

SE GUIDING COALITION ENROLLMENT AND PROGRAM BALANCING

SURVEY QUESTION - CONCERNS

THEME KEY

Theme Umbrella	Topics
Transportation and Safety	Location, distance to travel, biking, walking
Equity	Diversity
Single Strand DLI	
Multiple Location DLI	
Timing	Why now, Why our School, Phase 1 or Phase 2, In person engagement, Speed and timing
Covid 19	pandemic
Community	Neighborhood schools, community, continuity
Segregation	gentrification
Co-location	Choose if it is positive or negative
Utilization	Underenrollment, lack of funding
Engagement	Community engagement, outreach
Socio-emotional health	PTSD, Trauma etc.

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
The large number of students and families being impacted, and the fact that so many DLI programs result in a significant distance for relocation for the families involved	Co-location	Negative Response		
A decision to move CSS without having first identified a new location is irresponsible and unfair to the CSS community. 500 kids. Families that may want to know sooner rather than later whether they will be able to follow CSS to it's new location vs enroll in a different school. Find a location for it before approving the decision to move it out of the Clark building	Co-location	Negative Response		
2.) Some key assumptions of co-located programs schools in K-5 have been voiced by a few loud voices and experiences in the coalition mainly from a single school (bridger). I haven't been convinced that those voices, while loud, actually speak for the majority of that school, or for other co-located schools. I'd like further information to support the assumptions from other people in co-located schools that indeed the assumption of co-located schools is a district-wide issue, as opposed to just an issue with an individual school. From listening in the youtube posted videos of the meeting, I have heard other quieter voices say their experience at other co-located dual language schools has been beneficial to their school as a whole (woodstock). I'd like more in-depth research to show that assumption is reflective of all co-located schools and worth correcting to achieve the goals of pps and the students and community involved.	Co-location	Negative Response		
It's irresponsible to propose to move us without having any idea where we would go, and with the precedent of ACCESS that there is no location for us. We have about 470 students. I honestly feel that the most we can hope for is that our program is split K-5 and 6-8, with each of those co-located with another school/program/focus. That will be the beginning of the end for our focus. Community is important, and in moving and splitting us up we will lose what we have built, including the interaction of our middle schoolers with our younger students. An unknown location is not just a concern for us: it indicates to all families in the district that PPS "can't be trusted".	Co-location	Negative Response		
I'm concerned about the move of the JDLI program from Grant to Madison. Grant has had a long-standing successful JDLI program. Moving it to another site will require a complete rebuild as well as integration of the other languages as proposed.	Co-location	Negative Response		
The redirection of the program and splitting grades up basked on immersion and non immersion. Additionally, if I have one child that continues with the program and one that doesn't I will have two kids in track at different schools. That is not an okay option for our family.	Co-location	Negative Response		
Please consider S.Tabor neighborhood (Atkinson Students) are proposed to be split up for their middle schools. This also splits up S. Tabor between 4 different elementary schools. This greatly affects this community both in elementary school relationships by having split feeder pattern to middle, but also disrupts relationships at the elem. school level between families who share childcare where one lives n. of woodward, another lives s. of woodward, but then again splits s. of woodward up between yet another two more schools (areleta, Creston). No other neighborhood is being split up as much, and I also feel this lack of voice is due to PPS not making sure Atkinson Neighborhood program parents were on the coalition.	Community	Negative Response		
Many families I know attending Mt. Tabor have had siblings attend Franklin and chose to live in the neighborhood to attend Franklin as they feel so connected to that school community. I really hope there is some consideration for the timing of students currently in 8th grade for example who were looking forward to coming to Franklin next year. There has already been so much to adjust to, I hope they don't have to live with more adjustment next year.	Community	Negative Response		

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
The reason we moved was to be close to Bridger, which we live a block from, and the thought of commuting every day is sad. We wanted our child to attend a neighborhood Spanish immersion program, but now the program is moving out of the neighborhood. This makes it hard to build community with the parents and kids in the neighborhood who now have to travel far for school.	Community	Negative Response		
That the South Tabor neighborhood is broken up into several different schools, and Bridger is made into a Chinese DLI. Do the neighborhood demographics support that? I thought DLIs were intended to be in the neighborhood where speakers live.	Community	Negative Response		
I have lived in the Glencoe/Mt Tabor/Franklin district since 2002, before my children were born. Now, as a Franklin parent and Glencoe parent/2021 Mt Tabor parent I'm extremely concerned about the fast-track approach to changing the feeder situation for Mt. Tabor to Madison HS from Franklin. This affects 700 kids at MTMS, 500 at Glencoe, and their families and there has been almost no community participation or announcements about it. Most of the rebalancing news we were sent was about immersion language and re-opening Kellogg, so we mostly passed over it, as there is so much else to deal with in this extraordinarily stressful year. Most Glencoe parents and Mt Tabor parents were aware of the need to open a new middle school at Kellogg; and the possible rebalancing of immersion language students at other MS, but we had NO IDEA of the additional scope of this project that drastically affects Mt Tabor - with families who have already invested time and resources into the Franklin community and are concerned about having to start over at a new high school in a more distant neighborhood with a younger sibling. It's inequitable from a family resource standpoint and an economics/environmental standpoint for many Glencoe/Mt Tabor families who currently can walk and bike to Franklin and would have to cross a highway to attend Madison.	Community	Negative Response		
I'm worried about the physical distance between us and a school other than glencoe given we are so close. We were excited about walking to school, being in walking distance from school friends, building community and not using our car/polluting to get to school.	Community	Negative Response		
It totally eliminates the bridger community. The kids and families put a ton of effort into that school and to have it eliminated is heart breaking.	Community	Negative Response		
The thought of Bridger losing it's neighborhood school program is deeply concerning to me. Our children deserve a place that they can take ownership of in their neighborhood. It instills a sense of pride in the neighborhood with the children and allows them to make meaningful relationships within their own community. I also do not think it is a good idea to segregate the DLI programs. I do not see how that creates a cultural as well as social/economical diversity in these schools. I also have deep concerns for our middle-school kids crossing a state highway to get to school. 82nd Ave is a very very dangerous street. Has the district considered safety measures concerning this?	Community	Negative Response		
I'm also extremely concerned about the Bridger community having to bear the brunt of these changes. Bridger is losing so much in this scenario. They are losing their entire community. As is Lent, and I am also very concerned about taking away Lent's neighborhood school as well.	Community	Negative Response		
If put the immersion program all in one school without neighborhood school in the same building, it is losing the points for immersions program kids to connect the local community and culture.	Community	Negative Response		
It will ruin our existing school and community and reduce diversity here in woodstock.	Community	Negative Response		
That my children would attend Madison versus Franklin. We moved into the area specifically to attend these schools because of bike ability and community in inner SE.	Community	Negative Response		

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
children living on the same street but going to different schools, reducing the opportunity for lasting friendships and community to be built within neighborhoods	Community	Negative Response		
reduce the number of students at Atkinson so that the South Tabor neighborhood will be at risk of losing its only elementary school	Community	Negative Response		
I live on the board art of feeder schools and we bought our house in anticipation of our desired middle school. If that changes, so will our housing situation	Community	Negative Response		
<p>I understand this work has to happen and many parties will move, I just want make sure CSS will have a home where hopefully our whole program can exist together.</p> <p>Also, in terms of boundaries, is the coalition/board considering using backyards rather than streets as boundaries? Having households only separated by a street being sent to different schools divides neighborhoods unnecessarily. By slightly shifting the boundary markers to backyards you can increase the sense of community within a neighborhood that centers around our school. This would also eliminate families who live across the street from a school but also on a boundary from living across the street from one school but sent to another school 15-20 minutes away (example: 60th & Mt Tabor MS) which I imagine would feel like a thoughtless designation to those families.</p>	Community	Negative Response		
As a staff member at Bridger currently, I have some concerns about these changes and how they will effect the neighborhood kids. Bridger has a very strong community and I am concerned about losing that and having to rebuild all of it from the ground up with a new community and culture.	Community	Negative Response		
This is a breach of trust and the commitment that the schools have made with parents and their children. We did not sign up to be shuffled around from school to school. We signed up for an immersive program where the children had the stability and reliability of being in the same school, with the same group of students so that they could develop strong connections and support in their learning. My child has friendships with children in the neighborhood classrooms as well as her own and to disrupt these relationships and the community that we have built over the last several years is beyond upsetting. It is a violation of our trust and your commitment to educate our children in the manner that we signed up for. You are changing the course of their education in the middle of the program and it is not something we have chosen or would have agreed to. In fact, it is being forced on us and at a time when so much has happened it feels like violating and cruel.	Community	Negative Response		
The community aspect of building public neighborhood schools is lost with this plan.	Community	Negative Response		
Don't move the Spanish Dual Language Immersion (DLI) program out of Atkinson to Lent. Losing the DLI program would decrease diversity at Atkinson and require kids to be driven to school at Lents. It would also mean that children living on the same street would attend different elementary and middle schools. It would also decrease enrollment at Atkinson significantly, possibly leading to a school building closure in the future, leaving this neighborhood with no elementary neighborhood option.	Community	Negative Response		

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
Franklin has served this neighborhood for a very long time if not since the beginning. This kind of history has the effect of creating an identity and neighborhood cohesiveness that would be lost if all of a sudden and going forward, the children of the neighborhood no longer have Franklin and it's proximity as a visual and social identifier. Franklin is part of our community and in turn, we are NOT part of Madison and feel no connection to it, either historically or proximity-wise. We as parents of former Franklin students remember what we went through when Franklin merged with Marshall. It was a huge struggle and then the remodel further caused upheaval. We bought this house 20 years ago because it was in the Franklin neighborhood. We strenuously object to changing these boundaries now, in the midst of a pandemic that is causing a great deal of social and academic dislocation for the kids in this neighborhood. Please allow the feeder pattern to remain Glencoe to Mt. Tabor to Franklin. Please.	Community	Negative Response		
Disconnection with neighborhood	Community	Negative Response		
Dividing this neighborhood of good friends would be beyond sad for these students.	Community	Negative Response		
Breaking up a neighborhood of friends we see Atkinson from our porch and this has our son at Creston. Across Powell. Finally it appears he won't even attend Franklin which is our front porch view!	Community	Negative Response		
Regarding Mt Tabor students being split between Franklin and Madison: my current 8th grade son would lose 2/3 of his school community because he would go to Franklin and the rest would not.	Community	Negative Response		
Students have found a community at Grant and moving schools so abruptly could cause many students to drop out of the program, or cause (emotional) stress not to mention some students are in programs such as AVID that creates a close knit within the class and JMP students who are in it or need it would lose that if they have to move schools	Community	Negative Response		
Ideally the program would stay with the school where it has 20+ years and where many relationships have been formed.	Community	Negative Response		
I worry that the proposal for the middle school and high schools is tearing apart important neighborhood communities and it is evident there was no representation for the community that I live in.	Community	Negative Response		
With a son in the JDLI program and in the Richmond community, I have two issues with the proposal. 1) The JDLI program has been in place at Grant HS for a long time. Moving this to Madison would be uprooting the program and teachers. This is disruptive and not a good thing for its community.	Community	Negative Response		
The current proposal seems to fall short on the stated goals. For example the current proposal shows overcrowding at Franklin, Bridger and near capacity at Kellogg which are feeders for the eastern boundary. While at the same time, underutilization of Atkinson, Harrison Park and Woodstock which serve inner south east. This doesn't feel fair or equitable. Moving the Spanish Immersion to Lent and Chinese Immersion to Bridger may achieve some goals, but both will be at capacity without modulars and neighborhood communities will be split up. Has the coalition/district balanced the impacts on school communities and transport with the concerns over co-location? If so, will these results be made available? I believe there should also be a consideration for the increased need for transporting kids to news schools via highways and congested intersections. This will promote many more families to drive kids, increasing local air quality effects and traffic.	Community	Negative Response		
Displacement of my kids	Community	Negative Response		

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
It would also mean that children living on the same street would attend different elementary and middle schools. This goes against community building.	Community	Negative Response		
Some of our kids friends are already saying they wouldn't be able to transport their children to the new schools bc of work schedules. This tears apart the program we have been building since kindergarten where we all committed to the program until High School. PPS should adhere to the same commitment by not making it impossible for families to fulfill this.	Community	Negative Response		
This proposal means that our neighborhood school of Atkinson would only be left at 40% capacity which means that it is subject to more drastic changes in the future. This is unacceptable and does not satisfy the rebalancing questions. Also, the loss of the DLI program is a major loss for not only the immersion families but also the neighborhood families as it offers multiculturalism and a wealth of different experiences for the neighborhood families as well.	Community	Negative Response		
Separation from older sibling at Grant HS. Loss of friends from JMP deciding not to continue in the program due to the proposed changes. Loss of teachers.	Community	Negative Response		
<p>The Woodstock Neighborhood has been shaped by the Mandarin Immersion program for 22 years and has become an integral part of the local community. Businesses sprouted up that rely on the program for their very existence– including several Mandarin daycare and after school care centers. If the program left it would leave a giant hole in the community. Like many elementary schools this one is a community hub and ours would lose much of what people have worked so hard to make it. The school would become very homogeneous and lose much of the diversity that make it attractive.</p> <p>Relocating the program would seem like a budget driven consolidation of resources. While I believe that far East Portland neighborhoods are often underserved, I do not see how this improves the quality of education for people who live anywhere. The Argument that diversity would be increased is very hard to believe. Woodstock would obviously become much less diverse. I think we would also find that the amount of parents willing to take their kids to less well-resourced schools and neighborhoods would be low. The outcome might be a loss of economic diversity within the Mandarin speaking students (currently scattered throughout SW and SE) and ethnic diversity.</p>	Community	Negative Response		
You are breaking up the diversity of Atkinson, by taking away the immersion program. Atkinson is currently an amazing diverse community, and your boundary proposal makes it more white cuts out many of the lower income families.	Community	Negative Response		
Not to mention the proposed boundary changes divides up many of my kids' friends into different schools, many of whom literally live 2-3 blocks away.	Community	Negative Response		
The progression from Atkinson to Kellogg to Franklin is perfect for the children who live in the neighborhoods near these schools. You (with our tax dollars) remodeled Franklin and are rebuilding Kellogg. You should be thinking about expanding Atkinson so that more children can go to school from first grade to twelfth in their neighborhood.	Community	Negative Response		
Atkinson school is so important to our success with diversity and culture one of the only ways keep moving forward with our ever so changing society's anti racial commitments is to keep schools like atkinsons funded and operational.	Community	Negative Response		

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
Splitting Mt Tabor students where 1/2 of the school feeds to Franklin and 1/2 feeds to Madison is very problematic. Social connections for students are more important to them than anything else, and it will result in students losing their friends as a source of support during the most difficult transition in their lives- going to high school.	Community	Negative Response		
Collapsing of language programs into shared space lessens the interaction with broader community and "neighborhood" students further than it already is.	Community	Negative Response		
My child attends Grant and loves the atmosphere of going to a school that has had an immersion program for so long. She loves the classes offered at Grant and has enjoyed building a community there. Switching to Madison would require building a whole new Japanese community there and completely upending the Japanese program which has been going on for many years at Grant.	Community	Negative Response		
Kids shouldn't have to be moved from their school mid course. If they start at a school they should be able to finish at a school. I'm concerned that my son who should be starting at Franklin next year will have to transfer to Madison a year or two later.	Community	Negative Response		
Removing children from their neighborhood community, especially on the heels of a pandemic when they have experienced so much isolation, is going to further the affects of social emotional disconnection and sacrifice the health benefits of walking to/from school. Neighbors spent years planning the remodel of Franklin and making efforts to connect the school with the community, as seen in the prominent position of the theater. What happened to this commitment to valuing the relationship between a school and the community around it? We are seriously being short-sighted about how much schools rely on the support of their neighborhoods.	Community	Negative Response		
You propose sending kids who take a ten-minute walk to school to bus 45 minutes to Madison High School. it breaks up the community connectedness that community schools provide and increases time and stress involved in commuting farther away. It also destroys the benefits that the local kids have in running on Tabor for track and field practices.	Community	Negative Response		
Community: We live in Southeast and are a proud part of this community. We appreciate PPS' commitment to neighborhood schools and believe in the sense of community that grows out of our kids attending schools within a reasonable geographic distance with their neighbors. The entire Southeast community would lose that if kids are sent 4 miles into the Northeast community.	Community	Negative Response		
a lot. majority of proposals are very negative for us, including not going to neighborhood schools were we have worked hard to build community	Community	Negative Response		
In terms of the Mt. Tabor Middle School feeding into Madison, this is displacing my kids out of the communities they live and love into another community and increasing their commute ten fold. Why aren't other more affluent communities, such as Grant, Jefferson, and Alliance HS, also absorbing more students from the eastern and northern neighborhoods, to relieve the the pressure on inner NE and SE high schools?	Community	Negative Response		
That my child won't attend her neighborhood school, and that Madison will be overcrowded as it absorbs students from other high schools undergoing renovations. I grew up in SE Portland and attended public schools. My social and academic connections, many of which I retain nearly 35 years after graduating from Cleveland High School, were based on the accessibility and community afforded by attending schools in or near my neighborhood.	Community	Negative Response		

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
Grant has offered Japanese classes to neighborhood students since 1969, became home to the JDLI high school program in 1998, and is the only PPS high school with Japanese language study. We want to ensure that the appropriate stakeholders across PPS are properly engaged to ensure that the potential impacts to schools, the JDLI program, and families who commit to it from kindergarten through 12th grade are properly considered. Our community has not been considered in this proposal. Moving this program to Madison without proper engagement of the community impacted is not good. The proposal also seems to flip a good number of kids between Franklin and Madison. Disrupting people's schools to just flip kids between the 2 seems pointless and actually not very thoughtful at a time when so many people are already struggling.	Community	Negative Response		
I strenuously oppose moving the Spanish dual language program from Atkinson to Lent. This would have the effect of uprooting a strong and effective community at Atkinson that benefits both neighborhood and DLI students. For instance, the neighborhood students at Atkinson now enjoy the benefits of interacting with DLI students. This, in turn, promotes diversity and respect for other students and their cultures.	Community	Positive Response		
I do not want to send my kids to schools not in my neighborhood	Community			Positive and Negative
lack of data/evidence/clarity on disbanding co-location schools, harm of neighborhood schools,	Community	Negative Response		
spanish emersion at Lents? So we need to drive her there? I haven't seen all the details exactly but I like my child being in a neighborhood school. Bridger is a great community and your throwing it all away.	Community	Positive Response		
I would not like my children's high school to change. Currently we are slated to go to Franklin, part of the reason we purchased a home where we did. Please to do change these boundaries	Community	Positive Response		
My kids won't go to Franklin	Community			statement
Madison is very far from where we live AND the Japanese program being at Grant is why we chose Richmond in the first place. It is near our community, where we live and work, we wanted an immersion program and heard of the great success of this particular school track. *we are not Japanese	Community	Negative Response		
My child goes to Arleta but is in the markers for Lane. Could he still go to Kellogg, since it Arleta leads to Kellogg? I want him to be able to stay with his friends.	Community			
Moving Mt Tabor to Madison -- uprooting a SE school from its community and placing it in distant community in the NE.	Community	Negative Response		
2 of my children currently attend. If the school gets the k-8 model split up will my kids go to different schools? No time to get to 2 different schools. Breaking up the community. Loosing the teaching style	Community	Negative Response		
Neighborhood cohesion completely broken by some of these boundaries. Franklin needs to retain Glencoe boundary. FHS Alumni stay in this neighborhood for generations.	Community	Negative Response		
It ignores the concept of neighborhood schools. Instead of a 5 min bike ride to a HS less than a mile away, it'd be a 40 minute bus ride to a HS 5 miles away. It makes no sense	Community	Negative Response	Location	
I'm mostly concerned our school will be split up or in the worse case dismantled altogether.	Community	Negative Response		

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
It disrupts current established communities, especially in such a disrupted time for all of us. More than ever our kids need stability and community right now. I understand that some of these changes were already in the works and in particular the new Kellogg is getting close to completion, but it really seems like we should hold off for a bit & see where things are at maybe in the spring at least?	Community	Negative Response		
I am sad to see that we will loose our neighborhood school. A school that is directly across from our home of 10 years. I am more sad to see that boundary lines might further separate our kids and their classmates. The proposal would be much more palatable if we knew the neighborhood kids would get to stay together at their future elementary.	Community	Negative Response		
This seems like PPS created a geographic closeness problem with opening three middle schools close to Franklin and now Mt Tabor, with Glencoe, is being sacrificed as a result of PPS's poor planning errors. While the families who enrolled in the Language Immersion programs already made that choice for its benefits over neighborhood school benefits, the majority of families did not. My Mt Tabor student is not in the Japanese program, but she has many friends in those. We have never heard of problems by having this program in our school.	Community	Negative Response		
The boundary changes causing Glencoe kids go to Madison is a mistake. That's a long way for them to go. If the goal is to get more rich kids at Madison (an idea I support), then giving Madison part of Grant's area seems like a better solution in terms of transportation and socioeconomics.	Community	Negative Response		
I'm also concerned that the current families in neighborhood DLI who don't have siblings in the program will be forced to choose between staying in or splitting up. Also when the schools don't feed to the same HS you have years of families split between multiple schools.	Community	Negative Response	Seperating sibilngs	
We worry that taking DLI options out of other schools will significantly change the community at the school. At Atkinson our son in the neighborhood program had much more exposure to Latino culture than he otherwise would have. And for children for whom the DLI program is not a fit after a number of years, having a co-located option enables them to remain at the school with friends rather than starting over at a new school.	Community	Negative Response		
Families at Mt. Tabor already have a relationship and comfort level with Franklin, why take that away? It may seem unimportant but it can take years to build I believe directly relates to how well kids do at school.	Community	Negative Response		
Too many school communities being uprooted.	Community	Negative Response		
That we stay in SE, NE, or East Portland to maintain our schools deep connection to this community.	Community	Negative Response		
Separately DLI and neighborhood programs into separate school DOES NOT create a sense of community.	Community	Negative Response		
Our high school is now incredibly far and eliminates any chance of my children being able to bike to school. This is incredibly disappointing.	Community	Negative Response		
Breaking up communities that have supported each other for years to add school boundary lines that do not allow children to walk to their closest neighborhood schools.	Community	Negative Response		
I am concern that moving Woodstock DLI to Bridger displaced the entire current Bridger student population out of the school creating tension in the neighborhood which seems to project itself as "second class citizens" missing something. 2) Bridger would still need portables assuming that all current Woodstock DLI and HP DLI moved there.	Community	Negative Response		
We are not a racially diverse school. However, in the past PPS has not allowed us to "advertise". It is extremely hard to increase diversity without not just the support, but even the permission, of the district.	Community	Negative Response		

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
I am concerned my child will have to start one HS and then move to another, interrupting both program/academics and community (not to mention transportation and feasibility of after school activities).	Community	Negative Response		
I am concerned that, in a few short years, demographics will change/populations of school age youth will change and families will have been separated from closest school community for nothing (except you ticked your box)	Community	Negative Response		
<p>The Woodstock MIP program is successful program for PPS for 20 years. This is PPS' success story, by moving the program, you are guaranteeing that for the next 12 years, the enrollment numbers and completion of each grade will be lowered. Is this really what educators want for their students? Your top priority should be for the success of their students in the programs that they enroll in.</p> <p>I am only speaking from a grade school level, I can't even imagine the impact that it will have with middle school and high school kids. If you currently have an IB program at Cleveland then the move to Franklin where they will not have the IB program, what should you tell the students that have been studying a Mandarin for so many years?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Your efforts are wasted. • You are not good enough. • We don't care about you. • Your future doesn't matter to me. • We care more about balancing schools instead of your future. <p>What about their friends that they've known all their life since grade school or from the neighborhood? They are no longer together in the same school because PPS decision on rebalancing.</p> <p>In SE Portland, there are two high schools to support all of the high school students. Your proposal does not handle the overcrowding issue with Franklin! Franklin will still be overcrowded and I believe the only solution to that is to either open Marshal High School or build a new high school. As Portland continues to grow, overcrowding schools will continue to be an issue. PPS needs to look further into the future on how to overcome this issue.</p> <p>There are a number of things that PPS has done incorrectly in the past decades that they are trying to rectify now such as closure of Kellogg Middle School, Marshal High School, conversion of K-5 to K-8 (and now the reversal of that horrible decision). I feel that this proposal is on the same path of the bad decisions that PPS had made in the past.</p>	Community	Negative Response		

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
<p>My other main concern with this plan is how it divides the strong and close-knit BRidger community in two. Most Bridger families I know would not say that we are a "school-within-a-school" like what you claim you are seeking to eliminate, but are instead one school with two different modalities of learning the same curriculum. We have worked hard to overcome all the challenges that have been dealt to our community and have emerged as a stronger, more diverse, equity-focused community. When have changed the culture from introducing ourselves as the parent of a "3rd grader in immersion" or a kid in the "neighborhood 3rd grade" to just saying you are the parent of a 3rd grader. All 3 strands go on field trips together and the teachers plan activities for all classes as they have their PLCs together. The only inequity I see is that the class size of the single English strand can fluctuate greatly and there is no opportunity to switch kids between strands should the need arise. And of course the HUGE problem of us being overcrowded. But we have been told for years that when Kellogg is ready and the 6-8 moves out there will be enough room to have two strands of each. Now from the data this appears to be another "story" we were told to appease us. But I still feel that our community is better off staying together, both by remaining in the K-5 Bridger building, and the 6-8 together at Kellogg. Dividing them would be dividing more than classes, it would be dividing up friends, teammates, neighbors and more.</p>	Community	Negative Response		
<p>Seems like rebalancing issues should include both SE and NE schools.</p>	Community	Negative Response		
<p>NE portland has been unscathed by this decision and could be a part of the solution. Glencoe wasn't involved in the planning on how this would effect our kids. Moving all the kids to high schools that are so much farther away will impact every SE family negatively. I don't see this as a win for anyone.</p>	Community	Negative Response		
<p>I'm concerned that the local community has not been surveyed. 1) I hope everyone involved has listened to the podcast Nice White Parents. 2) It seems a travesty to take away local elementary school option from Bridger kids and only offer DLI. As we know, elementary schools are foundations for communities in many ways, and you will be affecting their community.</p>	Community	Negative Response		
<p>Continuity of place and community is important for feelings of stability, and with all the recent instability in this country and with COVID19, it seems like a terrible time to bring more instability to children. However, I don't know all the conditions that are being dealt with in other schools, so it's possible that it may be welcome change to some communities.</p>	Community	Negative Response		
<p>1. Negative environmental and social impact of increased commutes for multiple groups of children by taking them out of their neighborhood schools.</p>	Community	Negative Response	Environmental	
<p>This doesn't even touch on the significant environmental impact of shifting enrollment patterns for hundreds of kids.</p>	Community	Negative Response	Environmental impact	
<p>Additionally, the social-emotional health of students has been completely overlooked! My daughter will have to transfer to Madison her senior year of high school in order to continue Japanese Language Learning. This is very upsetting! She is highly committed to Grant sports, orchestra, teachers, and friends. Considering that the pandemic has already dramatically impacted the social and emotional health of PPS students. It is unconscionable to consider that PPS would make such a huge decision during a pandemic when the social and political climate is so troubled. Students and families need their school communities more than ever. The redistricting strategy will have a very negative impact on so many kids.</p>	Covid 19	Negative Response		
<p>It feels like this proposal is being pushed through during the Covid crisis when PPS hopes many won't be aware of what is happening and/or won't have the time or means to fight it.</p>	Covid 19	Negative Response		

