to families, community, more transparency	25
Slow transition	3
Please reconsider, frustration	42

Theme	Count
Breaking up neighborhoods, longer commute to school	26
Equity concerns	28
Comments supportive of the decision	5
Process concerns	11
Other	12
