

Student Assignment to Neighborhood Schools

Policy 4.10.045-P

Why address this policy

1. PPS has a number of overcrowded and underutilized schools (see the table at the end of this memo). Both states of utilization negatively impact students and staff.
2. We're running the SE process, which needs guidance, and will be continuing into the North and Northeast in future years.
3. The current policy reflects values and choices that we should either affirm or change and in some cases, clarify.
4. The current policy has not been examined from an equity point of view.
5. There may be some gaps in the current policy.
6. There are contradictions between what a sensible long-term policy might state, and what our short-term conditions require, as we reconfigure schools and adjust boundaries. Long-term, we should have an ongoing process for tracking enrollment, with frequent, small adjustments that affect only a small number of students. Short-term, we need to move a large number of students in order to balance enrollment. The full board should consider a resolution to lay out the rules for shifting boundaries over the next few years before reverting to a long-term policy and process.

What the current policy states:

Section I states the purpose (which we may want to re-write)

Section II provides definitions (which we may want to move to the end)

Section III assigns a student to their neighborhood school based on where they live

Part A assigns a student to their neighborhood school based on where they live

Part B states "Students have the right to attend their neighborhood schools through the highest grade" unless [as stated in Part D] they are assigned to another school for purposes of receiving special education services, ELL services, or alternative program services.

- The policy says nothing about students who move outside their catchment area (except that they are assigned to the school in their new neighborhood). The AD for this policy allows students who move to stay in their (old) school up to the highest grade.
- Do we want to continue to allow students to stay at their current school through the highest grade if they move outside their current school's catchment area?
- Do we want to continue to allow students to stay at their current school through the highest grade if PPS changes their school's boundaries and now the student lives outside their current school's new catchment area?
- In the case of a grade reconfiguration which establishes a new feeder pattern and changes boundaries in the feeder schools:
 - For students who live in the old catchment area of a feeder school but now live outside the new catchment area, and are in a grade that is being shifted to a different school, do we want them to be able to follow their cohort?

- o Same thing, but for younger siblings? [the transfer part of this actually applies to a different policy]
- o For students attending a feeder school who live outside the school's catchment area (either the moved or transferred) and are in a grade that is being shifted to a different school: do we want them to be able to follow their cohort?

Part C says that students who attend a school different from their neighborhood school (due to an approved transfer) have the right to return to their neighborhood school. [does this require the family to file a transfer petition?]

Part D see Part B above

Section IV covers managing the system

Part A says there will be a regular review of enrollment trends.

Part B says the Superintendent shall develop recommendations to the board when adjustments are needed. In doing so, the Superintendent will:

- Incorporate input from families, students, staff and community members
- Consider factors that contribute to optimal school boundaries, to the extent reasonable. The Board recognizes that such factors may conflict with one another, and include, but are not limited to, the following non-prioritized list:
 - a) A feeder pattern that allows as many students as possible to continue together from one school level to the next
 - b) Student body demographics
 - c) Compact boundaries that promote safer routes to schools and a sense of community as well as recognize and address natural and human-made barriers
 - d) Optimal use of existing facilities
 - e) Program and enrollment stability in the surrounding schools
 - f) Limiting the impact of boundary changes to the smallest number of students possible

Part C says: The Board shall have final approval of school boundary changes, with the intention that all changes be approved no later than January of the calendar year for the following school year.

If we had been constantly monitoring and adjusting boundaries, the six factors (a through f) seem reasonable. But now, not so much. How do we want to deal with long-term vs. short-term considerations? Do we need a resolution to guide us through the next two-three years of reconfiguration and boundary adjustments, and then revert to the long-term policy?

Section V covers student assignment following boundary changes.

Part A states:

- "Students living in the neighborhood approved for a boundary change may remain at their current school through the highest grade"; this language is unclear but implies that if a student's residence is outside the new catchment area, they can stay at that school indefinitely.

- It also extends the right to stay at that school to younger siblings if an older sibling is grandfathered in.
- Transfer students are also allowed to remain.

Do we want to continue to allow students to remain through the highest grade? Do we want to allow siblings as well? How about transfers—lottery vs. hardship? How about students who had previously moved out of the catchment area?

Also, what about feeder patterns? The policy does not state whether students who have been allowed to stay with their cohort (though they do not live within the new boundaries) can or cannot continue with their cohort to the next school.

Part B states that in relief of overcrowding or in the case of opening a new school, the Superintendent can propose and the board can agree to exceptions to Part A.

Section V mostly deals with temporary/emergency issues (a fire, repairs, etc.) which have led to a temporary relocation of students, and affirms that they are treated as if they were still in their previous school site.

SCHOOLS ABOVE 85 PERCENT CAPACITY UTILIZATION, 2019-20

School	Enrollment	Capacity utilization
ODYSSEY	244	121%
BEVERLY CLEARY @ FERNWOOD	619	112%
FRANKLIN	1,936	109%
LAURELHURST	698	106%
MT. TABOR	724	106%
ABERNETHY	507	106%
GRANT	1,813	105%
AINSWORTH	644	105%
VERNON	607	105%
WINTERHAVEN	299	104%
FAUBION	786	104%
LEWIS	410	102%
LLEWELLYN	509	102%
SUNNYSIDE	549	101%
CHAVEZ	549	98%
CAPITOL HILL	416	97%
HOSFORD	651	94%
DUNIWAY	512	93%
ALAMEDA	704	92%
GRAY	566	91%
CREATIVE SCIENCE	468	90%
MAPLEWOOD	374	89%
BRIDGER	453	89%
CLEVELAND	1,560	89%
ROSE CITY PARK	538	88%
LINCOLN	1,588	88%
SKYLINE	248	88%
WILSON	1,558	88%
WOODSTOCK	543	87%
JACKSON	793	87%
ROOSEVELT	1,195	87%
RICHMOND	627	87%
SELLWOOD	588	86%

SCHOOLS BELOW 65 PERCENT CAPACITY UTILIZATION, 2019-20

School	Enrollment	Capacity utilization
WOODMERE	273	63%
DA VINCI	450	62%
BEVERLY CLEARY@ HOLLYROOD	123	61%
LEE	269	61%
BEACH	436	60%
TUBMAN	430	59%
MADISON	1,079	59%
IRVINGTON	325	57%
WOODLAWN	327	53%
BOISE-ELIOT/ HUMBOLDT	343	53%
RIGLER	307	50%
ROSA PARKS	280	49%
MLK JR	341	49%
BENSON	1,055	48%
WHITMAN	220	47%
PENINSULA	265	42%
JEFFERSON	641	36%