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
This proposal is poorly timed during a pandemic and negatively impacts my neighborhood.	Covid 19	Negative Response		
And that this pandemic has disproportionately more severely impacted BIPOC and those with less financial resources adds even more outrage because the fact that this suggested change will disproportionately impact that same exact demographic. It's outrageous and you should be ashamed of yourselves. My tax dollars are being used to pay you to figure out how to uproot my child from her community and disrupt her education after her whole world has already been completely shattered. I cannot express adequately the anger and upset that this causes me. Please stop. Please go use your time to figure out how we are going to support our children on the other side of this pandemic because they are going to need significant extra resources and care especially BIPOC and those families who have not been able to afford to stop working and dedicate the last year educating their children from home. Which is what is required if a child is actually going to learn anything of substance.	Covid 19	Negative Response		
Why make a major change with the successful Japanese Immersion Program during a pandemic? Moving the high school from Grant to Madison now doesn't make sense to me and my family	Covid 19	Negative Response		
Big decisions like this should not be made during the pandemic when many families do not have access to income, food security etc.	Covid 19	Negative Response		
We are in the JMP program and specifically moved to the Grant catchment to be close for our kids high school experience. I've also heard that there are now going to be higher standards for testing into the JMP immersion for high school, so wondering how that will play out while also switching the location of the program. This feels like the rug being pulled out from under us, especially during the stressful times of a pandemic and kids having to do online learning. Not thrilled about kids potentially having to move to a different high school in the middle of their high school experience. Another benefit to Grant is it's more central location to families around the city.	Covid 19	Negative Response		
We are experiencing a pandemic and believe our time should be focussed on addressing the current inequities happening in distance learning. I do not think uprooting children in 2021, creating K-5 is a good idea for our students, teachers and staff during a pandemic. The language in the proposal and this website is more complicated than it should be, as most of the general PPS audience isn't in education and knowledgeable about what these terms mean. Perhaps work on breaking it down in simple conversational language for people to understand the impact of this proposal better.	Covid 19	Negative Response		
My son's best friend will stay at Mt Tabor while my son has to leave to Kellogg. There hasn't been much opportunity to make new friends during this CDL year of the pandemic and this proposal will add new anxieties of not knowing anything of the new school, students or teachers. On a positive note, he has been making good connections with his teachers at Mt. Tabor especially his band teacher. This proposal will have him lose those connections at a vulnerable time. The social isolation caused by the pandemic has been a difficult time for school age kids especially- I do question if this radical of a move in such an important foundational structure as school in our student's lives is too much for them to have to deal with emotionally & socially.	Covid 19	Negative Response		
That this is being pushed through during a global pandemic. Why can't this be put on hold. It looks like a vaccine is coming for COVID - why not wait until we can resume this in person - it seems like right now Kellogg could be used for temporary housing for families that have been displaced by the pandemic. Not everyone is being heard because of the pandemic! We need to be patient and take our time with this proposal.	Covid 19	Negative Response		
The proposal has been rushed through in the middle of a pandemic. This has forced the community out of the discussion. Sending out surveys is not the same as the open communication we would have seen before the pandemic.	Covid 19	Negative Response		

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
It's far too fast. It's unfair to change the game for 8th graders, especially right after Covid. Let them return to a sense of security and comfort and NOT MORE CHANGE. This would make sense if PPS was preparing for this change in 3-4 years but not for 8th graderd	Covid 19	Negative Response		
I don't think you should make any boundary changes for children during a pandemic. Psychologically, it would be extremely detrimental to the mental health and wellbeing of students. It is also causing an added stress for parents right now when you talk about boundary changes. We are all barely hanging on and this is setting people over the edge. We need more time to discuss these changes and have time to process them in a time not consumed with pandemic stress and anxiety.	Covid 19	Negative Response		
I am concerned we are doing this in the middle of an unprecedented pandemic and what that means for the mental health of children who have already been severely impacted through the loss of their classroom and school communities for a year.	Covid 19	Negative Response		
I am concerned that SE Portland is being used as a "test run" for this process (again in the middle of a pandemic) and feel it is unfair to uproot children in one chunk of the city at this time while other schools/communities/children are left alone- this feels very unfair!	Covid 19	Negative Response		
We are already exhausted and challenged by the pandemic. This is extremely concerning. Why the urgency?	Covid 19	Negative Response		
I am concerned that this proposal amounts to a lot of trauma-inducing changes to many SE school communities (not just CSS) during a pandemic. Our students, families, teachers are already really struggling, and these changes are only going to increase the trauma being inflicted by the pandemic.	Covid 19	Negative Response		
Kids will already be going into school next year a year and a half behind (distance learning is failing most kids and if they are learning, they aren't learning much), to add this change on top of everything else is unacceptable, misguided, and cruel.	Covid 19	Negative Response		
The fact this was done hastily and not taken into consideration the kids are dealing with a pandemic and separation already.	Covid 19			
Fourth, why now? It seems like there is a rush and people are just pushing numbers around to buildings without thinking of how that effects neighborhoods. Why was this not set in motion as soon as the old building was being torn down? Seems the was plenty of time to plan ahead. Now it feels forced in the middle of a pandemic.	Covid 19	Negative Response		
I have many concerns: 1. This creates a lot of change for students and families in a really uncertain and challenging time way beyond the basic immediate need to create feeder patterns for Kellogg	Covid 19	Negative Response		
...during a pandemic let alone.	Covid 19	Negative Response		
There is a rushed approach to filling Kellogg Middle school. Concerns include making such large, drastic changes during a global pandemic that will greatly impact the health and safety of children and their families in our communities when they return to in school learning.	Covid 19	Negative Response		
Timing, lack of transparency, significant impact on ability to continue in DLI program, additional disruption to stable learning environment in the midst of a pandemic, likely overall decrease in DLI enrollment, suboptimal facilities that are accommodating the relocated students (trailers in some schools, while other schools are projected to be under-enrolled).	Covid 19	Negative Response		

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
It is breaking up a successful DLI programs that already exists. It is creating yet another crisis for families to deal with during the pandemic. Families do not care if there kids need to go to portable classroom units, they are looking for educational stability during the pandemic.	Covid 19	Negative Response		
Disruption to kids and families at an already vulnerable time.	Covid 19	Negative Response		
Asking children to change schools after all the disruption from the pandemic is reprehensible.	Covid 19	Negative Response		
6. Nationally known, very successful DLI program will effectively be crushed.	Covid 19	Negative Response		
The stress it will be putting our children who have already been through enough during this pandemic. My friend is d grader is already upset about the conversations being had around this topic. Also the impact it will have on diversity in a number of schools.	Covid 19	Negative Response		
My concern is that I think there is a lot of information about what makes a DLI program successful that is not being articulated well to the people who are not engaged in DLI, but the decisions to center those programs are creating change for everyone. With better understanding of how the DLI program creates positive outcomes for our community, and with more emphasis on the benefits of change, more people may be more open to the needed changes in SE. I fear that we are not listening to the quiet voices of reason, and the voices who are absent from this conversation, and instead are being overwhelmed by loud voices arguing to not have their commute changed.	Data			
Glencoe and Richmond were left out of coalition discussions entirely. Sunnyside has had FIVE parent reps in addition to their principal. That's 12% of the entire 50 member coalition. That's outrageous. The proposal affects Glencoe's boundaries and high school; to not have involved us in the discussion is incomprehensible. In fact, it would appear the coalition may not contain a single parent affected by switching Tabor to Madison from Franklin, since at least one of the MTMS reps is in the Atkinson boundary and will be staying at Franklin. None of these concerns appear to have been raised or discussed or even acknowledged as valid.	Engagement	Negative Response		
Lack of representation in the process over the past two years by members of the Glencoe/Mt Tabor Middle School Community	Engagement	Negative Response		
I have concerns about the amount of dissent among parents. There were very few voices that spoke up in support of the changes. It was very intimidating for anyone to speak up if you AGREED with the proposal.	Engagement	Negative Response		Being a parent voice in the group
Lack of/late in process engagement with communities affected, especially non-native English speaking and BIPOC communities.	Engagement	Negative Response		
Lack of voice from under-represented groups and impacted schools/teachers; lack of definition of success,	Engagement	Negative Response		
It is not equitable. It doesn't make since why our school supply have 3 reps from the coalition 2 are admins(1 claiming she is representing as a parent but an admin) 1 Chinese speaking parent. When approach to the principal or the other admin representing neighborhood they claim they can provide information in regards to the process because they are a PPS employee. How is this equitable? Why are you putting all the work of 1 schools representation on a Chinese Native Family. Isn't that bullying and white supremacy to pick on a person of racial background. Also making her feel small during the meeting and pulling her aside berating her is not the right approach as well. She does not work for PPS she is a parent. I would advise the school principal to reassess his communication skills and take a unconscious bias or even a racial diversity course.	Engagement	Negative Response	SEGC	

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
I'm concerned that too many families will reconsider their options and we could lose good families. Especially, Spanish speakers. Please educate them, try to help their concerns, etc no matter what plan is finally implemented.	Engagement	Negative Response		
I'm concerned that too many families will reconsider their options and we could lose good families. Especially, Spanish speakers. Please educate them, try to help their concerns, etc no matter what plan is finally implemented.	Engagement	Negative Response		
I'm concerned that too many families will reconsider their options and we could lose good families. Especially, Spanish speakers. Please educate them, try to help their concerns, etc no matter what plan is finally implemented.	Engagement			
I am concerned about the inclusion of a high school in NE Portland in the boundary drawing process despite the focus of the first two phases of this process focusing on SE Portland.	Engagement	Negative Response		
<p>It seems clear from the open house that some schools were left out of the committee work even though they would be substantially impacted. It is respectful and essential to building trust in the process and moving people toward change that people are allowed representation and information interpretation and communication throughout. Hard deadlines do a disservice if the scope of the committee work has changed significantly and impacts a much broader community/communities. Transparency and outreach at vital times for impacted populations is the only respectful way to invite people to buy into changes. Further, it does seem that additional outreach needs to happen for the diverse populations affected and a strong encouragement for individual feedback from those communities. There should also be more student voices heard and opportunities for student feedback.</p> <p>We were only made aware several days ago that the proposal on the table would significantly impact the feeder patterns to our children's neighborhood schools. As with many other families, we were caught off guard. The process seems rushed and the timeline needs to be slowed so that populations can understand what is proposed, why it has been proposed as the best case and have the best opportunities to effect change/s to the proposal. This is not just any normal time period either. We are in the middle of the highest spikes of COVID, right before a holiday week which will be sad and hard and families are trying to hold day to day life together while staying safe and well. The proposal seems driven to open Kellogg. It has been obvious in listening and reading comments and feedback that the impacts are much more far reaching. The opening of Kellogg should not be the driving factor to speed up this process. Overall this process feels chaotic and rushed and without consensus.</p>	Engagement	Negative Response		

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
<p>First, I want to acknowledge that so much labor has gone into this work --much of it unpaid labor by well-intentioned parents, teachers, administrators, and community members. Thank you.</p> <p>I am concerned that there has not been extensive translation of materials offered prior to the start of this project, and it doesn't seem like there has been simultaneous translation in multiple languages available during the meetings (although if I am wrong about that, great!)</p> <p>I am concerned that PPS is focusing on expediency in meeting its stated goals to be able to open Kellogg on time without first hearing the priorities of / desires/ wishes/ needs of BIPOC families, families with low SES, families most impacted by the pandemic FIRST. I am concerned that the approach of this project created scenarios before involving, and listening to the above communities. The approach taken embraces white supremacy cultural values over the people who will be most impacted by these decisions. Additionally, PPS has engaged parents and teachers of color over the period of time since the new building was conceived, yet did not seem to include ideas/ outcomes/ feedback from earlier work done on these issues. This is more than a DLI vs neighborhood program concern --it has to do with really changing the racist ways of an institution. I am not critiquing individuals for this, but I think it is time to put a pause and find new ways to gather input and involve people who don't feel their voices matter. The strategy of offering scenarios first sends the message that the decision is already made and that gathering input is only performative. I am also concerned that this project has used educational jargon to define its goals. In the Zoom breakout session from the 11/19/2020 open house, I heard multiple participants ask for definitions of co-location and other terms used. These terms don't define what is important to families and children and create a sense of exclusivity. I also feel concerned that the project espouses equity as a central tenet, but when the phone surveys revealed glaring discrepancies in BIPOC communities' awareness of these changes, the process continued unabated. I would hope that PPS, in its efforts to address equity, can take a step back and slow down the institutional urgency in order to hear and elevate the lived experiences and voices of Black, Indigenous, Pacific Islander, Latinx, Asian, and other POC community members. This could be a moment for more systemic change.</p> <p>At the end of the day, I would like to see PPS press pause and make a substantial, unprecedented, and innovative effort to seek out, and listen to the communities most impacted by these decisions and let their priorities lead the way even if there is a huge outcry from white parents. White parents almost always get listened to--usually to the detriment of Black and Brown children. I am a white parent and a white teacher.</p> <p>Lastly, we are in a pandemic that disproportionately impacts many of the communities most affected by the SEGC conversation. I would like to see PPS prioritizing the well-being and positive learning experiences of all children over this project. Did PPS ask these families what they most needed for their children to feel safe and successful? Did PPS help create learning pods for families who didn't have the bandwidth, funds, time off from work to develop their own pods? Did PPS offer space or paid staff members or teachers aides to provide in-person or virtual support to these pods? There are so many creative, yet daunting-to-coordinate ways PPS can be supporting students and families most impacted by the pandemic. Is PPS moving forward with the SEGC at the expense of other work that could have long-term positive impacts on communities of color and lower income communities and their children?</p>	Engagement	Negative Response		

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
Lack of communication and opportunity to discuss about the plan with the school communities that will be greatly affected by this change.	Engagement	Negative Response		
My last and biggest concern is that I do not feel like I have heard from the native speaking families and families of color that are essentially being segregated into all DLI schools. Is this what they want? Similar to our election pamphlet (where you get to hear the reasoning behind those who are in favor of, and those who are against) I would like to see groups and side coalitions voice their opinions so we can hear them and know where they stand. If this is truly about diversity and equity I would expect to hear many praises from those underserved and under privileged. Thus far I have not see this...	Engagement	Negative Response		
I share the feelings of many folk who believe the lack of transparency, community input, and confusing information is a bullying tactic meant to overwhelm.	Engagement	Negative Response		
No attempt to understand community dynamics in each building, histories and cultures of programs, and relationships developed over many decades.	Engagement	Negative Response		
By moving whole school programs to the outskirts without obtaining more direct feedback from the existing DLI community, PPS will perpetuate institutional racism by segregating communities of color and creating more homogenous (white) schools located near the central city. I understand the merits of having a whole school program; however, if the move results in greater socio-economic barriers and less diversity, the intent to create more equitable programs will only result in more inequity.	Engagement	Negative Response		
Lack of consideration what families think	Engagement	Negative Response		
This proposal was developed without engaging the communities impacted. To change feeder options for the east side without looking at the (!) entire esst side and (2) all boundaries is just another bad and rushed decision made by PPS. We were told this was just about middle schools, not about changing feeder patterns for high schools.	Engagement	Negative Response		
Glencoe families seemed to be left out of the conversation when there are impacts to where their children may need to travel for school once they reach the high school level. At the same time NE neighborhoods seem to be deemed as untouchable.	Engagement	Negative Response		
2) Decisions around relocating DLI programs are being made without meaningful input from the native-speaker community. Phone surveys were aimed at middle school families, not the full DLI population impacted by the programs' move. From the community meetings I attended, the few native speakers enrolled in the DLI programs who were able to participate are against eliminating co-location entirely. Worse, from the few moments of outreach to native speaking members of the DLI community the feedback was about how they feared diversity would be lost by grouping all Spanish DLI programs together on the outskirts of SE, and the felt like they were being segregated/targeted.	Engagement	Negative Response		
If the November 19 open house is any indication, the Southeast Guiding Coalition seems to be in total disarray around this proposal. Some members seemed to admit as much in the breakout sessions. In summary, the meeting was a complete disaster. Almost no questions were answered and almost no one was able to input in a meaningful way. From the standpoint of gathering public input, the meeting was a complete failure.	Engagement	Negative Response		
As usual, PPS completely underestimated the number of people who clicked in. Your meeting structure and tools for facilitating public input were completely inadequate and totally overwhelmed.				

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
<p>This process appears to be counter to the goals of data analysis and community engagement. While I support the use of data to inform decisions, it must be a transparent process and the right data must be considered, with appropriate consideration of balancing measures to ensure unintended impacts are responsibly considered. Important voices to inform data collection were most certainly missed as this process appears to have been happening when the families affected are trying to get by day-to-day, managing remote learning, work, and in many cases, trying to meet the basic family needs while dealing with job loss and illness, all in the midst of a tremendous amount of uncertainty. This is yet another potentially destabilizing decision for many families that feels rushed and done without full transparency given the nature of the current situation. While I know intentions are good, it appears that this process has strayed from its intended goals and will likely have very real consequences, while unintended, that could have been avoided if it were truly data driven and allowed all voices to be heard. I urge you to be responsible to the members of the community who will be affected by these life-altering decisions and ensure they have been truly engaged, and not rushing through things during a pandemic.</p>	Engagement	Negative Response		
<p>I don't like that folks at Glencoe aren't involved in the planning until phase two even though the phase one planning ends up having an impact on where Glencoe students will attend high school.</p>	Engagement	Negative Response		
<p>The lack of inclusion of all schools (including Glencoe) in this conversation, the lack of inclusion of BIPOC in the discussion.</p>	Engagement	Negative Response		

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
<p>The proposal goes well beyond trying to balance enrollment of Kellog and it shocking, disappointing, and concerning that PPPS would try to claim that Glencoe students are not impacted by this process. The specific effort to exclude Glencoe makes it difficult to trust PPS and distrust at the outset of such a proposal is the exact opposite of what PPS should be striving for.</p> <p>Two major and specific concerns:</p> <p>It is unbelievable that PPS would try to implement such major changes during a global pandemic, when parents, teachers, students and community members are under immense pressure to just get by, much less make time for a poorly presented "Open House" that provided no specifics and no real information as to the basis for the proposal. All of the resources spent on the "consultants" and administration time should have been focused on helping those students who are being left behind due remote learning. And, zoom meetings are not the place to have a real dialogue with Guiding Coalition. No information was actually given and no answers to questions were provided. This should all be re-done when COVID is over, when there can be an actual back and forth between the Guiding Coalition and parents.</p> <p>Also, I have no idea why NE PDX was not involved in this process, given Madison's location. If the district wants to re-balance schools, they should be pulling from the schools greater neighborhood communities, and not pulling students from across town. I suspect NE PDX was specifically not involved, as they have defeated similar proposals in recent years and PPS didn't want to deal with them.</p> <p>If PPS truly wants to re-balance schools, and insists on pulling students from neighborhoods beyond any given school's immediate community, then it needs to be done district wide, where student are bused from Lincoln, Grant, Franklin, etc. To place the onus of re-balancing on SE speaks to the myopic nature of this whole approach.</p> <p>The above issues are very basic and should have been immediately obvious to the Coalition. Perhaps they were discussed--but certainly no results of those discussions were shared at the Open House. If this Open House were to ever succeed, presenters should have come prepared to address these issues. Clearly they were not. Which raises a whole host of other concerns.</p>	Engagement	Negative Response	Process	
We are also concerned about the coalition getting enough input from the very communities that this proposal is trying to benefit. The timetable of the coalition's work has been very aggressive, and the work has been hard to follow (because of the volume and speed of changes/ideas/proposals), even as a white, highly privileged family. The pandemic makes everything harder. Is there enough time to get the feedback needed to know if this proposal strikes the right balance?	Engagement	Negative Response		
only sending written materials in languages other than English 2 days prior to the session is unacceptable and presents a major equity problem for families not speaking English at home - how can families participate with such little notice?	Engagement	Negative Response		
I am concerned that not enough time has been spent studying this option and seeking input from non-English speaking families. I am concerned that there is the potential for serious unintended negative consequences for social equity and multi cultural community building.	Engagement	Negative Response		
Also, PPS and DDL's claim that native speakers want these programs singly located and consolidated seem to be based on assumptions and not actual engagement with or feedback from the Latinx and Chinese communities.	Engagement	Negative Response		

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
It feels sneaky and sudden without enough time for parents to absorb this new information. The proposal to make separate schools just for Spanish/Japanese/Vietnamese learners seems like ghettoizing these kids, while at the same time robbing predominately white schools (like Grant HS) from what little diversity they are ensured by having the Japanese program feed into it.	Engagement	Negative Response		
Third, Why is there only one proposal being presented to the public? There were many developed why not get public feedback on a couple? Clearly from the open house there are a lot of upset families. Maybe families would have felt like other options would be better for communities and neighborhoods.	Engagement			Statement
<p>The SE Guiding Coalition’s phase 1 mandate was to enroll Kellogg Middle School, identify a second comprehensive middle school in Southeast, and convert current K-8 schools to K-5. PPS communications on the Coalition's work have consistently tied it to the reopening of Kellogg, concealing the true breadth of change included in the Coalition's proposal. The current proposal vastly outsteps that mandate, by introducing school boundary changes and altering feeder patterns without input from each community impacted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This breakdown in both process and communication has created uncertainty and mistrust in PPS. This has been a rushed process in a time when families are already overwhelmed with distance learning, battling unemployment, political uncertainty and the pressure of a global pandemic. • The coalition should stick to its original mandate and stop any re-boundarying and feeder changes without first ensuring all impacted communities – including students – have a seat at the table. • PPS should publish data that clearly demonstrates how any decisions made by PPS’s SE rebalancing efforts will optimize the use of school facilities and help achieve racial equity and social justice. • If NE schools are solutions to SE’s “rebalancing” efforts, then all Eastside schools should be part of the conversation. Why are Laurelhurst, Beaumont, Alameda, Sunnyside, Cleveland, Grant, etc. immune? 	Engagement	Negative Response		
My children go to Glencoe. A couple of my concerns are the lack of transparency and condensed timeline of these proposals. We only first heard about these potential changes days before the open house and through an email from a neighbor. It feels rushed and hidden at a time we are all just trying to get by with the day to day virtual school during a pandemic.	Engagement	Negative Response		
<p>The lack of real community engagement and short schedule of meaningful solicitation of input from affected families. These decisions have major impacts on families; thus, the school district should allow a longer timeline to study and research these recommendations.</p> <p>Are there transitions plans for currently enrolled students that needs to move midway through middle school?</p>	Engagement	Negative Response		
I have concerns that multi lingual speakers were not given as many opportunities to hear the proposals and materials were not provided in multiple languages.	Engagement	Negative Response		
PPS's lack of planning: performing this review right before they want to open Kellogg Middle School, which rushes the process. This is especially bad during the pandemic, when it is harder to communicate, especially to those underserved families who are most impacted by everything (see point 2). 2. Huge disruptions to school communities, especially during and right after the turmoil of the pandemic, with distance learning, social isolation, and an economic recession.	Engagement	Negative Response		

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
<p>I am concerned about having enough time to reach all the affected communities in time to have adequate feedback. Some BIPOC communities feel they have not been involved in the process at all. Some of the goals of the coalition do not seem to be accomplished with this proposal -- for instance, Franklin is still overcrowded. I also am worried that you are proposing to changes to Madison's enrollment without looking at all the issues in North and Northeast Portland. Moving Mt. Tabor to Madison (including the Japanese DLI Program) may not be the best choice when you look at all the programs and boundaries in North and Northeast. Maybe it is, but you haven't studied it enough to know all the intended and unintended consequences yet. Doing more outreach and explaining the reasons for the recommended changes will go a long way to gaining community support. You also need to show us the data to back up your decisions and why this model is the best solution. Right now, I'm not convinced that it is.</p>	Engagement	Negative Response		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 29% of parents surveyed had awareness of the Guiding Committee - this is low • Importance of staying on the middles school/high school path ranks high on surveyed parents' priorities • I've read through the data on Enrollment balancing and see why moving the 250 or so students from Grant would open space in a crowded school but I'd like to better understand who that benefits...do those spaces to go to other students or just create a better learning environment for neighborhood kids? • How does moving Japanese students out of Grant impact equity? 	Engagement	Negative Response		
<p>I am concerned that not all strands (i.e., neighborhood, non-immersion) were included in the coalition (from Mt. Tabor).</p>	Engagement	Negative Response		
<p>I am concerned that DLI is the driver behind these sweeping changes - they they get more weight. WHat about ALL communities having representation?</p>	Engagement	Negative Response		
<p>I am concerned that groups are being moved from location to location without input.</p>	Engagement	Negative Response		
<p>The district and the consultants have put the coalition members in the untenable position of having to defend a proposal that was developed while missing key information. Errors in communication that missed constituencies makes it more more likely than not that the district has a predetermined solution. I suggest the board and district release your behind-the-scenes comprehensive plan and stand behind the methodology behind it (and if you're just gabbing, do the work for real). If you are unable to convince some families and they give up on public schooling, then that may be the right thing to do for the greater good.</p>	Engagement	Negative Response		
<p>CSS doesn't have a location. It seems rushed.</p>	Engagement	Negative Response		

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
<p>My concerns with this proposal is PPS trying to do too much in such little time with lack of communication with parents with the number of schools impacted. It feels that you are giving us an ultimatum and we have no other choice but to deal with it!</p> <p>There was not enough information to provide to families in various languages. I attended the Cantonese meeting and my needs were not met because the PPS representative was only spoke Mandarin and some of the families that spoke both languages were responding in Mandarin only in the Cantonese session. The translators didn't feel the need to translate everything that was said. I was on the call for two hours and a majority of the call, I was spending my time guessing the conversation. Yes, Cantonese and Mandarin are different! These are two different dialects, like Spanish and English. What PPS could have done was provide a staff member that spoke Cantonese ONLY for that session instead of having a Mandarin Only speaker and have translators. To make matters worse, the meeting time was still one hour. Do you know how time consuming is it is to translate? We spent so much time waiting for things to be translated. The Cantonese meeting was a HUGE failure on PPS' behalf.</p>	Engagement	Negative Response		
<p>I am concerned with many pieces shared during GC meetings and during the community town hall, i.e. this process is happening during a pandemic; BIPOC community members and underserved communities are not represented as well during meetings or during the community town hall. I would have liked to hear from Harrison Park families and Lent families more.</p>	Engagement	Negative Response		
<p>Only one option for rebalancing has been submitted for public review. The committee members do not fully support the plan presented. Parents, students, and school staff have not had adequate opportunity to provide feedback or input into the plan.</p>	Engagement	Negative Response		
<p>Japanese speakers haven't been given a voice in this. Richmond Elementary didn't have a voice in this.</p>	Engagement	Negative Response		
<p>Pretty much everything else - the Mandarin-speaking families were not consulted and do not like this plan - either the location proposed or the removal of the co-location.</p>	Engagement	Negative Response		
<p>8) It is so hard fo find the information about this rebalancing. Neighborhoods have not been able to really speak out about their feelings due to limited advertisement and a very hard to find webpage on the your district page. If you really want to know how the neighborhood feels, this should be a banner at the top of the district page. There should be fliers left on every door step, phone surveys to every house in the neighborhoods affected, and lawn signs announcing the upcoming meetings.</p>	Engagement	Negative Response	Process	
<p>The families in the Woodstock Mandarin Immersion Program (MIP) have said that they were not part of the early outreach and planning of this.</p>	Engagement	Negative Response		
<p>1. Communities of color were not involved enough in planning. There was not enough involvement, translation, outreach.</p>	Engagement	Negative Response	Process	
<p>Nobody seems to have mentioned that this proposal takes from Franklin (a relatively low income school) its highest income feeder schools and replaces them with low income feeder schools.</p>	Equity	Negative Response		

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
The changed focus on HS enrollment # balancing - that only moves bodies, not changing programming or substantial diversity impacts. Madison and Franklin are very comparable schools for programming and diversity (race and SES) Some can argue that Madison is more robust (higher test scores, graduation rates, smaller class sizes) SO, I don't clearly see how the move of the Glencoe feeder out of FHS to MHS furthers the goal of creating equity in programming. And, this model shows that it does not change the enrollment # at FHS. The only result is disrupting a huge traditional feeder to FHS - and especially during a traumatic time for all families. Its a huge community impact to the SE neighborhood that does not seem to support the goals of the process. That she is already immersed in as an 8th grader through sports, summer camps, hanging out on campus, etc. Our family also relies on her for help with her younger siblings that attend Glencoe - as both parents work.	Equity	Negative Response		
The further marginalization of the Chinese speaking community, the lack of diversity that will remain at Woodstock, also Shu Ren pointed out that the Chinese speaking community has not been involved in the process of developing this plan and seems to not be in favor of it.	Equity	Negative Response		
Destruction of Bridger as a neighborhood school and moving DLI to Lent. White privileged students will op out of DLI and your goals of equity will fail. Your goals and ideas are just, but will fail in the real world.	Equity	Negative Response		
Why not look at the entire Eastside and come up with a comprehensive plan that actually promotes equity.	Equity	Negative Response		
The way the information on equity is presented does not allow any synthesis of results. I see big changes, but am unable to understand whether this proposal meetings those goals. Too much detail, not enough synthesized info. I have a PhD in engineering and I find it impossible to understand - not a good sign.	Equity	Negative Response		
It does not address SES equity except for at one middle school, Mt. Tabor, by changing the feeder pattern significantly. I'm concerned about broad changes being proposed to the middle and high schools without a deep look at some of the elementary school border issues; splitting neighborhoods, not following natural boundaries in some cases like major streets. How can changes be made at the top level without examining and considering other changes at the elementary level that could also contribute to a shifting pattern of equity?	Equity	Negative Response		
You will likely not measurable improve poorly defined inequities. You seem to under-appreciate that many non-whites participate in the language programs.	Equity	Negative Response		
B) Half of the students in the MIP at Woodstock live in that neighborhood. Can't they make Woodstock all Chinese DLI? That's the least disruptive. If the MIP moves to Bridger, how many classes would there be per grade? This doesn't really feel equitable at all. Woodstock MIP is a nationally known program and a leader in dual language instruction. How does the MIP program at King align with "placing DLI programs in schools located where native speakers live".	Equity	Negative Response		
The Japanese program should move in 2021. This move is not dependent on the other middle schools. Grant is very crowded. Madison is reopening in fall of 2021. There is not a concern of boundary changes for this program. They would simply make the move one year prior to the other feeder schools. Neighborhood boundaries have not been offered the same delayed transition. From an equity standpoint the move should happen in fall 2021.	Equity	Negative Response		
decreased diversity in both Lent and Atkinson	Equity	Negative Response		

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
<p>I have concerns about how much listening was actually done to the BIPOC families who have historically had no/little voice. I looked at the survey data and I see that you interviewed a slightly higher percentage of families than match the attendance demographics. However, I definitely heard at the November 12th meeting the sentiment from one of the coalition members that voices from the Lent community were not being heard with regards to the displacement of neighborhood students from that school in order to create the single dual language school. I implore this committee and PPS to think about what it takes to really LISTEN and HEAR BIPOC voices. Given their historical silencing, I would argue that it requires trying to listen to all of their voices and concerns and PRIORITIZING them over the concerns of the administrative bodies or the white parent blocks. This might mean more than just phone calls to a few hundred families. This might mean round table conversations and phone calls and surveys and proposals that come directly from these communities about what their ideal scenario is like. What if your first draft came from a proposal created only by BIPOC members of the coalition representing all of the historically underserved neighborhoods and schools. What if the white voices were not allowed to participate in that first draft and only allowed to weight in after the BIPOC communities have had their say? What if PPS really tried to shed their racist legacy rather than just checking the boxes on a list to demonstrate that they have used a RESJ lens.</p> <p>In order to do this, I think my main concern is that the committee is trying to move too fast to accomplish too much. Given that only the Kellogg Middle school changes need to be implemented for 2021, I recommend that the rest of the proposed changes be reviewed, discussed, and re-evaluated. There are clearly many oversights in this current draft: displacement of the neighborhood students around Lent, transportation challenges for families wanting to attend the new spanish DLI program that is located only in a single building - how will this impact who applies and who attends? Will this only further create inequity in DLI favoring more affluent and whiter families who can juggle the new transportation logistics?, the distance and lack of safe routes that some students need to travel for high school with the new Madison feeder patterns - could this be accomplished differently if Northeast schools were factored into the high school overcrowding equation?</p> <p>I feel pretty strongly that the DLI conversation needs to be really robust and filled with equity conversations. As I hope you all discussed, the history of DLI programs nation-wide are riddled with inequity and racism. At its core is the dual standard by which Americans are judged - to speak 2 languages for a white person is seen as an asset, whereas for a darker skinned person it is often perceived as a sign of inferiority. The process of the DLI being a lottery system which requires paperwork submitted by specific deadlines without enough outreach to families who are not as connected to email as a form of communication creates inequity. I am not an expert, but I am learning about the inherent challenges with creating an equitable DLI program. I hope this committee has done its homework about these complex issues before making radical changes. I would hate to see the inequities worsen through a hastily made decision. Some resources shared with me by my equity committee co-chair: https://mobile.edweek.org/c.jsp?cid=25919821&bcid=25919821&rssid=25919811&item=http%3A%2F%2Fapi.edweek.org%2Fv1%2Ffew%2Findex.html%3Fuuid%3D1EF2E9A8-0AC1-11E9-90C4-A498B3743667 https://www.theatlantic.com/education/archive/2017/12/the-middle-class-takeover-of-bilingual-schools/549278/?gclid=Cj0KCQiAqdP9BRDVARIsAGSZ8AnHvKauNT0Y3hpoNafaX_ysLTQiLrDSpqjc5LaxfIV-QqDbAplh8BcaAm2fEALw_wcB</p>	Equity	Negative Response		
<p>The SE quadrant is one of the most diverse in the city, and yet the zoom call I attended was mostly white folks. Is PPS sending out notices to hear more community guidance from racially diverse neighborhoods?</p>	Equity	Negative Response		

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
I am concerned that the proposals shift my children (and their Glencoe counterparts) to a new high school (Madison versus Franklin) without any involvement, input, or feedback from our elementary school community thus far. Proposals to change which high schools and middle schools draw from are things that parents want to know about. I encourage and applaud the school districts mission and goals to achieve equity and, as a parent, want to be involved during the process and not just after decisions have been made.	Equity	Negative Response		
Change is hard for people. My concern is does the SE Guiding Coalition have the cache and gravitas to actually make their proposals a reality? Or will this all just end up being lip service and a continuation of the status-quo where the well-to-do continue to have their elite enclaves while professing "Equity" so long as the change that is required is not in their backyard?	Equity	Negative Response		
This proposal would result in segregation of students, primarily those who are part of underserved communities within immersion programs,	Equity	Negative Response		
This proposal might be fine but I have concerns about how it was developed. There are key communities that were excluded and goals only selectively considered (Laurelhurst, K-8, portables, right?). Glencoe families and staff were not adequately represented on this committee nor in phone surveys while Sunnyside was over-represented. It is unclear what was used to analyze transportation equity; previous balancing efforts used time on PPS bus or cost, but that is meaningless for high school and hopefully Trimet commute times were used. Regardless of the method, the proposal should include this information so it is clear that it was addressed.	Equity	Negative Response		
Current Glencoe students should go to Franklin HS or feed to Grant HS. Madison HS is way out of the way for parents who work in close-in/downtown Portland. Why do Glencoe students have no representatives on the SE Guiding Coalition during this phase even though the boundary changes affect Glencoe students?	Equity	Negative Response		
Don't decrease the diversity at Atkinson by moving the DLI program! People move here for this program and this school-like us!	Equity	Negative Response		
There is already pushback from privileged groups about moving JMP to Madison that is rooted in racist elitism. Their voices are loud but they are not the majority!	Equity	Negative Response		
Moving DLI programs is moving families of color. No minority racial groups should be targeted for relocating.	Equity	Negative Response		
We are extremely disappointed to hear about the potential changes to the Woodstock Immersion Program. It's a program that is mature and established, there is a whole system involved and strong roots within the region. There are parents who start language immersion learning from preschool (near Woodstock) and continue on to Woodstock and have shuttle that takes them to their after school programs. Making such change would cause tremendous inconvenience to the students continuous learning. From the proposal, I'm also seeing it seems like the DLI programs are being pushed out to the outskirts of the city, why is that? Where did the data come from to help support this proposal? Are inner city schools (majority with better scores) to be primarily just for English speaking students? Please note, not all the families that attend DLI are of that specific ethnicity. I'm trying to understand what is the goal here to really "balance" out the demographics? From what I'm seeing, it's only just "grouping" specific ethnic groups together and separate them, and not encouraging diversity and inclusion? Instead of encouraging and embracing world language learning, it's breaking a system. Strongly oppose to Woodstock Immersion being taken away.	Equity	Negative Response		

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
<p>Committee has over-reached its mandate to lock high school and elementary feeder patterns for phase 2.</p> <p>Mt Tabor and Harrison communities don't want to swap high schools- why on earth would we do this? No input from suddenly-impacted communities with this last- minute idea.</p> <p>And, once again, Cleveland and Grant - two of PPS' richest schools- somehow untouched/off limits, a GLARING equity issue.</p>	Equity	Negative Response		
<p>Those moves don't even do anything to create greater equity between Madison and Franklin, barely address building utilization, and the programing between these HSs are already balanced and similar.</p>	Equity	Negative Response		
<p>I am concerned that the DLI only schools seem to be centered in areas of highest poverty, making it more difficult for children to get to a neighborhood school. It also seems to discourage more vocal/wealthy families for signing up for Spanish DLI because the schools are in high poverty areas. It may end up segregating our community more.</p>	Equity	Negative Response		
<p>I am concerned that without looking more widely and having Cleveland and Grant on the table, the gains will be very short lived. Franklin will still be over-utilized in the current scenario, which will require more shuffling and disruption and energy in the near future.</p> <p>Further, I want to implore the committee to truly look at magnet programs with an equity lens. My neighborhood of North Richmond continues to be up for grabs in boundary scenarios (which I am personally 100% fine with: I want my kids going to diverse schools!) but as a family that can see the Richmond building from our block, it is really tough to always be seen as available to shuffle to new schools when our neighborhood school building is occupied by a very exclusive program that is NEVER part of alignment conversations.</p> <p>One wonders if Japanese language instruction would be so prized if it were located in a less gentrified and central location. I don't see families like mine clamoring to get into Russian programs at Kelly, for example, but a lot of families in our area choose Richmond, partly for the language and partly for something "extra" in a public school.</p>	Equity	Negative Response		
<p>You cannot address equity with one quadrant alone. This is a larger matter than SE school attendance</p>	Equity	Negative Response		
<p>Both of our elementary and high school were reassigned to vastly lower rated schools. Because only our middle school was not reassigned, only 3 out of 13 years of schooling were unaffected. For most others the magnitude of the change is less because only 1 out of 2 schools changed. Was magnitude of change taken into consideration. This distribution doesn't seem fair.</p> <p>The way in which these changes are being pushed through seems unfair, non-inclusive, horribly disruptive during an exceptionally stressful time. This is underhanded and cruel and not transparent.</p> <p>Why is getting rid of portable classrooms prioritized over staying in our neighborhood school? I was in a portable classroom and I loved it because I was in my neighborhood school.</p>	Equity	Negative Response		
<p>What RESJ lens was used in deciding that Lents and Bridger students be displaced?</p>	Equity	Negative Response		

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
Moving DLIs out of integrated schools reduces equity and community inter-relatedness; segregates/marginalizes BIPOC. Proposal puts outsized burden on BIPOC. Some students would be forced to choose between IB and DLI. Why is DLI the program targeted to help PPS "rebalance?"	Equity	Negative Response		
The decreased enrollment (and the potential impact of that) at Creston, the decrease in diversity of the Creston families (racial and SES), the shifting of boundaries to remove some families with no apparent benefit to the other school for adding them.	Equity	Negative Response		
Lack of equity. 100% racist: If you look at the definition of racism this proposal is 100% racist and unacceptable. Uprooting our kids from the school they know and love during a pandemic is completely ludicrous.	Equity	Negative Response		
I'm concerned that these proposals result in segregation of minority students. It also removes diversity from neighborhood schools. I have two Black students who see very few students of color in their schools right now. Moving immersion programs to segregated buildings removes what little diversity there is. These actions do not represent equity. This is systemic racism in action. I'm also appalled that the district is using voter funds to build schools with plans for filling them. Why was none of this determined prior to a school opening next fall? Filling a building should not be the driving factor. Making sure our students of color are represented and protected should be. PPS needs to stop talking the talk and start walking the walk.	Equity	Negative Response		
There has been no transparency in this process. You are moving kids to NE without even including the rest of NE in the process. It's ridiculous. No Glencoe involvement at all is very concerning. Equity seems to be the word of the day for this process, but how is this equitable? Only some kids will need to take 2 buses for 40+ mins to go to school. Parents will be able to participate less, kids get less sleep, creates more traffic, etc. What is equitable about this?	Equity	Negative Response		
The blatant racism of segregating our kids to outer se locations. The total disregard of who this will actually impact. The destruction of neighborhood communities. The fact that this plan with continue to marginalize POC while PPS repeatedly says the word "equitable" over and over.	Equity	Negative Response		
Pushing boundaries out will make Creston less diverse. It will also be challenging for creston to maintain a high enough enrollment level with these changes.	Equity	Negative Response		
I have serious concerns that our families of color are not being heard. I am deeply troubled by the attempts of PPS to further segregate and isolate our families and students who speak a different language and families of color. Pushing them to outer south East Portland is not the solution to your problems and it does nothing to address issues of equity. My children are currently slated to attend Cleveland HS, which has an IB diploma. Under the new proposal, Franklin does not have this option. Taking away they IB diploma is a huge disservice to these students. This does not give them a leg up. It pulls the ladder out from under them. What a shame and disgrace to watch the students and families lives that will forever be impacted by this process.	Equity	Negative Response		
I feel the equity piece is overblown, as the vast majority of the students in the DLI programs are not native speakers, they are actually privileged white students. If anything, this is inequitable as it's only happening in SE portland and not all over the entire PPS district.	Equity	Negative Response		
It is labeled "equity" but forces families of color to travel more than others. It will result in higher segregation. White schools will become whiter, and brown schools browner.	Equity	Negative Response		

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
will it really address equity? what is PPS doing to ensure enrolled students live within the boundaries for the school they attend? shouldn't all of the East side be considered when rebalancing rather than sending some SE high school students to the NE?	Equity	Negative Response		
<p>1. At a minimum, we would appreciate your addressing the concerns expressed by Shu Ren. https://www.shurenofportland.org/post/shu-ren-enrollment-program-balancing-project-scenarios-for-chinese-dual-language-immersion-dli</p> <p>2. We suspect that many families would choose to drop their children from the Mandarin-immersion program rather than enroll their children in schools many miles from home. Please consider the important community-building goals of neighborhood schools.</p> <p>3. We have one kindergartener and a child that will be entering PPS in three years, so we have mostly stayed out of this process - out of deference to those with more experience and out of a desire not to complicate the equity goals that we share with PPS. But we are shocked by the reaction of those families who have followed this process more closely and who are the people of color that this proposal is primarily aiming to support. We are deeply concerned that our children may be pawns in a political game of which we are unaware and of which we do not desire to be a part. We hope that this introduction to PPS is not representative of our planned 16-year relationship with PPS. Is there not a way of meeting equity goals without angering so many people?</p>	Equity	Negative Response		
<p>I am very concerned that my children will not have a school to go to given that the guiding coalition has not planned to house Creative Science until Phase II, and more so since I am dependent on the bus to attend school functions.</p> <p>But I am aghast about the supposed consolidation of language programs. As the communities were not consulted, it really gives the impression that wealthier neighborhood schools want to segregate immigrant and lower SES communities. It really sounds like a step backwards for diversity in schools.</p>	Equity	Negative Response		
<p>From an equity lens, there has not been sufficient opportunities for BIPOC family engagement in the decision-making process outside of those who were phone surveyed and/or part of the coalition. Superficially, it appears DLI programs have been a central focus, not the needs of BIPOC families enrolled in neighborhood schools. For a number of reasons outside of academics, BIPOC families anecdotally are less likely than their white counterparts to enter the lottery for a DLI (especially if it's not in their native language) or focus school, so in a sense these schools are inherently privileged. Ideally more data can be gathered about the priorities and concerns of BIPOC families enrolled in neighborhood schools in contrast with those in DLI/focus schools. Qualitative data should be viewed and/or interpreted by POC since they are more perceptive at reading between the lines. My hope is that decision-makers will prioritize the needs of the majority of the BIPOC families, regardless of school/program. Based on my experience as a WOC joining one of the zoom breakout sessions during tonight's open house, I can attest to the difference in priorities and concerns of BIPOC families based on the type of school enrollment.</p>	Equity	Negative Response		
It moves MIP out of Woodstock and decimated the population and diversity of the school.	Equity	Negative Response		
Again, we planned our life around schools, commutes, and now we are going from the top rated public high school to one of the worst.	Equity	Negative Response		wrapped up in a nutshell!

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
My concern is that my son will be forced to attend a high school that ranks and performs lower than his current anticipated high school.	Equity	Negative Response		
<p>My understanding is the Guiding Coalition is a white dominant group. Yet the Coalition and the entire project were represented almost wholly by people of color at the open house. This misrepresents this process as an effort by and for BIPOC people, when this is far from the truth. For Dani and Shanice I am confused why you are supporting this misrepresentation. Using BIPOC parents to represent a majority white group without noting this disparity is the epitome of performative allyship. If you want this to be a BIPOC led process, work harder to make it one authentically, or own that you have not been able to do so.</p> <p>Overall, this project is coated in a lot of equity language, but with a huge "trust me" attached to that language. It is the equity version of greenwashing. People do not trust you, in particular with driving greater equity in our schools, and your open house has not bothered to make a compelling case why the core goals of the study (e.g., getting rid of colocation and the L-8 to K-5 transition) will lead to greater equity. Though I know these (especially the K-5) have been a priority for the current board, PPS has provided insufficient data (both PPS and research on similar changes in other school districts) to demonstrate that the huge disruption caused by this transition will indeed have those intended effects. Instead they seem to be included as a priori assumptions, whitewashed in some equity language, and delivered by BIPOC presenters to make us believe they will have their intended effect.</p>	Equity	Negative Response		
I am concerned about how Phase 1 involved tying extremely sensitive issues like social and racial equity to the rushed opening of a middle school when much much more time and effort should be spent reaching out to affected groups who do not have adequate access to this process but are some of the most critical stakeholders.	Equity	Negative Response		
1. It is a huge upheaval for many families with almost no time to process or provide input. 2. This would be doable if there were clear RESJ benefits to our historically underserved programs. Unfortunately I have yet to see how this proposal will address RESJ issues in a real way. 3. In fact, it ends up hurting many underserved communities even more by taking them out of their neighborhood schools. It also segregates communities of color.	Equity	Negative Response		
We need clarification on how this is actually equitable. There is a lot of talk of moving around dual language programs, however, that should not be the only consideration with equity. There should be many other lenses used to discuss and address equity. There are concerns even from the committee that this work is not equitable and with some people calling it out as a racist process based on what was heard during the Open House.	Equity	Negative Response		

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
<p>I am a very proud parent of a Franklin High School senior and two students attending Mt. Tabor Middle School. We have been watching the construction of Kellogg Middle School which is approximately 3/4 mile from our house in our South Tabor Neighborhood. We had 3 children attend Atkinson for 12 years, but they have completed the elementary grades.</p> <p>With the latest boundary alignment map I have some concerns about the future of Franklin High School. The wealthiest and whitest schools in Portland including Lincoln, Wilson, and Grant are not included in the greater balancing process to fill a SE school in Kellogg middle school with 6-8 grade children. With the latest proposal Madison takes the most affluent neighborhood from Franklin which is Glencoe and another affluent neighborhood which is Sunnyside gets cut off from Franklin and heads to Cleveland. Part of Atkinson which is north of Division is the only affluent neighborhood left heading to Franklin. This is disturbing because of the equity differences between the whitest and most affluent schools which are Lincoln, Wilson, Grant and Cleveland and Franklin which is in the middle and the even less fortunate which are Madison, Roosevelt, Benson, and Jefferson. Franklin is roughly 50% white and would then become less white and less affluent. Currently Grant in NE is 75% white and is by far the most affluent high school on the entire east side. Cleveland in SE is 72% white and is clearly the second most affluent on the east side. These affluent neighborhoods are extremely important to have in a school's catchment that provide the funding gap within the schools for PTA funds for schools in the middle income like Franklin to compete with the wealthier schools.</p> <p>Cleveland would become even more affluent in this latest proposal. The Chinese emersion leaves Cleveland and heads to Madison also making Cleveland even more white. Although Franklin becomes more diverse with the loss of the Glencoe neighborhood, the funding lost by the affluent neighborhoods to the PTA is frightening. Madison is only 33% white now and would certainly get a boost by adding Glencoe.</p> <p>I feel once Madison reopens after its recent remodel project enrollment will naturally level off from Franklin and people displaced by the shift to Marshall will shift back to Madison away from Franklin. We saw this happen with Franklin once it reopened its doors to a \$100 million makeover. Cleveland lost enrollment from the transfers after Marshall closed and Franklin reopened its doors. Once Cleveland gets redeveloped it will have enrollment increases as well. Franklin has been called the most beautiful school in the state. We are very proud of our kids that attend there and their accomplishments.</p> <p>Franklin has been stated by PPS as a model for Portland high schools with its diversity and cross section of socioeconomic status that closely match the dynamic diversity of Portland as a whole. Franklin won its first OSAA championship in 60 years in Boys XC and followed that up a week later in 2019 with Boys soccer! Both were recognized at the school district as great accomplishments for PPS to finally compete with the powers of the state that include private schools and new suburban schools. I do not see any coincidence with the enrollment numbers targeted to be 1700 for Franklin which are up from less than 1000 before its remodel. If this formula changes it certainly diminishes the quality of education of our beloved Franklin High School.</p>	Equity	Negative Response		
It is not equitable for Latino student	Equity	Negative Response		
Removing sunnyside and mt tabor from Franklin makes the school all schools of lower socioeconomic status which is not diverse or better inequities at all!	Equity	Negative Response		
Moving all language immersion schools and the impacts of those moves on communities of color. The stated premise that focus option schools create an inequitable experience.	Equity	Negative Response		

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
We have many questions. Will the proposal be able to meet the goals around equity and justice without causing other challenges/inequities/injustices for low-income communities? For example, we appreciate the idea that non-native DLI participants should have to travel to the community they will be learning from and engaging with. But does removing a neighborhood option at Lent cause transportation challenges for low income residents in that area and how are those challenges measured against the potential benefits of combining DLI into one school?	Equity	Negative Response		
i'm troubled by the changing format of the DLI school; many, many parents in the feedback sessions on Thursday 11/19 shared that it seemed those were major equity barriers, not improvements, for dual language families in those schools. i don't see how drastically changing a STEM school with extra lottery spots for ethnicity and income located in a low income diverse area improves equity.	Equity	Negative Response		
. Although it seems like all this proposed change has the goal of equity, without involving the much wealthier schools in close-in SE and NE Portland, the changes cannot have a meaningful effect on balancing equity, instead just continues the PPS tradition of constantly making drastic change/closing schools in poorer communities and leaving wealthier schools alone.	Equity	Negative Response		
It doesn't seem that equitable. It currently seems more focused on data points rather than feedback from the communities actually effected.	Equity	Negative Response		
Lack of equity in the decision process, many stating they are just hearing about these changes without being able to fully be involved, lack of input from those most effected due to differences in technology access, not listening to the concerns of co-located programs and their needs and making them segregated from others,	Equity	Negative Response		
Also, sending the MIP to an already Chinese inhabited area, with an attempt to balance race and socioeconomic issues,, will not solve the core problem	Equity	Negative Response		
Native speakers of Chinese have been left out of the conversation about whether they would like the immersion program moved to Harrison. I think they should be leading the conversation. From our point of view it will diminish the diversity of our school. The neighborhood program is woefully unrepresentative of a diversity of culture, especially in this years kinder class. We would love to expand the diversity of our school not white it out.	Equity	Negative Response		
The DLI program states closing the opportunity gap for underserved students. By shifting programs into neighborhood schools that are already underserved, I feel this defeats the goals and objectives. Racial equity and social justice? When you shift DLI programs into a neighborhood that is already underserved, I feel you aren't taking these principles into account. When these programs are left in their current schools it fosters diversity and strengthens PPS goals and objectives.	Equity	Negative Response		
TWO out of seven "Proposal Theme" points "call out" Creative Science School, which is my family's school. This is a big emphasis on one school of the many that are affected by this redistribution. The first point states: "schools devoted entirely to a Focus Option create inequity of experience". That is an unfair and untrue burden to place solely on us, given the massive inequities among even neighborhood schools. We provide an option that is highly in-demand, implementing a constructivist philosophy. We seem to be in the wrong place at the wrong time.	Equity	Negative Response		

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
This program does not cost any extra over a neighborhood school. We are a "middle-income" school: we have a PTA, and raise money, but we do not have a foundation, nor do we receive foundation funds. With schools underfunded, and parent fundraising bridging that gap, this money makes a difference. However, given the amount we raise, we are FAR less inequitable than neighborhood, focus, and DLI schools that raise large amounts of money through PTAs and foundations. More details on this inequity are here: https://sites.google.com/view/reform-pps-funding/home	Equity	Negative Response		
It is still unclear to me how this proposal positively impacts equity for PPS students. Also, CSS is left without a building.	Equity	Negative Response		
I am concerned with removing the MIP program from woodstock because it adds so much richness to the whole community. All students benefit from the language and cultural activities that the MIP program provides, including the students in the neighborhood program. This program integrates different populations into a caring, inclusive community and provides diverse perspectives that benefit all students, staff and families.	Equity	Negative Response		
I am concerned that the coalition couldn't articulate how proposed changes improve climate and academics for students of color (with a focus on Black and Native American students."	Equity	Negative Response		
I am concerned "equity" is being used without being defined. Show exactly how each individual proposed change leads to equity, and then maybe you'll get more buy-in.	Equity	Negative Response		
I'm concerned that kids of color in neighborhood programs like Woodstock and Hosford will be left with less diversity of race and culture in already very white environment. They're already very isolated. While I understand that a new middle school needs to be filled, it seems unnecessary to upend working programs, like the longstanding immersion program at Woodstock/Hosford/Cleveland. Focus on the middle school impact, leave things that are working alone. It's a domino effect of decisions made under deadline pressure.	Equity	Negative Response		
Doesn't appear that segregating the DLI programs in achieving the goal of equity.	Equity	Negative Response		
My concern is that PPS will give the best deals to schools whose parents are speaking out with loud voices. The opposite should be happening. If the goal is equity, historically underserved schools should be prioritized. Poor and non-white kids should not continue to be marginalized simply because they don't have parents coming to meetings and advocating for them. Do not wait for parents of color to fill out a survey or give comments about what they want. Just give them what is best. For example, we all know that it's important for kids to be able to attend a neighborhood school close to their house. Lent, Harrison Park, Marysville, and other low SES schools should stay intact because those kids need neighborhood schools most. Atkinson and Glencoe, for example, are high SES schools, and I would argue that their needs should come second, despite the comments you may be getting from their parents. Please prioritize the wellbeing of poor and non-white kids.	Equity	Negative Response		
It will make our school less diverse.	Equity	Negative Response		
I do not believe the proposal achieves the goals of racial equity and social justice. The communities of color affected by the proposal were not adequately consulted in developing the proposal. I would note, in particular, that Shu Ren opposes the proposal and similarly believes that the proposal does not achieve goals of racial equity and social justice.	Equity	Negative Response		
My concerns are that I am not sure that the scenario you put forward is actually equitable in the minds of the BIPOC people in SE that is proposing to serve. As a white privileged mother of a Latino child (adopted from Colombia) I feel so fortunate to be able to enroll him in a Spanish Immersion program where he can learn his native tongue as well as be surrounded by kids who look like him and have Latinx adult role models as well.	Equity	Negative Response		

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
Adding the idea of equity seems to be making the proposals too complicated. The proposal actually decreases equity by reducing diversity and causing less education equity. The idea that the immersion programs should be moved out of neighborhood schools is flawed, since there are no clear benefits to the students. This will drive more diversity and is more likely to create academic equity district wide. When it doesn't then those issue should be addressed separately. The proposal increases segregation and reduces diversity and breaks a long history of functioning immersion programs with no plan on how to continue supporting their long term success.	Equity	Negative Response		
I am concerned that the meeting on 11/12 ended with BIPOC members voicing their opposition to Scenario 10 as the only option being presented to the community, and PPS moved forward anyway. I feel their ideas were actionable and offered a positive move towards applying the RESJ lens.	Equity	Negative Response		
Woodstock Elementary will lose diversity. The native speaker families will have their language immersion program sent far out to the east.	Equity	Negative Response		
I am concerned with change in diversity	Equity	Negative Response	diversity	
The impact on diversity for Woodstock elementary.	Equity	Negative Response	diversity	
Moving dli program at woodstock will drastically decrease the diversity of the school and negatively impact the community.	Equity	Negative Response		
Moving the Dual Language Immersion programs disproportionately affects students and families of color.	Equity	Negative Response		
4) the meeting spoke about equity. We need an explanation about how this "balancing" improves equity for our Black residents of Portland. As far as I can tell, it is not serving this group at all. (If you really want to talk about equity -- then talk about why a wealthy neighborhood like Bridelmile still has Spanish immersion.) 5) If more DLI is desired, why not consider just add DLI to local schools that want it?	Equity	Negative Response		
If you move the MIP, the BIPOC students in the MIP will not get to do the IB Diploma at Cleveland. One of the CHS Equity Committee's goals is to get more BIPOC students involved in the IB program. By moving the MIP and replacing them with Sunnyside kids, you will be "whitening" the school by 3.2% according to PPS statistics. This will make Cleveland the "whitest" school on the east side and further disenfranchise the 70% BIPOC kids in the MIP. This is based upon PPS statistics. It seems like the Sunnyside kids should be moved to Franklin, and the MIP left at Cleveland. https://www.pps.net/cms/lib/OR01913224/Centricity/Domain/207/Enrollment%20by%20Race%20and%20School%202020-21.pdf	equity	Negative Response		
I am concerned that this proposal segregates lower income and multilingual students away from the best eastside high school for academics [currently Cleveland which houses the IB program] and entrenches the stereotype that white, higher income students deserve strong academic programs while non-white mixed income multilingual students get warehoused far away from the better schools in the better parts of town.	Equity	Negative Response		

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
<p>The process has not been transparent or involved much of the community, particularly the Chinese or the BIPOC community. I did not hear about the process until recently. I did not see the information translated into Mandarin or Cantonese until recently. I did not see any of the meetings involved the Chinese community until recently at the open house.</p> <p>The process does not seem equitable. The Chinese, other communities of color, and low-income communities are being segregated. The white and more affluent communities are being grouped together at the historically better resourced and white schools. For example, why not have people in Sunnyside, who are predominately white attend schools such as Madison rather than displace students how are further south who currently attend Hosford and Cleveland and ask them to drive further to Madison? It will be a hardship to travel 20 minutes further and will make schools such as Woodstock, Hosford, and Cleveland reduce the diversity that the district has worked so hard to achieve.</p>	Equity	Negative Response		
<p>2. Communities of color will be sent to school on outer edges of district in lower served areas. 3. Communities of color in current schools vocally disapprove of these proposals.</p>	Equity	Negative Response		
<p>3) The theme of people using different definitions of demographic equity is meaningless in the context of the RESJ lens this process has supposedly been conducted through. When a plan disproportionately impacts students and families of color, no lens of racial equity and social justice would use a definition that saw such an outcome as acceptable.</p>	Equity	Negative Response		
<p>You are essentially eliminating our school and decreasing diversity in neighborhood schools.</p>	Equity	Negative Response		
<p>Potential lack of diversity of students</p>	Equity	Negative Response	Diversity	
<p>Each of the SEGC meetings opened with a reminder of decentering whiteness, starting with a reminder to not rush through things and yet the breakout sessions consistently reported back that they didn't have enough time to evaluate everything and everything is moving forward at the speed it is for the sake of the timeline. In meetings with the Southeast region community, committee members have expressed that insufficient time was allotted to adequately review the proposals presented to them and that voting was rushed. The SEGC meetings made a mockery of the RESJ lens in what can only be described as a calculating, malicious way.</p>	Equity	Negative Response	Process	
<p>Converting Harrison Park back into comprehensive middle school makes sense given that Kellogg will not have sufficient space for all the students from current SE K-8's. My concern is simply that the district is able to provide sufficient funding and support for the conversion of Harrison Park so that the quality of facilities and opportunities for Harrison Park students are on-par with the other middle schools. I also think families will have an easier time envisioning how the proposal could be successful if information was provided on how PPS will meet the new student transportation.</p>	K-8 to K-5	Negative Response		
<p>Why tie up DLI & Focus options in this? Let's balance middle schools.</p>	K-8 to K-5			statement
<p>I would like the k-8 classes to stay together in one building.</p>	K-8 to K-5	Negative Response		
<p>Removing the option of K-8 schools for families with kids that do better in that smaller mid-level environment.</p>	K-8 to K-5	Negative Response		
<p>I think schools should remain k-8</p>	K-8 to K-5	Negative Response		
<p>Changing Bridger ES, changing Vestal ES MS to Harrison Park. I don't want Harrison Park to be the MS for Bridger or Vestal.</p>	K-8 to K-5	Negative Response		

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
Dissolving K-8s destroys an opportunity for middle school students to mentor the peers in their own community, and some kids really need a smaller middle school experience to be successful.	K-8 to K-5	Negative Response		
Every community that I have spoken with (Harrison park, arleta, and CSS) wants to remain a k-8. Taking this away because you built a middle school (when a k-8 would have solved the overcrowding issues) with our tax dollars is unjust. We are being punished because of PPS mistakes!!	K-8 to K-5	Negative Response		
I am also concerned by the move from K-8 to K-5 + 6-8 schools. I love the presence that the mid-level students provides at our school, leading various initiatives and bringing in a broader focus that what would be available if we were only focused on elementary ages. Older siblings are able to help out at pickup and drop-off of younger ones, and I believe it makes the difficult time of early teen years a little less foreign as our students stay with their same classmates, building and staff.	K-8 to K-5	Negative Response		
Jr High aged humans should be in buildings with humans other than those in a position of authority. Being in a place where they are role models and asked to assist with younger humans is better for them and younger humans who have people to look up to. All kids have an opportunity to interact with kids who aren't just their age and I have seen so many positive outcomes in the K-8 model. I have two adult children who attended PPS Jr High schools and both (very different personalities) had horrible experinces. We were elated to find a mindful K-8 and will be very sad if Jr High is elsewhere. Our children will not attend a PPS middle school.	K-8 to K-5	Negative Response		
I'm concerned that all families that participate in the Spanish DLI program for SE will be sent to the far SE part of PPS area. I'm concerned that making Lent Elementary 100% DLI will force Lent neighborhood students who cannot or do not want to participate in Spanish DLI to go to a school further away. I'm concerned that Spanish DLI and Chinese DLI students will be segregated into separate schools. Separate is NEVER equal.	Multiple Location DLI	Negative Response		
I prefer the scenario where Bridger/Atkinson share a catchment and Lent expands its DLI program to 2 strands. This feels more equitable to the Bridger & Lent communities to me.	Multiple Location DLI	Negative Response		
Why move the Chinese Immersion to overcrowded Franklin HS? Why move the Japanese Immersion to Madison HS? You will lose many current students to the DLI programs if you geographically move the high school locations.	Multiple Location DLI	Negative Response		
Placing all bilingual immersion programs of one language in one school may make financial sense, but it creates ghettos. All Spanish immersion in Lent? All Chinese in Bridger? I was fooled into thinking that diversity, not homogeneity, was one of our educational goals.	Multiple Location DLI	Negative Response		
DLI programs serve the entire district. High school should be centrally located. The DLI programs have been very strong programs and have been models for others.	Multiple Location DLI			Statement
The Japanese program will be a great addition to Madison. This move doesn't depend on the new middle schools opening. The Japanese program should move to Madison in the fall of 2021 when Madison re-opens. This will give Madison an enrollment increase and right size Grant.	Multiple Location DLI	Positive Response	Suggestion?	

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
<p>1) Over indexing on eliminating co-location (as opposed to balanced or appropriate single-strand co-location) of DLI programs exacerbates inequalities by segregating minorities to the outskirts of Portland. While seemingly well intentioned, in practice this leads to fewer opportunities for diverse experiences for students, decreases socio-economic diversity, and closes the door on native speakers by confining them to their own communities.</p>	Multiple Location DLI	Negative Response		
<p>However that goal seems mired in some fascination with cramming all the DLI into language-specific locations which jettisons students currently attending the proposed locations as their own local, neighborhood schools. This entire process has been equitable for only those who have access to technology and broadband considering this is all happening during a pandemic.</p> <p>In the presentation last week I repeatedly heard calls about dissatisfaction from parents whose children attend co-located, DLI schools. This was not remotely represented in the two breakout rooms I attended following the presentation.</p> <p>This process and the presented scenario definitely feels as though it was derived from statistics and not students, quantitative and not qualitative. Unfortunately for the scenario designers, kids are going to be affected; transportation disruptions, neighborhood cohesiveness, and community friendships. And from what I could tell, all these disruptions are to wrangle DLI into language-specific locations for what seems like a thinly veiled attempt to increase ESL test scores or something.</p>	Multiple Location DLI	Negative Response		
<p>For my own family, we are quite sad and worried that Creative Science does not have a new location included in Phase 1. It is very hard to evaluate the move without that information. As a community member who attended the Open House and the breakout discussion I was deeply troubled by the proposals that the language immersion programs be combined and pushed far out into East Portland. Co-located programs provide such wonderful opportunities for cross-cultural connection and learning even for the neighborhood-program students in a school like Atkinson or Woodstock. I think the changes to these programs are deeply misguided. Is there really evidence that native speaking families are choosing not to enroll in dual immersion programs because of the distance between their home and the school? From an equity and racial justice lens it seems to me it would be much better to try and come up with transportation options rather than segregate these children from higher SES neighborhoods.</p>	Multiple Location DLI	Negative Response		
<p>It seems to be very problematic: would effectively dismantle current, successful program, exclude parents in SW from attending the new CH dual immersion program due to distance; involves complex planning /changing schools during pandemic; collocational programs are more balanced than having an all-Chinese school in the Pearl which has large Chinese population (Chinese parents want to integrate in English-speaking society, not stay isolated, which is a practical difficulty for immigrants).</p>	Multiple Location DLI	Negative Response		
<p>Woodstock co-location is a culturally integrating, positive experience for both programs based upon school wide meetings and feedback from both neighborhood and DLI programs. It is a beneficial program that has taken 20 years to achieve this level of success and it would be terrible to tear it apart. It's possible that some co-located programs may have problems, but that doesn't mean a one-size fits all approach should destroy a wonderful program that benefits the neighborhood and the whole city (based on it's central location for Mandarin DLI). Moving it further east would hurt the neighborhood component and the opportunity for Mandarin DLI students who live in more western parts of the city.</p>	Multiple Location DLI	Positive Response		

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
Moving the MIP program from Woodstock would negatively impact all students and families at Woodstock. We are against the program moving elsewhere	Multiple Location DLI	Negative Response		
That the plan doesn't effectively meet the needs of most of the students that will be moved. I'm concerned about what I mentioned above, as well as the district pushing this through for the wrong reasons, and not considering how the rest of the east side families will then be effected. Perhaps implementing smaller bite-sized changes would be better for all in the long run.	Multiple Location DLI	Negative Response		
-Don't move the Spanish Dual Language Immersion (DLI) program out of Atkinson to Lents. Losing the DLI program would decrease diversity at Atkinson and require kids to be driven to school at Lents. It would also mean that children living on the same street would attend different elementary and middle schools.	Multiple Location DLI	Negative Response		
Japanese Immersion Program has been feeding in from Mt Tabor to Grant High School for years. The new proposal will disrupt long standing programs at Grant, teachers, etc. The proposal fails to address whether shifting the relatively small population of JMP students that would attend Grant from Tabor (~100?) to Madison is actually going to address anything. Since the JMP is a district wide program and not tied to neighborhood schools, trying to draw a boundary line to define where these students feed into for HS doesn't make a lot of sense either.	Multiple Location DLI	Negative Response		
I'm am concerned that schools that have been established and working well for 20 years will lose their identities. Many of these DLI schools have siblings in immersion and non-immersion programs or neighbors who watch the children. Plus, the school benefits from the culture and diversity of other backgrounds. Don't take that away from students.	Multiple Location DLI	Negative Response		
It seems like it is affecting a lot of people in a lot of different ways. Not everyone will be 100% happy, and that may lead to some conflicts.	Proposal	Negative Response		
There is absolutely no regard being made for the hundreds of families enrolled at Creative Science School. The constructivist focus is a valuable one that PPS should be recognizing instead of shoving aside.	Proposal	Negative Response		
I do not think that the Woodstock MIP program should be relocated. This does not reflect the desires of the community.	Proposal	Negative Response		
I do NOT want to see Mount Tabor middle school feed into Madison instead of Franklin.	Proposal	Negative Response		
How the transition plan may affect teachers in small immersion programs. Whether the transition will be abrupt and force students in the schools in the old configuration to move to a new middle school half way through middle school (very disruptive for students).	Proposal	Negative Response		
staff cutbacks at Atkinson	Proposal	Negative Response		
The proposal is rushed. Moving Atkinson Spanish immersion has not been on the table for long enough for people to learn about the change and give you input. Also, shopping these proposals around during the pandemic is adding stress to families, and lots of people don't know this proposal is on the table because we get so much communication from teachers, the school and the district. It seems like you're trying to hurry this in darkness.	Proposal	Negative Response		

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
<p>That the current students at Franklin high school will be moved out of their neighborhood school. Nowhere in the wording on the PPS website mentions that the goal is to move current Franklin High School students away from their neighborhood school and bus them to Madison school. I have received feedback from the Glencoe PTA, the Mount Tabor Principal, and other parents that the redistricting could affect current high school students. My son is a Freshman at Franklin High school right now, he's barely hanging on with Covid online school, next year he would attend Franklin in person as a Sophomore and finally feel like it's normal and then his Junior year in 2022 he would be moved to Madison and continue there until his Senior year. No thank you! We have supported PPS and all three of our children have attended the neighborhood schools and we have been very active and involved parents at Glencoe, Mount Tabor Middle and Franklin High school for the last 15 years! If the above scenario happens, we are done with PPS and will send our last son to private school.</p>	Proposal	Negative Response		
<p>We don't want MIP program move to other school.</p>	Proposal	Negative Response		
<p>This goals don't appear adequately focused on the high number of students in immersion programs. The problems are not sufficiently defined and therefore the solution cannot be weighed against other options. As a result the solution clearly creates more problems than are solved. You will create transportation issues. You will disrupt families and students lives.</p>	Proposal	Negative Response		
<p>A) If the MIP moves from Cleveland to Franklin in 2022, my child will be a senior at Cleveland. Is she expected to switch schools for her senior year? That seems really cruel. She'll be completing her IB diploma at Cleveland and will have her friends and relationships with staff. If this happens, can it be phased in? For example, students already at Cleveland would stay and Franklin would take 9th graders starting in 2022. B) Half of the students in the MIP at Woodstock live in that neighborhood. Can't they make Woodstock all Chinese DLI? That's the least disruptive. If the MIP moves to Bridger, how many classes would there be per grade? This doesn't really feel equitable at all. Woodstock MIP is a nationally known program and a leader in dual language instruction. These proposed changes make me incredibly sad. Examination of DLI programs should have it's own separate coalition process. This feels incredibly rushed and has a huge impact on many families and students.</p>	Proposal	Negative Response		
<p>My concerns is the proposal will ruin the MIP at Woodstock</p>	Proposal	Negative Response		
<p>For kids in the DLI programs, parents have planned since elementary school for the path the students would take (Richmond -->Mt. Tabor-->Grant). Switching this up while kids are already in middle school is not very respectful to the DLI programs (they are going to lose enrollments) or the parents and kids that have done the hard work to contribute and stay with these academically challenging programs. I understand there are capacity issues and other concerns, but plan ahead. Let the kids in middle school run the course. This will allow those still in elementary school the time to make an educated decision on what is best for their student and family.</p>	Proposal	Negative Response		
<p>Is there an option for Vestal kids to still feed into Roseway Heights? It is so much closer to us.</p>	Proposal	Negative Response		
<p>I have very serious concerns that Glencoe elementary is excluded from the process. They are being shuttled to Madison high school, without input. I am, quite frankly, shocked that they have no representation when proposals that were on the table included changing their boundaries and there is a huge impact on them. This is not a fair process. I also cannot figure how or why the NE schools would not be considered in this process. If Madison is underenrolled why aren't NE schools being considered to feed it? This fails like a significant oversight, and again, just a failure in the process.</p>	Proposal	Negative Response		

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
It seems to have expanded in scope and the committee has admittedly not had time to consider the transportation issues and disruption to students they are proposing to shift around and split cohorts. Some schools with big impacts (Glencoe) weren't even represented on the committee. I honestly don't know what even to hope for at this point if it eventually involves a switch to Madison. My 8th grader seems most likely to start at Franklin and then switch in 10th grade to Madison, which is more than twice as far away and further than 4 PPS high schools. If this is delayed, then I feel it will be even worse for him to switch in 11th or 12th grade. It probably would be best, if he's going to switch, to just move him to Madison now, but that doesn't seem like a possible option.	Proposal	Negative Response		
Why would you disrupt so many families so abruptly? Why would you not choose to do this kind of a change gradually, starting with kindergarten and then slowly transitioning the schools as the children move through the grades? Why has this only been brought to parent's attention by the activism of other parents and not by the district or school itself? By not bringing this to our attention but having to learn about it from other parents, it feels like you are hiding it which feels intentional.	Proposal	Negative Response		
For Creston, this proposal leaves us drastically under enrolled after burdening our school with a middle school. New boundaries need to draw in more students and families and not cut out areas that contain the majority of our current minority families. It is also important to honor the historic commitment to keep Creston a feeder neighborhood school to Kellogg and Franklin as has long been agreed.	Proposal	Negative Response		
I question the equity of the new boundaries and how those changes solve the problems originally posed. The emphasis of the survey was on the BIPOC students. We are a two parent household who both work full time. All our excess time and energy is put into filling current shortfalls in our local community schools. This shared responsibility to our community and the friendships we have developed are simply not respected under the current proposal. The focus needs to be on how we make the current underperforming schools better, and improve the infrastructure of facilities to accommodate future growth. I know that people in our neighborhood faced with the choice of sending our children to a distant High school not close to our neighborhood will choose to remove their kids from PPS and go private if they have the means. For families like us who don't, we are faced with the possibility of moving to a different area. The boundary redraw will expedite resources moving out of the district when they are needed the most.	Proposal	Negative Response		
I'm very concerned that current 8th graders could be shuffled mid stream in high school and that in the context of current pandemic disruptions this should be avoided at all costs for the classes of '24 and '25. Also, I think relative to sustainability all high schools should have a 2 mile radius so that households within that radius would have assured entry into their closest HS so neighborhood and walkability is always prioritized over arbitrary boundary lines.	Proposal	Negative Response		
The hard work put into making Franklin what it is	Proposal	Negative Response		
What does this mean for Kinder enrollment? I was planning on enrolling my kid at Atkinson in Feb or asap for Fall 2021. It seems absurd to push this through when Kinder enrollment is in a few months- on the other hand, I wouldn't want my kid to start at one school and be up and moved a year or so later...yikes!	Proposal	Negative Response		
I'm concerned about impacts to neighborhood schools that would lose their DLI programs. Where will the students come from to make up the loss? Will the schools be viable after the removal of these programs?	Proposal	Negative Response		
Sports programs at Madison— are they on the same level as Grant? What about their fields/facilities? Same goes for Mock Trial and Con Law teams.	Proposal	Negative Response		

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
I am OK with my daughter attending Kellogg instead of Mt. Tabor for DLI, but I do not agree with the plan to have the high school be Madison. Franklin is within walking distance. I would prefer to keep her within the neighborhood if classes are going to be held in person.	Proposal	Negative Response		
We do not support the Japanese program moving to Madison (rather than Grant). It's especially shocking that PPS is considering making a decision like this during this extremely strenuous time. If this happens, we will probably remove our two kids from the public school system after Richmond/Tabor and send them to private schools.	Proposal	Negative Response		
I do not think the Japanese language program should feed into Madison at any point in the future. I would pull my kids out of the program and send them outside of PPS if they were to be sent to Madison.	Proposal	Negative Response		
The Japanese Immersion Program moving to Madison High School	Proposal	Negative Response		
It disrupts the Japanese program for no reason.	Proposal	Negative Response		
The possible relocation of the jmp program from grant to madison	Proposal	Negative Response		
It takes the care and the history out of the program. It was a sneaky tactic as the original proposals made it seem as though the JDLI programs would not be touched so parents were not paying attention until you pulled the rug out from under them. Believe me if this option was on the table first way more JDLI parents would be active members, participants of this committee.	Proposal	Negative Response		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I don't think the high school overcrowding can be addressed by quadrant. It should at least be addressed eastside and westside. - I don't think this should be addressed until the construction of all of the HS on the eastside is complete. - Marshall HS should be updated and reopened. - I'm concerned that moving the focus/ language programs around will cause a disruption that will be detrimental to the program and the kids. 	Proposal	Negative Response		
I want my son to attend Grant	Proposal	Negative Response		
When Mt. Tabor upgrades will take place	Proposal	Negative Response		
JMP parents are very strong advocates for the JMP program staying at Grant. It should be noted that these strong advocates DO NOT represent all of the parents and families in the JMP. Oya No Kai (the parent group of the JMP) has issued a statement in support of the program staying at Grant without input from it's members.	Proposal	Negative Response		
I would like the Japanese Immersion program to stay at Grant High School	Proposal	Negative Response		
Uprooting kids from schools like Creative Science while in pivotal grades like 8th grade.	Proposal	Negative Response		
Where to start? First, I have no confidence in PPS to manage such a large transition across so many communities in such a short time frame. I'm sorry, but it's just not believable that you have the competence to do this. Looking back on the terrible transition to K8 schools, PPS has never proven itself capable of managing this level of change this fast. Additionally, the stated reasons for the K8 transition turned out to be largely bogus. As a result, the community is left to wonder, what are the real reasons and causes for this new upheaval? In short, you have no credibility in the community when it comes to this type of change.	Proposal	Negative Response		
With two of my kids already in a DLI program that may be moving I am concerned about making sure my third child is able to attend in the same location.	Proposal	Negative Response		

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
The intensive skills students are already not in their neighborhood, they don't like change, and those parents are dealing with more challenges than normal. Another move to a different school would be seriously detrimental for some of these families	Proposal	Negative Response		
I absolutely want Glencoe to feed into Franklin High.	Proposal	Negative Response		
I'm concerned that the High School "feeder" pattern is changing - I don't understand why	Proposal	Negative Response		
This process has not been transparent or inclusive of the people in our neighborhood (students and families) who will be deeply affected by the proposed changes.	Proposal	Negative Response		
Lack of input from affected schools. Tabor parents were not told that changing the high school feeder was even up for discussion.	Proposal	Negative Response		
the moving or removal of Creative Science School, one of only three focus options that address the total failure of PPS to serve the gifted student population in K-5	Proposal	Negative Response		
It will demote our child's high school education from a five star school to a two star school.	Proposal	Negative Response		
Moving Glencoe kids to Madison. We live closer to both Grant and Franklin, it's not really a "neighborhood" school at this point. Laurelhurst is still a k-8, and also closer to Madison than Glencoe and Mt. Scott are. Cleveland is untouched despite Woodstock being much closer to Franklin. Sunnyside should become a regular program. You really should rebalance everything on the East side, not just for Franklin/Madison. If you are really serious about equity and inclusion, rethink the entire thing, not just tinkering around the edges. Move focus programs into less privileged neighborhoods, DaVinci and Winterhaven, for example.	Proposal	Negative Response		
I have a child in Glencoe now who would then move to Mt Tabor MS and then Franklin. I'm opposed to the new PPS program balancing for a number of reasons. The first being that there have been no representatives from Glencoe involved in this process. I watched beginning of the latest meeting of the SE guiding coalition on YouTube and it opens up with the discussion of creating an inclusive process to involve the community in the process of creating new school boundaries, and yet no one from Glencoe has been involved.	Proposal	Negative Response		
Sweeping changes have been proposed without key stakeholders at the table. There are no representatives from Glencoe neighborhood catchment in the Phase 1 coalition. The Reps from Mt Tabor are from Atkinson. Once such huge changes were proposed to this catchment, the process should have been stopped. This uncenters the neighborhood school. There seems to be no outcome - outlined in the coalitions goals and directive from the Board - achieved. Yet, disrupts huge groups of children (not children centered) and increases a huge transportation problem - moving children from a 15 minute walk to a 45 minute bus ride.	Proposal	Negative Response		
Literally they couldn't stay in the program at Marshall.	Proposal	Negative Response		
My Tabor students should go to Franklin to preserve the diversity of the school, and avoid unnecessary environmental impact of longer commutes	Proposal			

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
The proposal doesn't alleviate the overcrowding at Mt. Tabor and Franklin High School, while taking the Mt. Tabor neighborhood students out of their neighborhood high school. PPS made a plan for neighborhood schools and took away the ability to transfer for stronger programs like IB. The community supported that plan by passing bonds to upgrade schools at risk to their family finances. Each community spent significant time in the planning process to make sure the upgraded neighborhood schools had the programs and spaces that were best for their community. Now, PPS wants to make large groups of students travel to another neighborhood's school that doesn't have the programs they need and takes approximately 2 hours out of their day for travel, while they usually spend 15 to 20 minutes walking to school. PPS feels this plan will even out the socioeconomic state of each school, but with the Mt. Tabor neighborhood portion of the switch between high schools, it just transfers the problem from Madison to Franklin.	Proposal	Negative Response		
I don't want to lose the families at our eastern boundary, especially because that will change our demographics (making us whiter and wealthier). Also, I want our population to grow not shrink	Proposal	Negative Response		
The fact that you changed the borders of schools without truly engaging the community. This speed reeks of white supremacy.	Proposal	Negative Response		
None!	Proposal	Negative Response		
Obviously I don't want to have to switch schools, especially during a pandemic. Also there are zero benefits for JMP families or students. The proposal is not taking into account the people who will be affected. I believe the whole thing is unnecessary.	Proposal	Negative Response		
My children are in the Japanese Immersion Program, my son is at Mt. Tabor (8th grade) and my daughter is in Grant (Freshman). We have made many major life decisions (home purchase, job choices) based on where we thought our children would go to school based on traditional feeder patterns for the JMP program. This feels very rushed to come up with a proposal that moves the JMP from Grant to Madison, especially for my children who may be directly impacted during a very stressful time (pandemic) during a challenging time in their lives (adolescence). I also feel like it does not meet one of the objectives for increasing diversity. If the JMP program is pulled from Grant, I believe the diversity of that school would dramatically be impacted in a negative way. These kinds of major decisions need to be made over the course of several years and not just over the course of a few months.	Proposal	Negative Response		

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
<p>I have two main concerns about the proposals that have kids from Mt. Tabor feeding into Madison. Mainly, it is much farther and completely changes the means of transportation and time involved getting to and from school. Currently, it is a 10 minute walk from our house to Franklin with the busiest street crossing at Division. The proposal would have our child crossing Burnside, Stark and Halsey and Interstate 84! And it would take 50 minutes, according to Google. This new arrangement is not walkable and would mean a disruption of our family schedule and resources as we would need to come up with a transportation plan that is currently not required by the walkable proximity of Franklin.</p> <p>Secondly, I think it would be incredibly irresponsible and disrespectful of the students to implement a change where they have to change between high schools during their high school career. After attending the orientations of both Madison and Franklin today, it seemed that they were both good schools but the disruption that would come from switching schools midway is really shameful. While the transportation issue would be annoying, I feel like a mid-course change of school could cause irreparable damage to the learning process. Each school has it's own culture, program tracks and systems that become more understandable over the years along with relationships with teachers and counselors that are built up over time. The fact that the board would even consider switching schools midway upsets me no end, as they obviously have other priorities than the student's development, psychological well-being, academic performance and sense of belonging.</p>	Proposal	Negative Response		
I'm concerned that too many families will reconsider their options and we could lose good families. Especially, Spanish speakers. Please educate them, try to help their concerns, etc no matter what plan is finally implemented.	Proposal	Negative Response		
To clarify, our school is Richmond Elementary, which is not on the survey.	Proposal	Negative Response		
My concern is that the process seems rushed, and lacks data on the impact of proposed changes. Moving all of the language immersion out of neighborhood schools could unfairly impact the families that depend on those language programs, as well as tear apart communities built around the diversity of having language immersion programs inside neighborhood schools.	Proposal	Negative Response		
Woodstock DLI moving away from established success and away from engaged parents and not listening to Shu Ren's letter	Proposal	Negative Response		
Potentially our children will go to different high schools. The lack of communication and engagement about this process and the speed of impact on families has been challenging.	Proposal	Negative Response		
Although I liked the things above, the Latinx families at our school (that spoke out at the meeting we had) were not happy with the move. They were worried that if the program moved into a less white and affluent neighborhood that the opportunities they were looking for might not be at the new school. And I had not thought about that, but it does make sense. If white families leave due to distance and take their (unfortunately) money and power, what does that mean for the kids left in the programs.	Proposal	Negative Response		
Lack of the bigger picture - all of sudden we're moving SE students to a NE high school without taking into account NE balancing. Also, what about Climate change and trying to keep students within walking and biking distance of their schools?	Proposal	Negative Response		

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
Incomplete proposal. Not having a building for CSS. Leaving 500 students without a building and not giving ONE option for a replacement or explanation. Seems very similar what happened to Access school. I feel you have not balanced the schools properly to take into account the students at CSS that are mainly SE residence.	Proposal	Negative Response		
Moving language programs Far East, creating segregation, reducing diversity in neighborhood schools, increasing commute time for majority of DLI students	Proposal	Negative Response		
Madison High school might have the Japanese Program instead of Grant Highschool	Proposal			
The proposal makes racial and ethnic diversity worse. The proposal would make each Dual Language Immersion (DLI) program be located at one site, such as all K-5 Mandarin Immersion Program students to Bridger elementary school, isolating the kids from neighborhood. I think education should help kids get involved in their communities.	Proposal	Negative Response		
There has been no input or representation from Richmond or Glencoe despite major impacts to their feeder patterns. The proposal to move JDLI from Grant to Madison has had NO INPUT from the JDLI community and gives no consideration to the history of the program and its place at Grant High School for the past 25 years. Moving Mt Tabor neighbor kids from Franklin to Madison is not logical - they can walk to Franklin but will face long commutes to Madison. Why isn't the coalition including a look at the Grant feeder schools to fill Madison when they are significantly closer geographically to Madison than the Mt Tabor kids? SE kids should not be used to rebalance a NE high school. The entire east side needs to be considered, not just a section of SE Portland. Also, this move does almost nothing to address the current overcrowding at Franklin.	Proposal	Negative Response		
The proposal lacks any significant impact on equity and instead forces segregation to communities who do not want that. With Kindergarten at low enrollment levels for this year, how will that affect student population until they graduate. Will PPS be able to accommodate those children the following year? Will this impact how the feeder programs look? I don't believe something as complex as racial equity can be solved with this one sided approach. It has to be paired with educational opportunities, staff education and support, and a shared vision.	Proposal	Negative Response		
I have no understanding of how the stated goals are being addressed. I've seen multiple re-districting proposals with wildly different impacts for my son's middle and high school possibilities in the past few weeks, and I have no idea how they've been whittled down. There's a bit of demographic data out now with the current proposal. I don't see a lot of benefit toward the stated goals. The whitest schools become more so in several cases. I'm concerned that several elementary and middle schools have borders, on one side or another, that are mere blocks from the school, and that doesn't seem reasonable for many folks who would be forced to travel significantly farther.	Proposal	Negative Response		

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
<p>I am concerned first of all with such a broad, sweeping change being made to so many school communities in the middle of a pandemic. I understand that boundaries will need to be changed to create feeder patterns for Kellogg and that no scenario is going to please everyone, but it surprises me that such sweeping changes as relocating all the DLI programs together and moving CSS are being considered, as they are unnecessarily disruptive to students already facing so much trauma. It seems like if we are going to disrupt so many school communities, then we truly must look at all the schools, not just SE. And I feel like that must have become apparent as you worked because the scenario does involve schools outside of SE, as was noted in the meeting. I feel like when it was realized that this vision could not be implemented without impacting schools outside of SE - that was a very clear indication that the changes being contemplated could NOT be made without considering NE schools as well, at the very least. Either the scope of the changes needed to be reduced, or the coalition needed to start over and involve stakeholders from NE schools as well from the get-go.</p> <p>Additionally, on a personal note, I am concerned about where our school (CSS) will end up. We have received assurances that CSS will absolutely continue as a school, but that its location cannot be determined at this stage. I feel like the truth is that is because PPS does not own many buildings large enough to house our program. Our current building (Clark) is one of the few that is. I understand why Clark is needed as a neighborhood school and feel like if CSS needs to move to promote equity and help the children of Bridger who will be losing their neighborhood program, we can do that, but I think that it is going to be difficult for PPS to locate a building large enough to house us, and I am concerned that pushing that decision out to Phase 2 means that ultimately we will be told we must be split, or disbanded. Given the unique nature of our curriculum, we can survive a move (though of course we wish it were otherwise) but we may not survive a split. Our mid-level students work closely with our grade school students and it is central to our focus curriculum, so I am hopeful that the fact that we really should remain a k-8 is being considered and that there are, in fact, other suitable sites in SE Portland, or in the Southern half of NE Portland, for us to move to.</p>	Proposal	Negative Response		
<p>It doesn't seem to value CSS. The plan does not take into account over 400 students that attend CSS. One of the 7 stated themes, that of considering the effects of relocating CSS, is not being addressed.</p>	Proposal	Negative Response		
<p>This should be a whole district plan, not piecemeal. Madison is actually in NE Portland, so why is it included in the SE coalition. This type of piecemeal shortsightedness is typical of PPS, which leads to unintended consequences. PPS shortsightedness like closing schools and consolidating into K-8s puts us in positions like this. Instead of redistricting only in SE we need to think district wide, we need to think of solutions that are long term and holistic. Reopening Marshall would alleviate high school overcrowding.</p>	Proposal	Negative Response		
<p>Our neighborhood school is being completely dismantled, and that is unfair to every single person in that school. My child would have to be bussed to an unfamiliar school in order to remain in the DLI program, instead of being able to simply walk to school. It's unclear what neighborhood school option we would have if we drop out of DLI since the boundaries are moving targets, but it currently looks like we'd be transferred to a school that would involve a commute. I don't agree that segregating the DLI programs is a good option for anyone. I'm unhappy about the prospect of completely changing the culture of schools by removing established school programs. Just about everything in this proposal is terrible for our neighborhood families.</p>	Proposal	Negative Response		
<p>The proposed scenario does not address enrollment goals. In particular:</p>	Proposal	Negative Response		

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
<p>We purchased our home with special attention to the schools our children would be going to and the walkability of those schools. We have considered moving several times and the main thing that keeps us in our home is our school community. We love the community and feel well supported. I am uncomfortable with the change of high school we will be fed into and if this boundary proposal is approved, we will strongly consider moving out of district. I know of many other families that feel the same way. We have invested in our schools and will be upset if this change is made. I do not understand how all of this fuss can be created to adjust Franklin's overcrowding from 108% to 107%. I don't understand why the Kellogg Middle school cannot be created as planned (i.e. fed by the K-8 schools changing into K-5 schools), while keeping the current boundaries. The trade off on disruption of lives vs the adjustment to the overcrowding situation by 1% seems not worth it. On the meeting today, everyone seemed to want the Kellogg transition, but nothing else.</p>	Proposal	Negative Response		
<p>So many concerns.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) 2) I think it is short-sighted to do this reconfiguration based segmented areas of town instead of looking at PPS as a whole. You made decide in reviewing the NE/N school districting to make additional changes that impact us after just making changes that impact my child right now. We need to look collectively at PPS and not each area in isolation. 3) 4) . 5) Many of my children's friends and classmates will now be heading to different schools under this proposal. It feels cruel to do this to children after enduring a pandemic. My kinder made friends with another little boy in his class. He was so excited and now, based on the new districting plan, they will not be in the same school. He will be devastated. It may seem insignificant to you, but it is a big deal to a child. 6) Making changes that don't incorporate a PPS school (Creative Sciences School) is appalling. My children don't go there, but I can't imagine how demoralizing and minimizing it would feel to be a member of that school community and being told that you will still be a program, but not have a space to operate in or where it will be located. <p>I am disappointed in PPS for not involving parent stakeholders sooner in this process and not involving anyone from Glencoe elementary. PPS preaches about inclusion and equity, but not involving all stakeholders or requiring input sooner is hypocritical. I am sure that the committee has worked so hard on this proposal and has the best intentions at heart. I feel for them with all of the feedback they have received tonight and the passion for which people are expressing their opinions. I'm disappointed that feedback is only being sought 3 weeks prior to presenting a final proposal to the PPS Board. Please put the breaks on this boundary discussion.</p>	Proposal	Negative Response		

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
<p>You should have a building for CSS BEFORE you consider moving it. You are potentially moving one of the most sought after schools in our area AWAY from our community. We want MORE focus options. Do not take them away! If anything make it weighted for the community like some of the other options and leave the current students there. I also am very considered for native speakers who live close to their DLI programs and having you move it. Not everyone can commute. Making families who live across the street from one school go to another is an additional issue. This proposal could make a lot of kiddos have to take LONG bus rides. Being a working parent I can not drive my kids to school and this should be considered. Also a parent mentioned we cant have more DLI classes due to lack of teachers. That is not the case. There are so many teachers we could get. Especially if we PAY them what they deserve! EXPAND programs for our community do not take them away or move them away making them harder to access. THIS is why people are frustrated with PPS. You are wasting tax payer dollars to make programs LESS accessible to those who need it. I would also like to note you should have mailed all parents information about these changes. I just found out about this change. It is unacceptable for such a huge decision not to be communicated earlier and more urgently. My husband and I were in different rooms last night and no one was happy. I really hope this is considered.</p>	Proposal	Negative Response		
<p>I am concerned that we are no longer zoned to go to our neighborhood high school. I don't think that pulling kids from their current schools is a good idea. Kids need stability, why don't you change the boundaries for incoming students instead of ripping kids from their known school environments?</p>	Proposal	Negative Response		
<p>This plan has NO PROVISION for an entire school's population, and clearly there's no other building available to house them: if there were space available it would presumably be listed in this proposal. Whistling past the graveyard on this issue is totally unacceptable - as unacceptable as failing to plan a location for any other entire school and still calling the program complete.</p>	Proposal	Negative Response		
<p>I don't see how the opening of Kellogg requires the demolition of successful and highly sought after dual language programs throughout the city. With a lens to equity and inclusion, I would have hoped that the solution would have been to equip every school in the city with a language immersion option, not make it more difficult for families to participate in them by reducing the opportunities. If this proposal goes through, PPS is making it even more difficult for families to engage in dual language programs by forcing them to travel further from their residences to get to them. For families with limited means, this will become a tremendous barrier.</p> <p>If a better balance for neighborhood students were a priority, why doesn't the district look at the current lottery system? Neighborhood students are being turned away from the dual language programs, which are in high demand, for out of neighborhood students. My family decided to pursue the MIP program because of it's location in our neighborhood. It just doesn't make sense why a highly successful and sought after program is on the chopping block. Both the Woodstock Elementary School PTA and Shu Ren of Portland oppose this proposal. I hope that PPS is listening and is able to take these immense concerns into consideration so that we can preserve this incredible program at Woodstock Elementary School.</p>	Proposal	Negative Response		
<p>Moving Japanese Immersion from Grant to Madison!</p>	Proposal	Negative Response		

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
<p>Really dislike how disruptive this will be for my HS student (currently "at" Grant). The pandemic has already had such a profound impact on our adolescent kids. Also feel it's a little disingenuous that this proposal has been billed as impacting SE Portland / middle grades, when it obviously has an impact into NE and the elementary and HS grades as well (Grant was not on the list of schools in this survey). :(This is a procedural complaint, I realize, but I feel that many people would have leaned into the process more if we'd realized the scope of potential changes.</p> <p>I feel some dismay about PPS choosing to relocate some of the HS-level language programs; it seems to me that it would be fairly inexpensive and FAR less contentious to ADD more language options to other area HS buildings. Why not keep Japanese as an option for both JMP and neighborhood kids at Grant AND add it as an option at Madison (and elsewhere?).</p> <p>One of the frequent topics that arose during your presentation Thursday night was the high demand for focus option programs and the sense of inequity felt by families who don't get in via lottery. Really wish that the district would respond by considering additional focus options rather than garrotting the existing programs; it seems that the demand is there and that the fairness aspect could be addressed by increasing availability.</p>	Proposal	Negative Response		
I also don't like the Spanish immersion class being removed from Atkinson. I like the diversity it brings.	Proposal	Negative Response		
CSS will lose our building with nowhere to go, disrupting the lives of hundreds of students.	Proposal	Negative Response	CSS	
this proposal would force our family to commute via car to a school or walk across a highway, another major street and several marijuana stores and liquor stores to attend.	Proposal	Negative Response		
Disruption of established communities, childrens' mental health, and forces 1000's of families to realign their lives around PPS' capricious plans.	Proposal	Negative Response		
<p>I have several major concerns with this proposal.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The current proposal vastly outsteps the Phase 1 mandate, by introducing school boundary changes and altering feeder patterns without input from each community impacted. Glencoe was not included in phase 1, and yet several boundary adjustments were put forward for our school, as well as changing our high school from Franklin to Madison. Parents from Glencoe need to be added to phase 1 ASAP. • The coalition should stick to its original mandate and stop any re-boundarying and feeder changes without first ensuring all impacted communities – including students – have a seat at the table. • PPS should publish data that clearly demonstrates how any decisions made by PPS's SE rebalancing efforts will optimize the use of school facilities and help achieve racial equity and social justice. • This proposal does nothing to address overcrowding at Franklin, leaving it on pace to be at 116% capacity by 2024. There is no point in adopting sweeping changes that do not address this problem. Will we have to go through this painful process again in 4 years? • Most of Mt. Tabor Middle School neighborhood students live within walking distance of Franklin High School. The proposal has Franklin students transitioning to Madison, which requires a 45-minute TriMet commute, including transfer. Biking safely is not an option. This goes counter to PPS's own assertion that "most students find their best fit close to home." We consider ourselves in the Franklin community. Our kids would require us to drive them to Madison each day, increasing our carbon footprint. I urge the committee to factor in health and carbon emissions studies and how a change from biking/walking to Franklin to driving to Madison would affect the health of our students (air quality) and the carbon impact in Portland. 	Proposal	Negative Response		

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
The proposed move of the JPLI program from Grant High School (ranked 28th) to Madison High School (ranked 94th) is to high of loss in the quality of education.	Proposal	Negative Response		
That my childs school will be dissolved or moved into a less desirable building or area	Proposal	Negative Response		
Loss of focus options	Proposal	Negative Response		
Elimination of CSS	Proposal	Negative Response	Creative Science School	
Very concerned about CSS staying a K-8 school and that we will be able to find another building	Proposal	Negative Response	Creative Science School	
Concerned about the Relocation and continuation of Creative Science school. We'd like to keep the community of K-8 and the program as it is as a whole, and keep it independent (not sharing with other schools/programs). I don't like the idea of relocation.	Proposal	Negative Response	Creative Science School	
My concerns are that it is not a complete proposal. A real proposal would state where they have all children attending. No school listed for Bridger neighborhood kids? No school for CSS? You are also not looking at all inequities, it just seems like language is all you are looking at.	Proposal	Negative Response	Creative Science School	
That Creative Science School will be relocated too far away	Proposal	Negative Response	Creative Science School	
It also leaves Creative Science school without a location which impacts my family personally.	Proposal	Negative Response	Creative Science School	
Where Creative Science School will be located	Proposal	Negative Response	Creative Science School	
That the Creative Science community is not recognized has contributing to those same ideas as the intent being put forward.	Proposal	Negative Response	Creative Science School	
I'm concerned about you moving CSS or splitting it into 2 schools	Proposal	Negative Response	Creative Science School	
My child's school (creative science) is left without an identified home.	Proposal	Negative Response	Creative Science School	
These proposals are also opposed by so many BIPOC and native speaking families—and their voices should be amplified.				
I have children (3 and 5), the oldest would start kindergarten at Atkinson in fall 2021. I am concerned about the possibility of falling enrollment and Atkinson closing. The big reasons to send our kids to public school include language immersion and proximity to our house. We live on 54TH and Lincoln, and do not want to have to drive our kids to school. If they are attending Harrison Park instead of Mount Tabor middle they will have to be driven to school. If Atkinson was to close, it would be even more driving. Once I have to drive my kids to school anyway then the scale will probably tip in favor of local private schools.	Proposal	Negative Response		
The reaction to the proposal is negative. Looking at the youtube votes during the presentation is was 34 thumbs down to 3 up. Also looking thru the coalition notes, there were a lot of fists thru all the senarios. Seems like no one is happy with the result and its the best of bad solutions. Perhaps things need to back up and reevaluate the criteria for assigning program locations and find the commons between good co-location.	Proposal	Negative Response		
None. Move them out. Woodstock is only growing. Neighborhood kids should be the priority.	Proposal	Negative Response		

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
Please identify at least potential locations for CSS before officially deciding to move the school. We have heard about programs like ACCESS not having a home and being moved around for years. It is irresponsible of PPS and unfair to the CSS community to approve this decision without first identifying a new building.	Proposal	Negative Response	Creative Science School	
CCS has a great community and great program and putting my child in neighborhood middle school is not an option	Proposal	Negative Response	Creative Science School	
Creating DLI focus schools and not addressing CSS focus school location	Proposal	Negative Response	Creative Science School	
Finding a location for CSS to move to keeping intact K-8	Proposal	Negative Response	Creative Science School	
Where would Creative Science be housed?	Proposal	Negative Response	Creative Science School	
Unknown location of creative science school.	Proposal	Negative Response	Creative Science School	
<p>DATA</p> <p>How do we know that the numbers you are currently forecasting will stay similar post pandemic? The make-up of the schools may significantly change after COVID and that doesn't seem to be a consideration. In addition, there may be changes to the Free and Reduced lunch numbers as well. That seems a bit short sighted to be working from pre COVID data and assumptions.</p> <p>There were some obvious flaws in the data when it comes to equity if some of the DLI programs actually do move (Cleveland gets less diverse? An overcrowded Franklin has an additional DLI program added?? ETC ETC). Although my kids are not a part of a DLI, I heard loud and clear from others that many are concerned that segregating out some of these populations that have dedicated years to creation of language programs would do irreparable harm to high functioning programs as well as existing neighborhood schools. Overall, there needs to be a revisiting of the data and even an explanation of how this proposal improves matters and addresses the committee's charge.</p> <p>NEIGHBORHOOD COMMITMENT AND PERSONAL FINANCIAL COMMITMENTS</p> <p>In our little corner of the neighborhood near I-84 and onramps, where the area is more diverse and less affluent, we committed 16 years ago to staying because of the schools, our diverse neighbors and being a part of the neighborhood school. Our commitment to these schools and neighborhood is significant and I hope it does not get dismissed. We committed and hung in through the last recession primarily so that our children could attend the schools here. Our children have been talking about going to Franklin for years. They have friend connections, sports connections and their Franklin pride is already strong. Please don't be dismissive to the plans and investment of a decade and a half. Both my husband and I come from single mother families who were impoverished growing up and we are looking for stability and positive educational experience for our children.</p>	proposal	Negative Response		
Charter schools being shuffled around and displaced into non-existence.	Proposal	Negative Response		

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
I have many concerns. I am concerned that you are proposing to give the Clark building to another school and you have no empty building for Creative Science School. I am concerned you are displacing Harrison Park community to change their school. Why did you not have a solid plan for ANY of this before committing to build Kellogg? Why does PPS have such a difficult history with planning, finances, and listening to the affected communities? I am concerned that you are all unaware of how beneficial and popular the Constructivist learning program is, and how other schools can benefit from using this approach. Instead of reducing us, expand us! There is a clear reason and demand for our program, where other schools fail, we thrive. We set our children up to work together, respect and support each other, and share their thoughts with each other. Sped students, and others who struggled in traditional or rigid classrooms do so well in this program. Please consider how many are lottery'ing in every year and how we can better support more students in their learning.	Proposal	Negative Response	Creative Science School	
I am extremely concerned about the possible break up of CSS into two schools (elementary and middle) which would take so much away from the integrity of the program. I am also concerned about an unknown change of location and what this would mean for me getting my kiddo to school. Stability is so salient to our health and wellbeing right now.	Proposal	Negative Response	Creative Science School	
I'm concerned about where the new location of the building for Creative Science school is going to be and the condition of the building.	Proposal	Negative Response	Creative Science School	
Not having a secure building for CSS and the change occurring in a pandemic.	Proposal	Negative Response	Creative Science School	
My child unable to continue MIP	Proposal	Negative Response		
CSS should not be moved.	Proposal	Negative Response	Creative Science School	
No building to house the population of CSS where my son attends.	Proposal	Negative Response	Creative Science School	
I'm extremely upset to see the elimination of Creative Science	Proposal	Negative Response	Creative Science School	
Where will CSS go?	Proposal	Negative Response	Creative Science School	
CSS should not be moved.	Proposal	Negative Response	Creative Science School	
No building to house the population of CSS where my son attends.	Proposal	Negative Response	Creative Science School	
I'm extremely upset to see the elimination of Creative Science	Proposal	Negative Response	Creative Science School	
Where will CSS go?	Proposal	Negative Response	Creative Science School	
It is completely inexcusable that the entire school community of Creative Science is without a building! How in good conscience is this even put in writing?!? There's no location determined for phase 2, so this needs to be decided in phase 1 during these initial conversations that all relate to this issue. To devalue all of these 500 students sends a strong message that these students don't matter and are disposable. Absolutely every single student in PPS deserves to have a school to house them. This school is not under review by the school board, so as it stands, it needs to stay as a K-8, it needs to remain in one site, and it needs an identified building.	Proposal	Negative Response	Creative Science School	
Our middle school assignment changes to Harrison Park.	Proposal	Negative Response		
The creative science would relocate. I'm concerned that the school would move very far away from south east. I also don't like that it may need to be in separate buildings,	Proposal	Negative Response	Creative Science School	

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
It is not clear to me how the plan addresses these issues. I don't like that the future of Creative Science is just left open ended. This creates a lot of uncertainty for our family. I would prefer definite answers in Phase 1.	Proposal	Negative Response	Creative Science School	
You are drawing a line down 65th Avenue and dividing a thriving community of young children. Kids who play together after school will now go to different schools than the kids across the street. This is not okay. I live on 65th and bought my house specifically to be in Glencoe district. Now I've been drawn into a different school than our neighbors. A terrible school at that. We will move if this proposal goes through. Please consider drawing the line between streets and not down the middle of a street! We are a community and we want to attend the same school as our neighbors 20 feet away!	Proposal	Negative Response		
This is a lot of upheaval for a lot of families. I worry that the boundaries seem absurd when we look at geography. That for example, a student could live one block from Kellogg and not attend there.	Proposal	Negative Response		
I'm extremely concerned about the possible loss of Creative Science School, and I don't see how turning Clark into a neighborhood K-5 truly alleviates any overcrowding in that district at all. You might make a few neighborhood parents happy, but you will be losing an amazing academic program in the process.	Proposal	Negative Response	Creative Science School	
Leaving our focus school without a building.	Proposal	Negative Response	Creative Science School	
Please give students enough time to make choices. Meaning, let them know well ahead of starting HS where they will go. Please don't force kids who are already at Grant to choose Japanese or another school. They have studied for so long. But they may not want to move to a new school.	Proposal	Negative Response		
Everything, namely that my children's school will be dismantled, moved and possibly split up causing needless upheaval in a time when children have already had too much change and upheaval. Instead of being able to walk to school, we will now have to drive our children. Our home value will decrease. One of our primary reasons for moving to this neighborhood will be for naught. All in all this is a horrible plan and no one I have spoken to is happy about this.	Proposal	Negative Response		
My kids will now have to go much further to school than would have gone before	Proposal	Negative Response	Location	
My concern is that PPS has had the goal of moving Creative Science out of Clark Elementary without a new home so that the district may dissolve the school without being overt about it.	Proposal	Negative Response	Creative Science School	
No building for Creative Science School	Proposal	Negative Response	Creative Science School	
Moving Creative Science with no identified building replacement that retains it as a K-8.	Proposal	Negative Response		
I am very upset with the proposal to have Mt Tabor middle school feed into Madison HS. We specifically bought a home in our neighborhood in order for our kids to go to Glencoe, Mt Tabor and then Franklin HS. We are emotionally and financially invested in our neighborhood and our local schools. Buying a home is a decision that costs hundreds of thousands of dollars and like most parents the neighborhood schools were paramount in our decision. The possibility that our kids may be going to Madison HS instead of Franklin HS is frustrating and upsetting. It feels like the people who are making these decisions don't understand how the proposed changes will negatively impact thousands of families and their children	Proposal	Negative Response		
Feeding school changes	Proposal	Negative Response		
That CSS has no building to be moved to. Please keep CSS and give us options for a location.	Proposal	Negative Response	Creative Science School	

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
JMP HS change (Madison) isn't a central location for a program that draws students from all over the district, Grant is more central	Proposal	Negative Response		
Please move school close to SE area	Proposal		Suggestion	
My children will attend high school in NE as a part of the Japanese Immersion program. The NE boundaries/redistricting haven't been considered and it seems shortsighted to begin to feed Mt. Tabor's Japanese Immersion strand to Madison without a comprehensive assessment of capacity in NE Portland. Further, many families in JDLI will leave the program as they live in SE and will not be willing to commute to Madison which is a further distance for them than Grant.	Proposal	Negative Response		
<p>There are a lot of concerns, but as a parent of children of Japanese immersion program in Richmond and Mt tabor, I especially worry about changing high school location. (Grant to Madison) When choosing this program, I did lots of research especially on high schools. Grant high school IS the major reason why I sent both my kids to Richmond (Japanese immersions). There are so many parents who have the same reason. Not only Grant is an academically successful school, but also it has offered Japanese classes to neighborhood students since 1969, became home to the JDLI high school program in 1998, and is the only PPS high school with Japanese language study.</p> <p>Some of my friends in Japanese immersion program live in Grant neighborhood area, and most said they would probably leave the Japanese program to go to Grant. My concern also is that less people choose the Japanese immersion program and the program will be eliminated eventually. It is obvious that our families are committed to it from kindergarten through 12th grade.</p>	Proposal	Negative Response		
I have multiple concerns about this proposal. As a Creative Science School parent, I am quite concerned about not having a building identified for us to move to.	Proposal	Negative Response	Creative Science School	
I am concerned that 500 kids will lose their school at css	Proposal	Negative Response	Creative Science School	
Started with specific goals but is now impacting a large portion of PPS schools, including many unique programs that draw students from all over the city	Proposal	Negative Response		
I don't like the idea of CSS not having a building.	Proposal	Negative Response	Creative Science School	
I have worked very hard to get my son into CSS and now I am concerned that he will not be able to finish out his middle school years there.	Proposal	Negative Response	Creative Science School	
I am concerned that PPS is still going to funnel all of the POOR kids into Lane Middle School without the proper development or support to encourage proper education. Its great that Kellog is opening... but why does the balance of the poor kids only go to Lane?	Proposal	Negative Response		
Moving Creative Science school disrupts a community of kids who are thriving. Instead of seeing the existence of only one school like CSS as not equitable, the focus should be on examining how the CSS model of constructivism and storyline is beneficial to ALL kids and replicating that model in other schools instead of moving or dissolving the current program.	Proposal	Negative Response	Creative Science School	
and having no plan for Creative science	Proposal	Negative Response	Creative Science School	
Why is Sunnyside remaining a Focus Option/Neighborhood while all others are being removed?	Proposal		Question?	

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
<p>stated goal of creating more socio economic balance between middle schools: your new proposed feeder program does not shift this. Sellwood MS will have a very white, high socio economic base segregated by race and money in this school.</p> <p>By removing chinese immersion from woodstock you will also create a lot less diversity for Woodstock and Hosford will be another white high socio economic HS in SE. Sunnyside already has a low population of free and reduced lunch. Cleveland HS will become a lot less diverse and more privileged with no DLI program at all!</p> <p>What is the impact of moving the Japanese students HS students in the middle of their HS program? How will all the JMP teachers be relocated from Grant and what will be the impact to their program and loss of teachers/staffing and students. Will students have access to transferring their AP credits and HS credits, as three years of students will be affected by this change. How will students from all 4 quadrants reach Madison which is very East and not centrally located.</p> <p>Parents deserve to see a true impact statement for each of these proposed changes with real timed data to support these moves and the real and unintended consequences of these moves.</p>	Proposal			
Where is Creative Science supposed to move to in 2021 as their school Clark location is now a neighborhood school? This is proposed in less than 8 months, where are CS students and staff to relocate to? What impact is there to their proposed move??	Proposal	Negative Response	Creative Science School	
I'm concerned about boundary changes	Proposal	Negative Response		
My major concern is that you are redistricting Franklin. Our house which is in walking distance to Franklin (10 minute) would be redistrict to Madison, which is miles away. It makes no sense that students that close to a HS would be redirected to one that is far away.	Proposal			
I'm concerned that CSS will be without a building or split between buildings or that CSS will lose its upper classes.	Proposal	Negative Response	Creative Science School	
Key concern: A key program priority for the middle grades, maintaining program pathway continuity, seems to have been disregarded for program continuity through high school. What balancing measures were considered to ensure this decision, which may seem reasonable on paper, does not have destabilizing impacts on a now robust program that prioritizes diversity (Japanese dual emersion program pathway change)?	Proposal	Negative Response	Program / Pathways	

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
<p>I have concerns at the higher grades where changes, especially to DLI would likely lead to large groups of students leaving the program because they don't want to leave current schools. While I believe it could pick up again I'm particularly troubled by the High School students in Cleveland's DLI Chinese program who would be immediately moved to Franklin but not to meet up with any other groups (there are no other strings at HS level just yet). This would mean asking current HS students to leave IB options and friends to move HS in the middle of their last few years just to get 1 class they need to complete nearly 10-12 years of dedication to this program. I really wish they could consider letting at least current 9-12th graders finish at Cleveland somehow. That way students rising currently at Hosford could then choose neighborhood or DLI but would at least have that choice.</p> <p>I'm also concerned that Chinese students riding to Hosford next year would then have to move to Harrison after just one year at Hosford- meaning 2 school changes in 2 years and then a HS change just 2 years after that... this is asking a lot for kids to go through so many school changes in that short of a time.</p> <p>I'm also concerned that the inner SE schools are not even being mentioned or touched in change discussions nor do they seem to have to make changes in any future phase. If you really want to improve access for underserved families why not look at locating non boundary DLI in patterns that feed to the high ranking HS like Cleveland. We know from listening to our current families at Woodstock that this is their preference and why they entered the program in many cases.</p>	Proposal	Negative Response		
That Creative Science does not yet have a new home. We would like to have it close to its existing area in SE Portland if possible, even though we live in St Johns and have probably the longest commute of any family attending.	Proposal	Negative Response	Creative Science School	
my children's school does not have a place to go. they have put a lot into building their community and developing their school. they have planted gardens and built bike shelters. we as parents have lovingly groomed and cleaned the grounds. we have invested in a home in the neighborhood so that our children can walk to school! we would not have purchased a home next to the freeway if not for their school!	Proposal	Negative Response	Creative Science School	
I think the reorganization should include more of the city - including schools that feed into Grant High School - since many students who will attend Grant actually live closer to Madison High School than many SE Portland students.	Proposal	Negative Response	Process	
Moving css would be disruptive for the program	Proposal	Negative Response	Creative Science School	
I am most concerned with the treatment of CSS, and the lack of a cohesive plan for the future of this school's program. It is absolutely unfair and unacceptable to propose moving the CSS students out of their functioning location and have no plan put in place to provide for them.	Proposal	Negative Response	Creative Science School	
You have left out an entire school population in the balancing proposal.	Proposal	Negative Response		
re-location of my child's school or changes to existing program	Proposal	Negative Response		

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
<p>this proposal leaves my child without a building for a school. i'm not able to commute so this is highly concerning. the proposal would change our high school to one much farther away from our house which is of concern for the first reason.</p> <p>the presentation and utter inability of the moderators of the session to answer even the most basic question in the Thursday feedback meetings makes it seem the decision has already been made.</p>	Proposal	Negative Response		
<p>How dare you even consider an option that doesn't plan for the 450 students at CSS. I know this is a hard job to do, but you all volunteered to do it. It is now time for you to put in some more hard work and find a solution that takes into account ALL of the students. Your job is not done until you find an equitable solution for the families of CSS as well as all of the other students in SE. Do not try to sweep these children under the rug.</p>	Proposal	Negative Response	Creative Science School	
<p>I don't like that there appears to be zero plan for Creative Science in place. I don't like that it looks like now neighborhoods that may have large numbers of kids have no neighborhood option (Lent).</p>	Proposal	Negative Response	Creative Science School	
<p>Regarding the proposals impact on CSS, it is very concerning that a new location has not been identified for our school. I would ask that the proposal at least include criteria that the new location will meet. These should include enough space to accommodate our K-8 program in one space or nearby spaces so that we can continue our model.</p>	Proposal	Negative Response	Creative Science School	
<p>Taking away creative Science building</p>	Proposal	Negative Response		
<p>My chief concern is that the Clark building that my two kids currently attend Creative Science school at is identified as a neighborhood K-5 school in the plan with no location designated for the Creative Science School focus program.</p>	Proposal	Negative Response	Creative Science School	
<p>We have been planning on attending US Grant through the Japanese Immersion for twenty years. Our home is in the neighborhood. We waited for the US Grant remodel. Her siblings went to US Grant</p>	Proposal	Negative Response		
<p>My concern is that Proposal 10 from the SE Coalition does not address CSS. By putting this off till Phase 2, you will have to make even larger boundary changes as you carve space for a 500 student school out of the existing locations. If buildings in NE are considered, that should be discussed now. CSS should know their target location in this proposal.</p>	Proposal	Negative Response	Creative Science School	
<p>My concern is Creative Science will be kicked out of Clark with no where to go. This proposal would displace nearly 800 students and split up a strong community and friendships. I don't like that if CSS is phased out my kids couldn't go to Bridger (2 blocks from our home) because it will be entirely Spanish Emerson.</p>	Proposal	Negative Response	Creative Science School	
<p>There is no location for Creative Science in this proposal! Although assurances have been given that the intention is not to dissolve Creative Science it seems it may be a casualty in the process. Frankly the fact that it is not mentioned in the Phase 2 outcomes bullet points on this page and the fact that also listed on this page is a bullet point that says "Schools devoted entirely to a Focus Option create inequity of experience" make it seem it is not a priority to assure my kids' school is not negatively impacted by this proposal or the intention may be to eliminate it altogether. My fear is come Phase 2 the response will be basically "sorry we tried but there is no space".</p>	Proposal	Negative Response	Creative Science School	

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
2, Proposing that Creative Science School be relocated to an unknown location doesn't make any sense because there are no vacant school buildings large enough, and closing an existing school for Creative Science to move into should not happen (as well as the proposed neighborhood school closures of Lents and Bridger to accommodate language immersion should not happen to those communities)	Proposal	Negative Response		
No building for CSS, shuffling too many students	Proposal	Negative Response	Creative Science School	
It's extremely concerning that the school my child attends is being taken away with no plan for a new location. This school is working so well for my special-needs child. Now I feel like this school is probably done for, and it's like the ground has been ripped out from under us. Since this proposal displaces an entire school, I don't see how this solves the overcrowding problem.	Proposal	Negative Response	Creative Science School	
Losing IB at Cleveland	Proposal	Negative Response	Programming / Pathways	
That CSS won't have a home or that it will dissolve	Proposal	Negative Response	Creative Science School	
Displacing actual entire schools and student bodies; instead of improving access to close equity gaps in focus option and immersion schools this just creates a new inequity by practically getting rid of them; it seems rushed; the tone-deafness of pushing forward with this proposal at a time of such unrest and challenges due to virtual learning; the lack of care to include building options for displaced schools and student families; Creative Science School is a healthy, thriving, and functioning school being pushed out; proposal 11 seems to be a better option yet in the breakout sessions one committee member admitted that the committee hadn't had the time to fully review it or other proposals in what has evidently been a haphazard process with an agenda all along.	Proposal	Negative Response	Creative Science School	
Personally, my child is thriving at Creative Science and was not doing well in our neighborhood school (Jason Lee) and the location, the K-8 format (I have 2 other children in the school and plan to send 2 younger ones when they are old enough), and the pedagogical approach has been incredibly positive for her after a traumatic bullying experience. We want CSS to remain where it is, as it is.				
Our community, our students deserve better. More people need to be aware of the issues that are coming if this proposal is approved. The families that will be forced to change schools, the gerrymandering of school boundary lines, the increased commute as students have to go further to get to school, etc. Surely the residents of Portland, not just those in SE, deserve to be aware of this process and the consequences if this proposal is approved.				

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
<p>There is no consideration that I can see regarding different learning styles and needs for the students. You speak of inequity being a problem, but Creative Science is the only focus school that you're looking to displace (and potentially close) - what about Sunnyside, Buckman, and Da Vinci, do they not also represent inequity in your eyes? When Trillium Charter School closed, we applied to all of them, and Creative Science was the only one that demonstrated equity in terms of our ability to attend the required Orientation sessions - the days and times offered did not work with our work schedule, but Creative Science didn't require it.</p> <p>If you consider the diversity of learning styles and needs of the students and their families, it makes more sense to have a diversity of educational philosophies available for them to choose from; a one-size-fits-all approach to education may look like the most equitable approach on paper, but once the needs of individual students are taken into account, one-size-fits-all doesn't actually fit every student's needs. That is specifically why we wanted our own children to attend a school like Creative Science. For them to attend regular public school would very likely destroy their love of learning, and be a real struggle, not just for them, but for our entire family.</p> <p>I see mention of a concern regarding racial equity in this proposal, but the only way it addresses that appears to be in the remapping effort - but only after the convenience of clearer pathways for students to move from school building to school building as they progress through grades. Where are the other racial equity efforts? And where is the concern for other aspects of equity: financial, educational in consideration of different learning needs, familial, etc? If equity is truly a driving force in this proposal, then that should be represented in the strategy, changes, and phases.</p>	Proposal	Negative Response		
Cleveland High School and feeder schools will not have any dual language programs.	Proposal	Negative Response	Programming / Pathways	
<p>2.As a parent of 3 students who attend or have attended Creative Science School I am concerned that it will be difficult to find a school that will fit all of K-8 students and that the school will be split, much like Access was when they moved. Part of what has made CSS so successful for our children is the continuity of teachers and community as they have moved into the middle school and the ability to have a small middle school experience. Not all students are best served by being in a large comprehensive middle school. My quirky, anxious, introverted, intelligent, creative kids would have struggled. I do believe that the Clark building may be the best location for neighborhood K-5 students if Harrison Park becomes a middle school but again the plans are too narrow to begin to implement phase 1.</p>	Proposal	Negative Response	CSS	
<p>3. I understand the logic and reasoning behind consolidating language immersion into smaller strands from an educational systems standpoint. I think by consolidating those programs at an elementary level the schools will become racially segregated and that is unacceptable. While that is clearly not the intention of the plan it will be the outcome. If part of the problem is single strand neighborhood programs in schools with DLI then DLI needs to be in schools that have the room for 2 strands of each- DLI and neighborhood.</p> <p>Boundaries, feeder patterns, and program location needs to be figured out for all South East, North East, and North Portland schools before any phases and decisions are final and implemented. It is short sighted to commit to and implement phases without doing so.</p>	Proposal	Negative Response		
<p>Being forced to weigh potential for extremely long, life-changing and disruptive commutes for existing Creative Science School students vs taking children out of the CSS program all together, which would have a significant negative impact on the students. Keep in mind that many who enrolled in CSS would not have done so if the school were in another location, such as SW portland.</p>	Proposal	Negative Response	CSS	

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
<p>My children not being able to walk to school. We currently live within blocks of Glencoe Elementary, Mount Tabor Middle School, and Franklin High School. This proposal will cause my 3 children to have to commute unnecessarily to a school not even remotely in my neighborhood. We did NOT spend a MILLION dollars on our home, just to be bussed accross town to another school. We will fight this proposal. SE is changing rapidly and we will not stand for PPS essentially "gerrymandering," our school zones. There are closer neighborhoods that could be shifted out of Grant to Madison. Bridger is a straight shot to Madison. Find out why only 60% of neighborhood kids in Madison's district, attend Madison. Start factoring in how many kids are pulled from each district to go to lottery schools, so PPS stops depleting neighborhood schools of students.</p> <p>How everyone is ignoring the lack of diversity at Grant High School, and the low percentage of free or assisted lunch program students is beyond me.</p>	Proposal	Negative Response	Woodstock	
Where will Creative Science end up?	Proposal			

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
<p>*****</p> <p>On a personal note, I have put hundreds of volunteer hours into developing our gardens and grounds. While I know those improvements will benefit a neighborhood school, and will always benefit the environment, it is hard to leave mid-project, and I worry that much work will be lost if the spaces aren't maintained (work that is dependent upon volunteers). In addition, last year we were priced-out of the garden education the PTA was paying for, and since the spring another parent has been working to develop our own garden education classes. This is a big commitment, and a risky one, but we have been excited about it and working hard. She raised and donated food from our school garden over the summer. I worked in that space every week this past spring and summer to keep it not only maintained but moving forward. I put a new roof on our shed after vandals destroyed the old one. I pruned, mowed, weed-whacked, watered, weeded, solarized, and put in new perennials. I sheet-mulched around every perennial, using endless collected cardboard. I spread 5 yards of mulch. I dug out 2 large weedy areas and replaced them with a "no-mow eco-lawn". I built a hose locker for an irrigation system. I made security improvements: posted signs, mounted fake security cameras (they were stolen), and worked on our fence and gate. I also cleaned up, repaired, and filed police reports for both a shed break-in and theft and a fire. I researched and wrote up a Project Development Request for a garden security fence. I met with a Facilities Manager and we've had our request approved! It's an amazing and unexpected development that we may not experience. That is hard. I've also developed a great relationship with our school custodians, which has been crucial to keeping up the space. I joined the neighborhood safety FaceBook group to try and help minimize garden vandalism, theft, camping, and illegal drug use. Right now I am working on a garden project with the local non-profit Eco School Network, as well as mentoring other project leads at other schools.</p> <p>I have started communication in a hope to preserve all of this garden work, should CSS move. In the current proposal 9, the Clark Building would become a neighborhood school. Grow Portland has a cornerstone of their non-profit, Title I-focused garden education program at nearby Harrison Park. I have talked with them on the phone about my hope that they would have a program at the Clark building, which would presumably be a Title I school. They used to provide classes for CSS and so they know the space.</p> <p>I really love our school garden space. It has given so much to me, and to my family, and I hope it is an example for what I wish for for all families: involvement in their school, providing them time together, in a way that they enjoy, investing in their community and providing an example for kids and others of what we can be, if we work together.</p> <p>Many things are true in this difficult process: it may be best for equity for CSS to move, AND that will be hard. We will make the best of it. I hope my experience adds to the conversation.</p> <p>Thank you for reading!</p>	Proposal	Negative Response		
None	Proposal			
You will wreck a very successful program	Proposal	Negative Response		

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
Changes in resources and disruption of education and learning for the students.	Proposal	Negative Response		
I would like to see Marysville students have similar opportunities of students in other areas like Woodstock for example.	Proposal	Positive Response		
PPS' work in trying to provide communication to the families before the meetings are horrible! Meeting links presented the day of to ensure that people don't get the information to attend. PPS relied heavily on an analytics company to do all of the work. PPS students and the families are more than just a number. You are impacting OUR livelihoods and OUR stability. It is easy for FloAnalytics to a drag and click a mouse to move a group of students to a new school to make sure that the school not overcrowded. I think further analysis is needed to dig deeper into the data and find out how many families are impacted by transportation issues. FloAnalytics should have enrollment data for each of the schools and families that attend the school. FloAnalytics are not thinking of the families that it will impact; they are simply doing business with you and doing whatever to make PPS happy and satisfy your needs . Further analysis is needed on transportation and number of students that attends the school that lives by the school. This should be PPS top priority to ensure that students are not traveling too far for school, especially for grade school and if they within walking distance of the school.	Proposal	Negative Response		
Moving mip program	Proposal	Negative Response		
It would be great if this proposal came with a detailed plan on what PPS is going to do to address the failing scores of this school besides redistricting.	Proposal	Negative Response		

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
<p>November 19, 2020</p> <p>Dear Portland Public Schools Board, Superintendent, administrators, and Enrollment and Program Balancing Guiding Coalition Facilitators:</p> <p>In response to the school realignment proposal that was recently submitted to the public by the Enrollment and Program Balancing Guiding Coalition, a working group task force of concerned Woodstock Elementary parents and leaders was formed to evaluate the proposal. We are writing this letter to communicate our many concerns about the sweeping changes that this plan would thrust upon our community.</p> <p>The task force of concerned parents is sending this letter on behalf of many of our concerned families to voice our strident opposition to the Coalition’s proposal to relocate our Mandarin Immersion Program to Bridger Elementary. We stand in solidarity with Shu Ren’s position on this matter (outlined in a letter to you on November 6th), we echo their concerns over the proposal’s dramatic negative changes to our children’s educational experiences, and we share their frustration with the many flaws in the decision making process that brought about the proposal in its current form.</p> <p>The Guiding Coalition’s proposal is highly problematic in a number of key ways. It dissolves Woodstock’s pioneering and successful co-located dual language Mandarin Immersion Program and reduces school diversity in both impacted schools by relocating our school community’s native Chinese speaking families into an enclave on the eastern edge of the city. The rebalancing proposal was put forth without conferring with the impacted communities in any meaningful way, and it makes assumptions about many of our native Chinese speaking families’ educational goals and preferences that do not necessarily align with reality. The problems and challenges with enrollment balancing and co-located school communities that the proposal aims to address are not currently present at Woodstock; in fact, the coalition’s proposal ignores the resounding success that Woodstock has demonstrated hosting two programs, and disregards our community’s heartfelt desire for Woodstock to remain a dual-track, co-located school.</p> <p>Woodstock’s Mandarin Immersion Program was established in 1998, one of the first such programs established in the United States, and the first public school to offer MIP on the West Coast. Since its inception, it has served as a model across the country (and around the globe) for schools looking to establish similar language programs co-located with an equally thriving and robust neighborhood program. Woodstock has two evenly balanced programs, with each program contributing approximately half of the student population of the school. Woodstock’s school-wide sense of community is strong, and parent involvement draws equally from both the DLI and neighborhood English scholar programs.</p> <p>We have a number of concerns about both the proposal and the process that was followed for drafting it:</p> <p>The proposed scenario dissolves a successful co-located program, where a strong sense of shared community and identity thrives among students, families, and teachers in both programs within our school. Woodstock is a flourishing success precisely because it has two programs under one roof. Families from both programs intermingle socially and professionally, and in many cases children within the same household are enrolled in different programs. Many school-wide events are conducted in both Mandarin and English. Our halls and classrooms are decorated with murals and mosaics in both English and Chinese, reflecting the value that our community places in having students from both groups learning and growing in our space. Kids in both programs engage in school-wide activities together, participate in the weekly Friday morning meetings side by side, share lunch tables and playgrounds, discover books in the same library, collaborate to solve common problems, forge bonds in after-school and extracurricular activities, and celebrate a robust exchange of inter-cultural celebrations and traditions that have come to define the Woodstock experience.</p> <p>The Enrollment and Program Balancing Guiding Coalition’s decision making process did not adequately engage with</p>	Proposal	Negative Response		

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
<p>There are so many problems with this proposal. It has snowballed from an opportunity to solve an existing problem with K-8 schools and celebrate the opening of a new middle school into something that creates more problems than it purports to solve. This process has been extremely rushed in the middle of a pandemic and seems to change with each new iteration spit out by a consulting firm that is accountable to no one and has no stake in moving these students around like game pieces.</p>	Proposal	Negative Response	Process	
<p>I won't pretend I understand the complexities, but my main concern has to do with my child not going to a neighborhood school for high school (i.e., not going to Franklin, which is an easy and safe walk away). I don't think there's been enough transparency around the work to affect feeder patterns. I think there'd be negative social and community impact of changing the feeder patterns, which seems to have been done without full disclosure and without working better with affected groups (including students).</p>	Proposal	Negative Response		
<p>I have concerns that the intended destination school may not want an influx of an entire program that can be quite disruptive to their current programs.</p> <p>I have grave concerns that this proposed change is rash and does not have an appropriate lead in time whereby children with siblings may be affected. That is, one really needs a 5 year plan so children can complete their time in a school and then make a transition. I would suggest that starting with a middle school change first and then slowly consider the elementary school option if it seems to be working.</p> <p>In general, and specific to Woodstock, if you have a program that is successful and working for the majority, why would you disrupt it? It doesn't really make sense to me.</p>	Proposal	Negative Response		
<p>People have made sacrifices to be in the program. It won't be thought out and will be hijacked people who don't know about the history of the program. Cohorts will be broken up. Students will withdraw. Promises broken-</p>	Proposal	Negative Response		

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
<p>Finally, the thing I like the least about this whole scenario is that it leaves my kids without a building to go to school in. We're a CSS family who lives 5 blocks from the Clark school building, and we love our school and our many neighbors who also attend school there. We understand that this scenario calls for Harrison Park to convert to a middle school, which leaves all the kids in the current K-5 without a building, but we think there has got to be a better option than the current proposal, which causes so much upheaval to so many people around the city.</p> <p>Leaving CSS without a building threatens to further damage the lives of children who have already suffered at the hands of the pandemic, and their parents who have dealt with the regular threat of having their school moved or shut down. Leaving us hanging with "we'll wait and see where you fit," seems like it will result in perhaps a years-long search and result in even more upheaval.</p> <p>Furthermore, attempting to relocate CSS will, likely as not, result in another neighborhood school being "taken over" by a focus option some years down the line, and further accusations that focus options "don't provide equity of experience." If that's your concern, maybe make other schools more like CSS rather than taking away a place where our kids truly feel at home.</p> <p>We're not opposed to seeing CSS move to a new building, in the interest of increasing diversity and providing a place for kids from the Harrison Park neighborhood to go. But we're not convinced the current proposal does anything to improve equity and diversity, a fact that was all too clear at the open house, where many voices from the coalition said the BIPOC people on the coalition do not like scenario 10 at all.</p>	Proposal	Negative Response	Creative Science School	
<p>The fact that there is no location designated for my son's school is troubling. I really hope that the vibrant community of CSS is able to have a place to be. I'm also concerned about the potential for breaking up of other school communities being disruptive for children.</p>	Proposal	Negative Response	Creative Science School	
<p>3) Why are you pushing the Mandarin program middle school all the way to Harrison Park, when there are other middle schools more centrally located between the two existing Mandarin Immersion Elementary feeder schools?</p>	Proposal	Negative Response	Location	
<p>No new home for CSS yet.</p>	Proposal	Negative Response	Creative Science School	
<p>That my son will no longer be able to attend the mandarin immersion program.</p>	Proposal	Negative Response	Statement	
<p>My children attend Creative Science School and it leaves us without a building. I fear that there isn't going to be a building available for us and that C.S.S will be dissolved or split up. My daughter previously attended our neighborhood school and it wasn't the most positive experience.</p>	Proposal	Negative Response	Creative Science School	
<p>6) The plan expressly does not consider the effects of relocating CSS as its position on the matter is to leave CSS without a home until later.</p>	Proposal	Negative Response	Creative Science School	

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
--	-------	-------------------------------	---	-------

7) The goal of avoiding portables is contradicted by the way that the number of schools needing portables is unchanged. Statistics presented in SEGC meetings show that approximately half of DLI students are English-learning and the 100% DLI model was presented as having the best outcomes for ELLs, a balanced DLI/ES model as an unsustainable second best, a DLI-dominant imbalance as having the worse outcomes for ES students, and an ES-dominant imbalance as the worst for ELLs. Setting aside the earlier mentioned fact that the proposal forces DLI students into the kind of unbalanced co-location these statistics say are worst for ELLs, the proposal "solves" the difficulty of maintaining a balanced model by adhering to 100% DLI schools with the exception of the Russian program. It concentrates the Spanish DLI at Lent, the Chinese DLI at Bridger, and the Japanese DLI at Richmond. The Russian DLI (ie the DLI with predominantly white ELLs) remains co-located at Lane where it is vastly outnumbered by the ES strands, raising the question of whether the committee only sees co-location as a problem of white non-DLI students being forced to share facilities with non-white ELLs and ELLs from Russian-speaking households as having an inherently easier time integrating. The way in which the non-white ELLs in the Chinese, Spanish, and Japanese DLI K-5s are made to enter a deliberately unbalanced co-location when their strands join a greater number of ES strands in middle school appears to answer that question. Also notable in this is how the committee, knowing that the SE region is home to a very large population of students from Vietnamese-speaking households, didn't see value in any SE region K-5 or 6-8 Vietnamese DLI despite a large population. That decision raises the question of how much the committee actually consulted with the community for the nearly 550+ students from Vietnamese-speaking households. These outcomes are not what anyone would expect from a process guided by any semblance of focus on racial justice but rather one that pays lip service to the concept while privileging white families. The recorded meetings are a testament to this as time after time, concerns and doubts about the process and its negative impacts to marginalized communities would be dismissed with handwaving and condescension. The committee claims to have worked with a focus on equity through the lens of racial equity and social justice but its actions betray its loyalty to white supremacy culture. Kenneth Jones and Tema Okun identify white supremacy culture as being marked by a sense of urgency that increases difficulty in taking time to be inclusive, making thoughtful decision making, and considering long-term consequences. What else but this is a committee that continually moved forward while its members repeatedly said that they had not been given enough time to even make an examination of all the issues on the agenda and all 20 of the originally proposed plans? What else but this is a process that moves from twenty proposals to just one after only a couple meetings and then gives the families of the 16 thousand affected students a matter of days to learn of the proposal before the official event to provide input less than a month before the committee meets with the district advisory team and finalizes its proposal to the superintendent? What else but this is a process that does all of this while funneling community involvement and feedback through methods that create barriers to the families of ELL students? Jones and Okun also identify a "only one right way" mentality to white supremacy culture "similar to the missionary who does not see value in the culture of communities" and "sees only value in their beliefs." This mentality is underlain by a belief that anyone who doesn't see the one right way simply doesn't understand it and that anyone who doesn't convert after being introduced to it does so out of personal faults. This is readily seen in the committee's approach and its response to challenges to its proposals, especially in those responses that condescendingly tell community members that the issue is more complicated than they understand and that they need to spend the hours upon hours required to review the full data and watch the meetings. The foundation of the committee's "only one right way" is the 100% DLI model which the committee holds as having the best scholastic outcomes for ELLs. This "one right way" is applied uniformly to the non-Russian ELL population regardless of its impact to the communities it affects and those communities' regional and demographic characteristics. The decisions to designate Bridger as the Chinese DLI school and retain Richmond as the Japanese location were apparently based on the high concentration of students whose native household language is offered as a DLI. When this "one right way" was applied to the Spanish DLI program, the committee disregarded the way in which the distribution of students in Spanish-speaking households is fundamentally different from those speaking other DLI-offered languages. As clearly seen on page 36 of the committee's baseline report, the distribution of these households is broadly distributed across the Eastern half of the SE region and as the table on that same page shows, there are more students in these households than students in Chinese- and Japanese-speaking households combined.

Proposal

Negative Response

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
will remove the ability of Atkinson or Lent schools to move a student between a DLI program and a neighborhood program, if such a move is in the best interest of the child, without requiring the student to move to a completely different school	Proposal			
I oppose the move to require a commute to Madison HS instead of an easy walk for our family to Franklin from our home near Mt. Tabor.	Proposal	Negative Response		
Loss of diversity at neighborhood schools due to segregation of DLI programs in outer SE. We really appreciate the co-locations of Spanish DLI and ISC with Neighborhood at Atkinson. There is a real need to make Harrison Park a functioning middle school building before it opens and to consider the distance and street crossings for MS and HS for some students.	Segregation	Negative Response		
Pushes minority population to the outskirts of Portland. More segregation, less integration. Pushes kids to a low performing high school, with no IB program. Worried about middle school commitment to 8th grade field studies work /travel to China.	Segregation	Negative Response		
Racial segregation	Segregation	Negative Response		
I am concerned that the latino community feels "pushed out" and disenfranchised from inner SE higher performing schools. I am in favor of a proposal that the community most served by the DLI programs (non-native English speakers) wants. If they want this scenario, then I will be in favor of it, but if they feel disenfranchised by it, then I am not in favor of it.	Segregation	Negative Response		
The Spanish immersion program brings cultural richness to Atkinson. All students in schools with immersion programs will lose important exposure to cultural and racial diversity if you isolate immersion into one school. Why would you want to give up an important tool to help cultivate our kids into anti-racist adults?	Segregation	Negative Response		
And let's not forget the fact that PPS is actively seeking to SEGREGATE the Mandarin-speaking community to an underserved and difficult to access area of the city.	Segregation	Negative Response		
immersion moves make no sense, seem to promote segregation and racial tensions. Have you spoken to immersion families? Mapped where they actually live? Note that immersion doesn't have to mean the family speaks the language, but that the child has interest in it. some overfill not addressed.	Segregation	Negative Response		

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
<p>This scenario is extremely concerning to me from a racial equity standpoint. When you segregate all four strands of Spanish elementary DLI to one school which is farther from the center and in an already underserved area, you are making our inner neighborhoods less diverse and isolating Latinx communities. You are also moving already underserved students from Lent away from their neighborhood school. I understand that one rationale is based on the number of Spanish-speakers currently living in a certain geographic area. I have been quite alarmed listening in to coalition meetings to hear rhetoric that discusses how placing all DLI students at Lent is what that community needs and will better serve them when no one speaking those words is actually part of that community. If families stand up and say, "yes, this will make our lives easier, create equity, increase our access to education" then I will support that 100%. But I have yet to hear that from ANY of our Latinx families and in fact have consistently heard the opposite, which is that they feel they are being segregated and "pushed out". The coalition materials were only translated into Spanish AFTER this scenario was finalized so I am not surprised that many families had no idea this was happening and/or could not even engage in making their voices heard. It is not lost on me that those who are least able to access this process are those being the most dramatically affected. Families and students are already under extreme stress due to this pandemic and loss of in-person school, and this is just such a drastic change and for the most vulnerable. I highly encourage you to rethink this.</p>	Segregation	Negative Response		
<p>segregation of immersion students</p>	Segregation	Negative Response		
<p>The current proposal to remove the Spanish DLI program from Atkinson is a terrible idea and will result in segregation of students of color, unnecessary hardship to students of color</p>	Segregation	Negative Response		
<p>It is not at all clear to me what the advantages are of combining and isolating DLI programs in some instances. Particularly the Spanish DLI K-5 program at Lent Elem. What is the guiding principle for removing the co-located DLI to create a single location? Doesn't that weaken the argument of PPS that DLI Native Language speakers have a greater success rate when learning in their native language but integrated into a larger body of students who are speaking English? Doesn't that unfairly isolate the Native language speakers?</p>	Segregation	Negative Response		
<p>Segregation of immersion students. Issues with commuting.</p>	Segregation	Negative Response		
<p>That it isolates the children who go to Glencoe from its actual physical neighborhood after middle school.</p>	Segregation	Negative Response		

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
<p>It is segregation. I was shocked to read on this page that the reasoning behind this move is to create more equity. It feels like the exact opposite. You are essentially moving the majority of latino children out of a predominantly white and affluent neighborhood and moving them to a school that is located in a majority non-white neighborhood with significantly lower socioeconomic households. Why is this not the other way around. Why aren't the white children being moved? Why isn't Atkinson being chosen to be the "immersion only" school. I imagine it has something to do with the fact that asking white families to uproot their children in the middle of their education after a global unprecedented crisis would be met quite unfavorably among those parents so it is easier to do so to the parents who are less often resourced and some whom do not even speak English and have not been communicated with or notified at all about this change so that it might go unresisted. It feels like blatant systematic racism being played out in our schools to our children. The diversity that Atkinson experiences, both racially and socioeconomically, is a huge benefit to the program. Attending a school in a neighborhood with higher socioeconomic families provides more opportunities for parental involvement and support of our children and classrooms. In comparison to a neighborhood where more families do not have the financial resources to not work and volunteer at their children's schools, the quality of support and education suffers as a result. This is one of the benefits of the Atkinson program. Latino children are able to attend a school outside of their own neighborhoods that possibly might be a better school. This is true for my child who would not have qualified to go to Atkinson had she not been a native speaker in the immersion program. Going to Atkinson was a selling point on the program. The school has a great reputation, high quality education, a strong and committed parent community and we decided to go to that school because of those resources.</p>	Segregation	Negative Response		
Segregation of Latinos	Segregation	Negative Response		
what programs will be offering to the students ? how are they going to select students for each school? is it going to be just a segregation of the Latin community?	Segregation	Negative Response		
All DLI at Lent, this is easily interpreted as segregation (even if not the intent.) Optics seem like the DLI program is shrinking. Families will have an easy choice to drop out of DLI due to transportation and optics of segregation.	Segregation	Negative Response		
Feels like you are segregating and pushing out the latinx community to the forgotten outskirts of the city.	Segregation	Negative Response		
Isolating all the latino kids to the worst school	Segregation	Negative Response		
<p>My main concern is concentrating DLIs in one school like Richmond, and especially eliminating the Spanish Immersion program from Atkinson. Atkinson has hosted a very very successful Spanish Immersion program in the community and I wonder what this elimination is even considered. I spoke with both the Spanish immersion and the neighborhood teachers and both dislike eliminating this program from Atkinson. During the last boundaries discussions at PPS around 203 years ago, that included the relocation for the Spanish Immersion program at Atkinson, the task forced reported a very strong support by the community members to keep the Spanish Immersion program at Atkinson. Actually, the recommended to start a double class of Spanish Immersion as it was so popular and requested by many families both Spanish speaking and no Spanish speaking. But what is truly troublesome for me if to concentrate DLIs in one only school without a neighborhood program, like Richmond, which has been a failure for the neighborhood kids that cannot attend and walk to their own neighborhood schools. I think this recommendation will bring immersion with segregation and unnecessary driving for neighborhood kids, but mainly it will incredibly reduce diversity and cultural richness to the schools. So, why are we recommended the elimination of hybrid-co-lateral schools, just because it is easier for administration, because it is definitely a huge cultural backlash for our kids and families.</p>	Segregation	Negative Response		

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
Woodstock Chinese DLI program has been very successful in the past 20 years. Moving ALL Chinese DLI programs to one school will negatively impact the success of the program. The move also promotes racial segregation and social inequity. Moving all/most Asian students to a low performing school while giving advantage to white students to a high performing school is NOT social justice.	Segregation	Negative Response		
separation of Spanish immersion and neighborhood kids at bridger	Segregation	Negative Response		
I am a parent of children enrolled in the immersion program at their neighborhood school. I only enrolled my children in immersion because it was at our neighborhood school. In fact my oldest started in the neighborhood program and then moved over to immersion in kindergarten to support balancing enrollment. I would not have opted to send my children outside of our neighborhood school for an immersion program. I am concerned that by moving the entire Spanish immersion program to Lent that you will have the unintended consequence of segregating native Spanish speakers and POC families. I am concerned that the decision makers have not really been listening to and elevating the voices of native speakers and POC families. I have heard from multiple native speakers that they opted out of their neighborhood school for a reason and are not happy to be sent to Lent. Are non native speaking families really going to opt in to Lent? I have heard from countless people in our community that being at their neighborhood school was most important, not immersion. You will lose those people and I truly think PPS will be hard pressed to gain enough people to continue 4 strands of immersion at Lent. Please listen to the voices of our native Spanish speaking families above mine if they are saying something different but I am informing my advocacy based on what I am hearing from our community of native Spanish speakers. I am certain there has not been enough outreach done to these communities to really hear what they actually want/need. This proposal reeks of decision makers assuming what would be better/easier for this community (i.e. having the immersion program in their neighborhood) and what they think the community needs rather than what they actually need/want.	Segregation	Negative Response		
segregation	Segregation	Negative Response		
I think instead of consolidating established and successful programs, that we should expand these options into more schools. I am in the neighborhood program cohoused with chinese, and yes we wanted to get into the chinese program and were disappointed that our students did not. However I think the overall increase in sharing cultural and language resources improves the overall experience in the schools and builds more supportive and thoughtful students in both programs and having a normality around being multi lingual and multi cultural benefits all of our future community members. This consolidation and separation feels a lot like segregation which does not really seem like the direction that we would like to go towards. What is the tradeoff between all the work, energy and funding that goes into segregating our students versus building up existing programs and expanding them to more disadvantaged schools?	Segregation	Negative Response		
I'm concerned that you are separating elementary students and families from their neighborhood schools and further disconnecting the schools from their communities.	Segregation	Negative Response		
) isolating the DLI programs is segregation - we learned long ago that "separate but equal" was a fallacy pushed by white supremacists	Segregation	Negative Response		

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
<p>This plan is basically segregation. Why are you pushing DLI to single schools? The programs work now. We need to create diversity not exclude those kids to neighborhoods on the edges. We voted for bond measures over and over because we have programs that work. Overcrowding is not a reason to destroy these programs.</p> <p>Once again PPS uses overcrowding as a way to destroy the programs that work and sacrifice neighborhoods that don't have as much money.</p>	Segregation	Negative Response		
<p>It segregates communities, divides neighborhoods, and does not address overcrowding of schools.</p>	Segregation	Negative Response		
<p>1 - it creates segregated communities, which benefit no one and no individual group. 2- benefits of co-located DLIs are lost - diversity, creating tolerance and exposure to other cultures are lost. 3 - completely upending the bridger and surrounding community. both neighborhood and the DLI programs will be relocated. 4 - more study, public engagement and outreach is obviously necessary as the options evolve.</p>	Segregation	Negative Response		
<p>After listening to people in my breakout room, I'm most concerned about the Latinx community being displaced from Bridger and being pushed farther east, the overcrowding at Franklin, and some of the Atkinson (maybe others) boundaries that cause kids to go to different schools from their neighbors across the street.</p>	Segregation	Negative Response		
<p>Concern that DLI programs are being segregated into their own schools into outer SE Portland. This seems to worsen diversity, and results in segregating non-Native English speakers from white communities. This doesn't seem to provide equity, and instead seems like segregating, and putting minority students into schools in areas that have not been served well in the past.</p>	Segregation	Negative Response		
<p>Unfair segregation with the Immersion programs, ,</p>	Segregation	Negative Response		
<p>This proposal segregates DLI programs. Segregation is never equal.</p>	Segregation	Negative Response		
<p>I'm very concerned that creating non-neighborhood, all-DLI schools could make those schools targets of racially motivated hate crimes.</p>	Segregation	Negative Response		
<p>I'm very concerned at the segregation of the immersion programs and vastly reduced walkability to schools. Changing the feeder programs and elementary schools is completely unfathomable and unnecessary.</p>	Segregation	Negative Response		
<p>Mt Tabor should stay at Franklin. Lent should not be DLI only - THAT is segregation. I have been in several meeting and NO ONE wants that.</p>	Segregation	Negative Response		
<p>I'm concerned about the latest feedback coming up that some people are feeling like DLI-specific school are "segregating" native speakers. I'm doubtful that is a universal feeling and wondering how you can determine the breadth of that concern. I'm more concerned that PPS doesn't seem to have clear talking points to convey the concrete benefits of DLI-specific schools, and for locating them in neighborhoods with higher concentration of native speakers. I instinctively think these two things are good choices, but to convince doubters, you need to get your talking points down and consistent otherwise it's going off the rails.</p>	Segregation	Negative Response		
<p>It is racist and promotes segregation.</p>	Segregation	Negative Response		

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
Furthermore, concentrating Spanish DLI to Lents and Chinese DLI to Harrison is Segregation and not supportive of DEI priority. That is not acceptable.	Segregation	Negative Response		
I am shocked that Portland in 2020 would be following a plan that results in racial segregation. Maybe they can try to justify it with some "grander district plan," but clearly Woodstock has been selected to become a wealthier and whiter school. Woodstock would be purged of almost all students with Asian backgrounds - instead of 40%, they would bring it down to less than 7%. They would increase white students from 52% to 78%. They would also bring down free/reduced lunch students by 20% (12.5% to 10%). It doesn't stop at Woodstock, this is repeated across K-5 where they grow existing large populations of white students (i.e. Atkinson) or shrink white representation where it is already comparatively low (i.e. Bridger). These complaints do not contradict, it is well established racist policy to create two levels of schools - those that are overwhelmingly white, and those that are mostly non-white. Numbers don't lie.	Segregation	Negative Response		
I also worry that creating entirely DLI schools will result in increased segregation of our schools.	Segregation	Negative Response		
I think this is racism, segregation, and discrimination.	Segregation	Negative Response		
Two things: based on what I heard from parents of DLI students at the open house, as well as my own impression, I am very concerned that consolidating DLI programs will isolate them from the larger community and create additional burdens for families who would have to transport their children to a school outside their neighborhood.	Segregation	Negative Response		
Consolidating DLI programs to be closer to "where native speakers live," which reeks of system racism, furthers segregation, and limits upward mobility for POC.	Segregation	Negative Response		
Secondly, it does seem like this proposal segregates non-English speaking programs pushing them into their own areas... how is that equitable?	Segregation	Negative Response		
It eliminates successful dual-language immersion programs and relocates them to schools very far from their current locations.	Segregation	Negative Response		
It's also concerning to see DLI students booted out of schools in affluent neighborhoods to the far fringes of the district. What kind of equity message is this?	Segregation	Negative Response		
Concern 1: segregation of Asian and Spanish children/family;	Segregation	Negative Response		
I am concerned that boundary changes will negatively impact Creston enrollment. I am also concerned about the concentration of wealthy schools feeding into Cleveland HS.	Segregation	Negative Response		
That Bridger will be a Chinese-only segregated school and that Franklin will be a minority school (Russian, Spanish and Chinese). Is the goal of the coalition to segregate minorities into particular areas? Because the proposal seems that way. I don't want our son to go to an all-Chinese school. I want him to be around/interact with people of different groups so he can broaden his viewpoints of the world. Although we would love to continue with the MIP program, the proposal to round up all the Chinese speaking (or want to learn Chinese) students to one school with no diversity will force us to pull our child out of the program.	Segregation	Negative Response		
It will segregate students. Absolutely. Without any other value!	Segregation	Negative Response		
It will segregation students based on race.	Segregation	Negative Response		
The proposal will segregate children of color and reduce diversity in other schools.	Segregation	Negative Response		

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
We moved to the Woodstock neighborhood for the MIP program, like many many other families, and feel very strongly a part of the community. Moving the MIP program feels like the minorities are being targeted, getting cast out of their community and pushed to worse, less convenient, more dangerous, parts of town to make room for more white kids. To the BIPOC communities, these changes feel like segregation and will achieve the opposite of desired outcomes of equality. The BIPOC communities feel that white people are making decisions for them about what is best for them without listening to their wants and concerns. Please do not do this to us, especially right now, when families are struggling so much. Please focus on filling Kellogg and allow time to figure out a better solution for rebalancing that is not so completely disruptive to so many families and communities.	Segregation	Negative Response		
The consolidation of the language immersion programs which reduces cross connection between cultures.	Segregation	Negative Response		
I'm concerned that the proposed changes would remove the highly successful DLI program from Woodstock School, leaving behind an under-enrolled neighborhood school with much less diversity. It very much feels like segregation of native Chinese families into schools in outer SE Portland. My family has been part of Woodstock School for 7 years. We feel that the Mandarin immersion and English scholar programs have successfully co-existed in one building and that it would be a great loss to everyone at Woodstock if the programs are separated.	Segregation	Negative Response		
Not sure why we are separating neighborhood and dli. With middle school being pulled out, wouldn't there be more room for neighborhood strands? Does feel as though we are segregating dli. And...in all of this, who is being heard? We are 2 working parents who have a lot of privilege but have hardly been able to keep up with the info to give any input.	Segregation	Negative Response		
Segregating language learners a definite issue for increasing inequities Not all schools have an identified building, a legitimate plan must have all the moving pieces identified and solved before a scenario can be adopted or else it is not a scenario	Segregation	Negative Response		
This proposal shifts the DLI programs further east with the assumption that all families currently enrolled will move with their program. I believe many families will stay with their neighborhood school which will make the "Socioeconomica Comparison" just wishful thinking. These shifts will not create racial integration, but rather racial segregation.	Segregation	Negative Response		
Underpinning all of this is an emphasis on DLI as a way to improve outcomes for ELL students. This is an important problem to solve, but doing it in this way will create defacto segregation for those communities even beyond what exists today. I grew up 2,500 miles from here in West Virginia, but our small elementary school of 100 students had over a dozen nationalities reflected. I believe this was a fantastic environment to grow up in and I would hope that the much larger schools here would bring people from different backgrounds together, not put up walls to keep them apart.	Segregation	Negative Response		
I also feel that you are grouping all of the minorities into one school and this is NOT creating the diverse and racially balance schools that PPS would like. You are segregating the minorities into their own community and this is a huge issue!	Segregation	Negative Response		
Would this be segregating DLI programs?	Segregation			
I am concerned that PPS moved forward with presenting Scenario 10 to the community or even entertained the idea of segregating students to the outer boundaries for DLI programming.	Segregation	Negative Response		

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
I am concerned because the proposal seems both to segregate and separate school communities. I also feel that (despite assurances to the contrary) this is but a first step toward PPS trying to dissolve focus option schools, which serve a need for many atypical learners who would otherwise fall through the cracks or specifically require an IEP to have their needs met.	Segregation	Negative Response		
The presented plan decreases diversity by removing people of color from neighborhood schools. It increases travel impacts to the entire student body. The plan does not solve overcrowding at Franklin or Cleveland high school. By regulating immersion and people of color to specific schools it allows for targeted crimes and discrimination.	Segregation	Negative Response		
This plan segregates many students of color and removes majority of diversity making the non-immersion schools vastly whiter - we got rid of "separate but equal" long ago for good reason! Most kids at the Woodstock MIP would need to commute past many ES's to get to Bridger and if plan ultimately is to go to Harrison, they'd have to pass multiple middle schools, both would drastically increase commutes, likely resulting in significant attrition from the program. This could both jeopardize these flagship immersion programs and also reduce the cultural diversity training our students desperately need at this time in America.	Segregation	Negative Response		
Relocating the MIP "closer to where Chinese-speaking families live" may be true for some families, but far from all of them. And secondly - this is just straight up Segregation! I also understand that native speaking families and Shu Ren were not significantly (or at all) consulted in this proposal. This is just a bureaucracy making uninformed decisions on "what's best" for marginalized communities. Shame on you PPS.	Segregation	Negative Response		
I am concerned that this proposal segregates non-native speaking and minority populations away from the city center and leaves schools closer to the center of the city whiter. I am concerned that these proposals, which have such a high impact on these populations, were not translated into the languages spoken by the communities they purport to help. In my anecdotal experience, the Chinese community at Woodstock values the diversity of a co-located program and does not want to be segregated, and families in the neighborhood program feel the same way. I am concerned that this proposal rips apart long-established and successful programs and tears at the fabric of these neighborhood communities. I am concerned that PPS is jumping ahead with these phases that leave huge unanswered questions for the next phase with no plan for how to address them. I am concerned that PPS is more focused on paying lip service to its purported values than to serving the needs of its students and their communities.	Segregation	Negative Response		
I have concerns about unintended consequences such as reverse discrimination but forcing these programs to be pushed into high concentration neighborhoods and isolating from the rest of the community.	Segregation	Negative Response		
Forcing my kids to move schools & leave friends because they are in the immersion program. It also seems to segregate poorer students from attending Sellwood/Cleveland as the top academic schools. My kids will miss out on IB.	Segregation	Negative Response		
Leave Woodstock's Mandarin program and feeding pattern alone. It's straight-up racist to move Asian kids out of rich White kid schools by removing the Chinese DLI program away from Woodstock and concentrating the Chinese programs in Bridger. Reducing the number of feeder schools for DLI programs is wrong-headed and exclusionary - and will only exacerbate the class, ethnic, and racial divisions that kids are already forced into. It's embarrassing for anyone aware of Portland's racist history that the current proposal even exists.	Segregation	Negative Response		
Segregation, distance, splitting up a school population	Segregation	Negative Response		

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
I don't like that the proposal pulls a diverse mix of kids out of the Lent neighborhood school (which they can walk to) and buses them miles up the road to Clark, leaving the Lent school under-enrolled with many kids from outside of the neighborhood. It seems to me that the proposed scenario will see Lent School even further reduced in enrollment as parents who had their kids in Spanish DLI programs choose instead to send them to closer schools.	Segregation	Negative Response	Diversity	
I'm concerned that the people who this proposal presumes to be helping are not being heard. many families have chosen to put their children into Woodstock's immersion program so that they can also go to Hosford and Cleveland which are historically better achieving schools. By moving all immersion programs to the east side it looks like you are essentially trying to segregate these POC. I'm concerned that moving the entire program out of Woodstock will cause many families to pull their kids out of such a valuable program. I know many families who have said they will not move their child. Michael Bacon said that Woodstock is the model program. Why change something that is successful? Our principal and our community have worked hard to make this the strong community for which we are all so grateful. Put the resources into the other schools that aren't working to make those as successful. If you can't get enough kids in the Harrison Park program that is obviously an issue with the neighborhood not WANTing... can't you open the Harrison Park immersion school to anyone who wants to join instead of keeping it in the neighborhood?	Segregation	Negative Response		
Consolidating the DLI programs strips diversity from the neighborhood schools that currently house the DLI programs. The DLI programs draw a large number of Asian and Latino students and further segregating them physically seems to go against one of the main goals of this balancing plan. Let's be honest, if PPS is trying to even out enrollment, diversity, and experience the DLI programs need to go away. Languages are great but based on the numbers, these programs do the opposite of balancing diversity. Alternatively, PPS should address how these programs cause segregation and clumping of diversity.	Segregation	Negative Response		
Moving the immersion program to deep south east is segregating hard working immigrant families and restricting their children's opportunities to network and make friends outside the area. Pps talks of equity, but their decisions do not follow their talk in this case.	Segregation	Negative Response		
2) The theme of schools devoted entirely to a focus option creating inequity of experience is made worse by segregating the K-5 DLI programs. While I'm sure someone spent a lot of time putting together the research showing improved outcomes for ELL students in non-co-located immersion programs, mandating isolated DLIs creates the kind of a separate system that was ruled unconstitutional 66 years ago. As written in that decision, separate educational facilities are inherently unequal. I'm sure members of the SEGC can argue that the DLIs are separated by language and not by race, but those kinds of bad faith arguments deliberately ignore the fact that there is a clear racial component to the ELLs that this segregation is meant to serve and the fact that this proposal leaves the ELLs in the Russian DLI integrated with students at Kelly. This inequity would then be worsened by the students in the K-5 DLI schools becoming the minority in a co-located middle school.	Segregation	Negative Response		
I am very concerned about the Mandarin Immersion Program (MIP) being moved away from Woodstock, Hosford, and Cleveland. I have read the statement from Shu Ren of Portland, and it is obvious to me that the Chinese community has not been adequately represented in this decision. I also have friends in the program, and they are very unhappy with the proposed change, especially having to choose between continuing with Chinese or taking International Baccalaureate classes, a choice which should not have to be made. I urge you to rethink moving the MIP further East, and to ensure you are accurately capturing the perspectives of those you are seeking to help.	Single Strand DLI	Negative Response		

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
Some of the boundaries seem to over or under-enroll certain schools. I assume this can be adjusted in a later part of the process. I am concerned with Bridger being so overcrowded as Chinese DLI. Harrison Park needs a neighborhood K-5 to feed into it, but is Clark larger and better able to hold the DLI program? The problem with that is then neighborhood students have to cross 82nd Ave.	Single Strand DLI	Negative Response		
My concern is the Mandarin program will no longer be with in the neighborhood community and how the students will not have the offering of IB classes.	Single Strand DLI	Negative Response		
I am concerned about the location of the Spanish DLI, but if truly best for most Spanish speakers then it is okay. Maybe better at Bridger or Atkinson? Also, worried for Bridger neighborhood.	Single Strand DLI	Negative Response		
I am concerned about the location of the Spanish DLI, but if truly best for most Spanish speakers then it is okay. Maybe better at Bridger or Atkinson? Also, worried for Bridger neighborhood.	Single Strand DLI	Negative Response		
I'm not opposed to the move to Madison. However, my concern with all the DLI programs moving there is for the students not in those programs (which includes mine because Glencoe doesn't offer a DLI). Will there be adequate resources and focus on "regular" students outside of those special programs?	Single Strand DLI	Negative Response		
Moving jmp from grant.	Single Strand DLI	Negative Response		
I am very concerned that the plan to move the Japanese Immersion Program students from Grant to Madison is simply a move to shuffle 200+ students into Madison HS to improve its utilization score. Further, if Japanese is moved from Grant to Madison that will give Grant ONE world language course of study and Madison FIVE world language options. How is this equitable to Grant HS students? Further, if this move is done in 2022 without a phase-in option for current students, many will be faced with the impossible choice of either 1) staying at Grant HS to graduate from the school they have spent their formative years at or 2) completing four years of study in a world language many have been learning for 10+ years	Single Strand DLI	Negative Response		
Mt Tabor's JMP program being moved to Madison is completely unfair to the students and families that have planned their progression to Grant for years - some of us buying homes in neighborhoods specifically to support our child's education.	Single Strand DLI	Negative Response		
Moving the Japanese Immersion Program from Grant will be extremely disruptive. The kids at Grant have already endured years of shuttling to Marshall during the remodel and now have to deal with the stress of online school. Making another move and leaving the Grant community that they know and love will be devastating. Some kids will not be able to continue their Japanese studies if it moves to Madison and they will not be able to fulfill their goal of graduating with the completion of all 4 years of the Japanese program after 11 plus years effort and dedication.	Single Strand DLI	Negative Response		
I agree with separating primary and secondary schools. Strongly disagree to move the dual language program from Woodstock to Bridger .	Single Strand DLI	Negative Response		
My concerns are moving the Japanese from Grant to Madison. Japanese has been offered at Grant since before the JDLI program was implemented. Folks like having the Japanese as a language option even if they are not in the immersion program.	Single Strand DLI	Negative Response		
How this will affect Japanese language classes?	Single Strand DLI	Negative Response		

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
<p>Grant is the long-time home of the JMP. Also, making these kids move high schools, to one much further away, and one that has no previous experience with Japanese immersion, would not be easy for students or parents. Especially after already dealing with so much change and uncertainty in the current Covid times. They already lost their 8th grade Japan trip... more disappointment and uncertainty shouldn't be in the cards, at least until some much stronger considerations are made.</p>	Single Strand DLI	Negative Response		
<p>Moving the Japanese program from Grant HS</p>	Single Strand DLI	Negative Response		
<p>Thank you for providing this forum for parents to give individualized feedback on policies. As a parent to two children who attend the Japanese Dual Language program I would like to request PPS please reconsider making the decision to switch the location of the program from Grant High School to Madison High School while there are so many factors effecting our schools. I support efforts trying to increase equity in our schools, but I do not feel moving the JDL program to Madison is the solution. Rather, I think compromised students should be given greater opportunity to attend schools like Grant.</p> <p>I am a fourth generation Japanese American. While my grandparents were not interned themselves, they were subject to a climate of fear and distrust. In order to prove how American they were, they had to burn all of the family heirlooms. They hid their language; giving their children American names and only speaking English with them. My parents were only able to share a few words of Japanese with me, and rudimentary language classes in high school were not enough to restore what was coerced from my family during WWII. The Japanese Dual Language Immersion program gave me hope that we would be able to recover as a family from this generational trauma, by giving to my children a chance to develop Japanese as a true second language.</p> <p>With my experience with studying Japanese in high school, I can tell you that having only a few Japanese classes is not enough to create what the JDL program is doing. A history of understanding cultural exchange and the community created by JDL is something we as parents commit to from K-12. Grant has been home to the JDL program for over 20 years, and has become part of the fabric of how the program works and is supported. To make a decision to just switch the program to another school in the midst of the pandemic seems undermine what has been built. Thank you for your kind attention.</p>	Single Strand DLI	Negative Response		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - - Keep Atkinson's DLI program in place. I have heard from Atkinson's DLI and neighborhood community alike that our co-located program is positive for our students. - - I am concerned that removing the neighborhood option from Lent would put burden on populations on an underprivileged area/population. - - - Both Bridger and Lent would need to continue to use portable classrooms under the proposed scenario. This is unsafe in terms of modern school safety standards and against the goals of the balancing process. 	Single Strand DLI	Negative Response		

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
<p>There wasn't support for the consolidation of DLI programs. I feel like the segregation of these programs is detrimental. There is so much benefit to these programs being in schools and sharing the culture with neighborhood school colleagues. I wish we had a DLI in our school as I feel that connection and education would be amazing to share with other students. You will be missing a wonderful learning experience for all children by removing these programs from being embedded in neighborhood schools</p>	Single Strand DLI	Negative Response		
<p>I'm concerned about the staggering of the change. My son will start at Madison fall of 2021. I want a guarantee he can remain there if he wants and that his younger sister will be able to join him in 2 years.</p> <p>I'm concerned about the disruption to my daughter's schooling in her last year at CSS. We may opt to send her to Harrison Park that year instead, but would like plenty of notice about decisions so we can prepare her.</p> <p>In general, I hope the committee makes decisions that serve the most underserved families, but provides the more privileged communities a smooth and caring process to grieve and change mindsets. I would like to see this be a healing and restorative process for Portland.</p>	Single Strand DLI	Negative Response		
<p>Also, the DLI programs and focus options have in some cases taken many years or even multiple decades to evolve to where they are. Is there a possibility that taking programs away from neighborhood schools --avoiding colocation -- is not the only answer and that there is no one-size-fits-all-DLI-programs solution to the issues?</p>	Single Strand DLI	Negative Response		
<p>The Open House Scenario #10 creates a disproportionate and inequitable amount of change by dismantling the existing Bridger (DLI & Neighborhood) and Lent (Neighborhood) programs. After attending Bridger's PTA and PPS' focus group/open house meetings, it is clear that a majority of the DLI community has not been adequately surveyed. The lack of early outreach to DLI/native speaking families (beyond those entering Middle School) is very troubling given the importance of reaching consensus on DLI K-5 feeder patterns in Phase 1.</p> <p>It is imperative that PPS prioritize targeted DLI outreach in Phase 1 to understand:</p> <p>(1) if commute times for native Spanish speaking families will get worse with proposed whole school relocation (based on Open House comments that cited private preliminary research from Atkinson's Jennifer Fontana -- data suggests existing native speakers' commutes will actually increase with the whole school relocation to Lent),</p> <p>(2) if DLI families from Bridger and Atkinson, especially non-native speaking/language partners, intend to leave DLI if their programs are relocated to Lent. It will be detrimental to the DLI program if the 50:50 balance between native speakers and non-native/language partners is lost, and</p> <p>(3) if native speaking families desire to attend a whole school Spanish DLI program in Lents or a program located in a more central location. Based on PPS' heat map for density of Spanish speaking students, there appear to be two clusters -- one near Bridger and one near Lent.</p> <p>Furthermore, with Scenario 10, Lent neighborhood program families will be disproportionately impacted -- they will lose their neighborhood school and will need to commute further (a hardship as many have expressed they have limited transportation resources).</p>	Single Strand DLI	Negative Response		

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
The proposed High School change for the JDLI (Japanese language program) would force us to withdraw our son from the program and likely enroll him in private school.	Single Strand DLI	Negative Response		
We are in the DLI program and are native speakers. Moving the DLI program out of Atkinson to Lent makes our lives much more difficult due to childcare and work hours issues to consider. I don't think we would be able to continue the program if the DLI program was moved to Lent and we would lose the continuity and the social and emotional benefits of our children being a part of this program long term. We have invested so much into this program and it breaks our hearts to consider this new reality of not being able to continue.	Single Strand DLI	Negative Response		
Making HS students in DLI have to change schools to stay in program	Single Strand DLI	Negative Response		
If Bridger is only for Chinese bilingual the kids will be in an isolated environment. No diversity. They need to expose to other English speaking kids.	Single Strand DLI	Negative Response		
Moving all Spanish Immersion to Lents	Single Strand DLI	Negative Response		
I am extremely concerned that the Japanese Immersion Program could be relocated from Grant High School. I strongly oppose this, both for my own children and for other families in the program.	Single Strand DLI	Negative Response		
1) I don't understand removing a DLI program that has been at Woodstock for over 20 yrs and is working. It is part of the identity of the school and what it is known for. To take it away makes no sense at all. Not to mention the school will then be underutilized/lose its diversity and will be at risk of shutting down. So now as a parent of a kindergartener I am faced with a terrible decision of either removing my child from a wonderful (or what I thought was) DLI program and put them in neighborhood (which could eventually shut down) OR be forced to get thrown into the new boundary cycle and drive out of our neighborhood everyday for the next 12 yrs...I think this program should be left alone and keep Woodstock Elementary's identity and soul of the school intact.	Single Strand DLI	Negative Response	Woodstock	
Too many changes that has a negative long term impact to the Mandarin Immersion Program(MIP). these changes are not taking our children's education into consideration. The school board is trying to make changes that claim to allow better access for the Chinese/Asian community to the MIP, yet have not failed to consider the ramifications to all that are impacted in the program. The Chinese community are not the only families that participate in the program, there are many non native speakers that also participate in the program and by disregarding their needs and focusing on the native speaking families are in turn a form of racial discrimination that needs to be address. Not to mention, by grouping all Chinese into one school is in turn a form of racial segregation. For a school district to so blatantly racially segregate one ethnicity into one area is completely opposite of what America has found for in the past Century and goes against the claim of PPS's goals of creating equality for all its students. This is a concern that should be considered when looking at the future of our education system and what we want to project to our students.	Single Strand DLI	Negative Response		
Is it a problem having all Spanish and mandarin alone at a school? Is putting them closer to the families that speak those languages best? It seems yes. But it also feels bad pushing the programs to outer SE where the here are less resources. I don't know the right answer.	Single Strand DLI	Positive Response		

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
The change of Japanese immersion's high school from Grant to Madison does not appear justified. There is no clear benefit to the students to having a Japanese DLI program at the same school as a Spanish and Vietnamese program. It is not clear what spurred the change to Madison for the Japanese DLI program as Grant's social-economic and utilization numbers were not provided. There appears to have been little justifying the change and it will result in a significant effect on families who have dedicated years of involvement in the program for seemingly no benefit.	Single Strand DLI	Negative Response		
The lack of discussion about FULLY SERVING ELL populations. Will this proposal provide a spot for each ELL student who would like one? Will it provide enough spots to have diversity from the native English-speaker population that will be the ESL portion of the DLI program?	Single Strand DLI	Negative Response		
The combined neighborhood and Chinese program is GREAT FOR ALL STUDENTS, you will only be harming them all to separate them. It is borderline offensive that you wish to combine the chinese programs and no longer have them mixed.	Single Strand DLI	Negative Response		
2. By moving all the DLI programs into one school, it feels like you are pulling all the diversity out of existing schools and possibly making life incredibly difficult for the people being moved. The new location for any of these families may be incredibly different than their current one, and forcing them to move across town just to essentially segregate them seems remarkably short sighted for a Portland group in 2020.	Single Strand DLI	Negative Response		
The reduction of Spanish immersion programs in SE.	Single Strand DLI	Negative Response		
Putting all of the immersion programs into one location is also NOT a good decision. My son is a 2nd grader at Woodstock where there is already two strands. The children in the DLI and neighborhood classes intermingle with each other on a daily basis. The statement that was made during the conference of these two programs does mix is NOT TRUE. The removal of the DLI program from Woodstock will eventually lead to the closure of Woodstock due to low enrollment numbers. If you look back at the history of Woodstock Elementary, the immersion program was brought to that school due to low enrollment numbers. There are approximately 55 students in each grade in the Mandarin Immersion Program (MIP).	Single Strand DLI	Negative Response		
There hasn't been an equal and all voices heard approach. Richmond has been left out of the conversation and not just Richmond but our Japanese native speakers. We have a direct impact of the move from grant to Madison. It feels as if we this is creating PPS own form of segregation, putting all immersion programs into one high school will put many minorities into one school, into a school that is in an ideal neighborhood.	Single Strand DLI	Negative Response		
I think the model that CSS follows is one that should be implemented by more schools, not less. Why do you think there is such an interest in this school? I also think things like the arts and foreign languages should be in all school, not select schools that you lottery into.	Single Strand DLI	Negative Response		
DLI goes beyond academic language learning. The utmost important purpose is to have a full cultural exchange when students from Chinese and American backgrounds interact and learn from each other. By moving to Bridger, the student body will lose much of the non-native speaker population, and form a "Chinatown" type of closed learning vacuum and these native speakers will lose the exposure they need to American culture. Without a fully immersive learning experience for both Chinese and English, the dual language program will lose its purpose and eventually dissipate. The consensus among native speaking parents right now is to continue having 2 locations for MIP at Woodstock and Harrison Park/Bridger, and maintain the MIP/neighborhood colocation model. Additionally, Bridger still relies heavily on the use of mobile classrooms. Grouping native speaking students there is a brazen show of racial marginalization.	Single Strand DLI	Negative Response		

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
I like having the diversity the Chinese immersion brings to Woodstock elementary and the neighborhood. Would not love to see that change	Single Strand DLI	Negative Response		
<p>The proposal and work seems to have marginalized communities of color in the dual language immersion programs and the proposed solution, at least for the MIP, is not aligned with this community's desires. This is horrible, given that this work was supposed to center on equity.</p> <p>And, critically, to our family's knowledge, NONE, if any, of the Dual language Mandarin parents and families at Woodstock desire to have their children attend an all-Mandarin school. As do the neighborhood parents that we're connected to, the families in the MIP speak about and value the diversity of having a shared neighborhood/MIP program.</p>	Single Strand DLI	Negative Response		
<p>You are still pushing the Asians out of the West neighborhoods and farther East claiming to cluster with other Asians. We don't buy it and it stinks of pushing Asians out of the West neighborhood schools - Hosford and, most importantly, Cleveland. It is bizarre that you target mainly the MIP schools and take them entirely out of high performing highschoools and place it in lower performing less attended schools. Your claim this will lift up the other schools? You are destroying the foundation these programs are built on and forcing them to start over - shame on you. This is all in the guise of being equitable, but it reeks of veiled bias and racism. Why the MIP? You have done this with other MIP schools and there were obvious setbacks. Teachers quit and the students did not do as well. There are still indications these programs are struggling to perform as well as the first Chinese MIP.</p>	Single Strand DLI	Negative Response		
<p>I don't like that DLI programs will be pulled from many neighborhood schools, leaving parents to find new ways to get their kids to school or simply pull their kids out of the DLI programs and enroll them in the neighborhood school where they used to get DLI instruction.</p>	Single Strand DLI	Negative Response		
<p>1) The voices of non-white constituents appear to have been silenced as they expressed their displeasure of the choice that was advanced: I think this could potentially open Portland schools up to costly legal troubles down the road if they are found guilty of redlining people out of certain schools on account of race: You are moving children that are ESL learners to lower performing schools while prioritizing the interests of their (predominantly white) peers to their already more highly performing schools.</p>	Single Strand DLI	Negative Response		
<p>Has any modeling done with the potential disenrollment of current DLI students? My son will likely drop out of MIP and opt to continue attending Cleveland. My daughter in time will likely dis-enroll in MIP assuming the current proposals are adopted.</p>	Single Strand DLI	Negative Response		
<p>5. MIP program is nationally known program that has been successful for decades- and there is not a problem with colocation, so their success is not being honored and their is not a problem with them but they are being dismantled.</p>	Single Strand DLI	Negative Response		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I think this is incredibly unfair for the students and families in JDLI. We have built our children's entire education, since Kindergarten, on the premise that they will attend Grant High School. • The JDLI has been at Grant HS since its inception. It has brought diversity to that school. I believe that the program will not only diminish in size and interest if moved, but also fear the integrity of the program will be lost. • Madison is NOT centrally located, as are other schools in the JDLI program. It will be extremely difficult for many families to get there. 	Single Strand DLI	Negative Response		

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
We are concerned the new proposal will dramatically affect the students learning from original non-dual language and dual language culture and community and also the diversification culture of America n. This will end up students being isolated from dual language American students and pure Chinese students' culture. It will eventually drop the Chinese students enrollment rate and their passion and enthusiasm on dual language program.	Single Strand DLI	Negative Response		
Having spent several hours each day for the past week reviewing the documents and watching the recorded meetings, I have serious problems with this proposal. Not concerns, but serious problems. I refuse to underplay the severity of the problems by calling them concerns. I have to start somewhere so I'll start with how 7 of the 7 themes the SEGC tried to address either misses the mark or are flat out exacerbated: 1) The notion that the SEGC operated with a belief in assertion that imbalanced co-located DLIs are difficult for school communities is farcical since its solution, to segregate DLIs creates greater difficulties in the immediate harm done by breaking up communities, the ongoing tensions caused by transporting students to schools in different communities, and finally by causing imbalanced DLI colocations when the DLI K-5 feeds to a middle school with 3 ES K-5 schools. The research the SEGC had on October 8th showed that scenarios where the ES side is larger than the DLI harms the ELLs. A process that examined its proposals through a RESJ lens would not deliberately create a system that moves ELLs from the best possible outcome to the worst at the same time those students would be dealing with not only the transition to middle school but with early adolescence	Single Strand DLI	Negative Response		
Social and emotional: If this proposal were to proceed. All of our son's Mt. Tabor Friends would continue to go to Franklin and he would be the only one going to Madison. That would have a devastating effect on his emotional well-being in what is a very difficult time.	Socio-Emotional health	Negative Response		
During a time when all resources should be focused on how we are going to recover from the crisis we are all still enduring and the tremendous impact that that has had on our children's education, emotional welfare, physical health, and social development, you are choosing to focus time and resources on creating more change and disruption. This is appalling and unethical. An additional concern over the timing is that we don't even know what next year will look like. There may be still distance learning. We may be in schools again but there will need to be significant recovery and acclimation back into a school setting. The children will need extra support to catch up on their learning as having been in a year of online that is no way as academically valuable as in person learning. Every child I know is behind in some way and placing an additional burden on the community of rearranging entire schools and families adds unnecessary stress, emotional strain, and upset.	Socio-Emotional health	Negative Response		
This proposal would result in unnecessary hardship to DLI students who must transition to new school communities and neighborhoods, and social and emotional impacts on students and families who will experience increased stress.	Socio-Emotional health	Negative Response		
I would like my son to remain at Franklin H.S. In 2021, he will begin his Junior Year. We live in the neighborhood. He has anxiety and a new routine would not be in his best interest.	Socio-Emotional health	Negative Response		
Shifting the boundary would also affect mental and physical health of our children by preventing some kids from walking to Atkinson. Instead it would require that kids (west of 57th) to cross Powell Blvd, Foster Blvd, and 52nd ave to get to Creston, and would require our kids (east of 57th) to cross Powell Blvd and Foster Blvd to get to Arleta, resulting in more kids being driven to school. This would result in congested neighborhoods and streets in SE Portland, and unsafe traffic congestion around Lents, Creston and Arleta schools.	Socio-Emotional health	Negative Response		

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
<p>Moving kids from Grant to Madison within 2 years time does not put our KIDS well being at the forefront. Please. They need some stability.</p> <p>For children like mine who will get caught, it means this... 9th grade intro to H.S. spent ONLINE. 10th grade spent in the Grant community (if they can even get back in the building). Then a GIANT choice has to be made... Continue to learn Japanese (the much loved track for the past 10 years) in an entirely new school, OR stay with in this newly built community at Grant.</p> <p>How is that fair to ask our kids to handle more upheaval?</p> <p>I understand wanting to give opportunities to MANY kids, and make our school system far more equitable. But couldn't we do this with a bit more time to prepare? Our kids are being asked to adapt constantly. But to potentially force them to make a life altering choice after trying to adapt to so many other factors is not the best for their well being. Of course they will survive, but why put them through so much more. They need STABILITY right now.</p>	Socio-Emotional health	Negative Response		
<p>Social and emotional: If this proposal were to proceed. All of our son's Mt. Tabor Friends would continue to go to Franklin and he would be the only one going to Madison. That would have a devastating effect on his emotional well-being in what is an ALREADY very difficult time.</p>	Socio-Emotional health	Negative Response		
<p>I have many concerns, especially how these changes will affect our kids' psychology. Now when the schools are closed, parents are trying to survive and now PPS is coming with a change some parents even don't have an idea of either time to get involved. Is this the way PPS is treading parents and children? Is this the time to make such a big change. Why does PPS have to make the change just now? There is nothing left stable in our kid's life.</p>	Socio-Emotional health	Negative Response		
<p>My daughter is a Freshman at Grant. Through Covid, these kids obviously are struggling. She is in JMP. If I'm understanding this correctly, she would be asked to be moved to Madison? I think this would be a huge mistake for her mental health frankly.</p>	Socio-Emotional health	Negative Response		
<p>The kids have had a rough couple of years doing online learning and having little social interaction. I feel very strongly that middle and high school kids should have the option of staying in their current schools, rather than forcing them to leave their school support systems during this emotionally fragile time. If that means they have to leave the programs because the teachers are leaving, that may be, but giving them the option to stay in their currently enrolled school is extremely important for the well being of these kids.</p>	Socio-Emotional health	Negative Response		
<p>lower house value, lower fitness, lack of sleep, stress, mental health, friendships, lack of regard from PPS for real needs of current Mt Tabor students.</p>	Socio-Emotional health	Negative Response		

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
That Creative Science School is being left without a building. The constructivist method is highly successful, engaged and desired. Our school is being left without a home, being disregarded and asked to "trust" PPS that we'll find a home. This feels unsettling at best for our family and community. If a school is found but a greater distance, my children's neighborhood school, Bridger, will no longer be a neighborhood school. They would then be sent to Clark, the former home of CSS which feel traumatic for my kids: go to the same building without the same program, without the same kids, without the same teachers, all immediately following a pandemic. This process has led to significant increased mental anguish for my 4th grader.	Socio-Emotional health	Negative Response		
Also breaking up the neighborhood community is horrific, especially at a time when mental health is so delicate.	Socio-Emotional health	Negative Response		
Additionally it would impact our oldest Childs social engament since we attended Glencoe, moved for two years and in returning have been faced with Covid. She is already having a tough time reconnecting with the students she attended Glencoe with and most of these friends will attend Franklin. We feel very strongly to keep our children in our local community and feel our child should attend Franklin for her high school experience.	Socio-Emotional health	Negative Response		
Now, change is hard. Yes, yes, it is. We encourage resilience in our kids. We have seen them rise to the challenge this year. I would say our kids are well aware of change especially with the lessons of 2020 and the struggles they face daily to stay positive during the pandemic. However, unnecessarily yanking out the rug beneath them after such a hard year and in the midst of a challenging holiday season and with COVID spiking feels wildly out of touch and downright cruel. These kids have struggled, our family has struggled. They have had to adjust to new ways of being. They have expressed deep sadness at losing their school experiences. They just want to look forward to the schools they love and return to a semblance of what they remember after the pandemic wanes. Please acknowledge the significance of this year and slow the process down to respect the mental health impacts to our communities and children.	Socio-Emotional health			
2. Negative mental health, social, and community impact of changing feeder patterns that take children out of neighborhood schools, particularly in light of the greater context of the current impacts the pandemic.	Socio-Emotional health	Negative Response		
As a person of color, this greatly affects the sense of safety for my family and heightens our emotional anxiety.	Socio-Emotional health	Negative Response		
If accepted as proposed it would mean my children would both be moving from Grant to Madison High School. This has already been an extremely disruptive year and if you look at the Grant kids, there core social needs will be disrupted. The foundation of their high school community will be broken up. It has already been a very unstable situation for several years. They started Grant at Marshal, then moved into Grant, then pulled due to a Pandemic and now asking them to go to Madison. That does not seem like a stable learning experience	Socio-Emotional health	Negative Response		
The mental health impact of all of this on kids has been so huge and I can't imagine why you would think this was a good time or a good idea or fair to these kids.	Socio-Emotional health	Negative Response		
Concern 3: negatively impact kids social and emotional, especially considering they are already under tremendous stress from COVID.	Socio-Emotional health	Negative Response		
taking away the building to Creative Science School without any place for that school to go, again impacting the mental health of all of those students as they try to navigate why PPS would do that. Creative Science School allows students that would otherwise struggle in a normal school setting to thrive through inclusivity, compassion from all students and staff, and the constructivist approach allows these children to become independent thinkers, compassionate community members and creative problem solvers.	Socio-Emotional health	Negative Response		

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
<p>My child is a freshman in the MIP. His cohort of buddies are all neighborhood kids going to Cleveland, but he understands the importance of continuing Mandarin to opportunities in college and beyond. Moving the immersion program from Cleveland will force him to choose between his friends and his education.</p> <p>If you take a gander at the male dropout rate for the MIP, you'll understand what a unicorn he is, to be getting good grades and still be solidly engaged with the program in high school. Due to covid, the class trip to China which he had worked toward for 8 years was canceled. Moving the program to Madison, and probably even Franklin is adding insult to injury, and will be the kiss of death for his participation in the MIP, because he will always choose his friends.</p>	Socio-Emotional health	Negative Response		
The lack of relationships the kids grow to have in a K-8 school	Socio-Emotional health	Negative Response		
I am concerned carbon footprint will increase.	Socio-Emotional health	Negative Response		
Please wait until kids are back to in person learning before considering these changes. This will cause harm to psychological well being of our students.	Socio-Emotional health	Negative Response		
<p>The likely elimination of CSS, by being moved without a destination building, means the elimination of the only school in the PSS program with a Constructivist teaching method. I have two children, one of whom will probably be fine in a regular school, but the other struggles with anxiety issues. The community based approach at CSS has made it much easier for him and although he had issues from time-to-time, he was able to participate and learn effectively up until the switch to CDL. When I was young, my own brother struggled with very similar issues and he was ultimately forced to leave the public school system and I am afraid that we will have to do the same if the CSS program is eliminated.</p>	Socio-Emotional health	Negative Response		
<p>I think the value of children going to neighborhood schools should be one of the highest priorities for PPS. I think the extra stress/anxiety this will cause would be poor timing given the context of current socio-economic conditions and uncertainties related to the pandemic, loss of jobs, political and social unrest, etc. (#2020hasbeentough).</p>	Socio-Emotional health	Negative Response		
Incredibly concerning is that Glencoe was not included in the Phase 1 and they see substantial changes to boundaries and feeders.	Timing	Negative Response		
<p>Shu Ren's letter to the Superintendent and SE Guiding Coalition is very troubling. Why were Chinese native-speaking families not consulted *at the outset* of the process to ensure that the aims toward equity and rebalancing were actually welcomed by the communities they claim to serve? From what we have heard, there are many Chinese families who in fact view the proposal as segregation to outer SE, when they would in fact prefer to be integrated into the inner SE community. Equity means nothing if you don't involve the beneficiaries of these efforts *before* beginning a process. We strongly urge to you to start again by consulting with these communities *first*, then developing a proposal based on their feedback.</p>	Timing	Negative Response		
<p>Our school, Glencoe Elementary, was not included in phase 1 although the proposal greatly impacts our school feeder pattern to high school changing it from Franklin to Madison. By not involving the Glencoe community members in the initial process, they are feeling blindsided and left out. But I think there is an advantage in the switch to Madison. By the time my student is of high school age, Madison will be a brand new school and not over-crowded as Franklin is.</p>	Timing	Negative Response		

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
<p>Timing: As my family is affected by this, I'm wondering why didn't I receive a postcard about it in the mail? I found out from my neighbor Nov 16th and was only able to attend one association meeting about this topic before the Nov 19th open house. The deadline to make this decision needs to be pushed out until the spring.</p> <p>Data: I've read through the report prepared by FLO and while I appreciate all the data in this report, what and where are the benchmarks for how this data was assessed and developed into Scenario 10?</p>	Timing	Negative Response		
<p>The timing of this. We are in the middle of an already horribly unstable and deregulating time with the pandemic and online schooling. This plan proposes that "if" we go back for regular school in the 21/22 school year, the kids would have one year at Atkinson and then have to change schools again for one more year and then depending on their grade, possibly change schools again for middle school. In my daughter's case that means she essentially will have been in 4 different learning environments in 4 years, changing "schools" every year. From online to Atkinson to Lents to Kellogg. That is so destabilizing and seriously puts into jeopardy my child's chances of success.</p>	Timing	Negative Response		
<p>The Glencoe community was not invited to participate in this phase of the planning even though the top two proposals significantly impact Glencoe students. Not just at the high school level but also at the elementary and middle school level. We were shocked and surprised to learn about this.</p>	Timing	Negative Response		
<p>timing of the changes, scope of the changes and the degree to which these are being made. There doesn't seem to be any concern for the children, movement between schools and the impact it will have on high school age children.</p>	Timing	Negative Response		
<p>My son is a student at Creative science and we live in the neighborhood. Without any idea where his school will be placed, I don't know if he can continue to attend there. I'm a working parent and only have so much flexibility for getting my son to school. I understand he has a year to get used to the change, but I don't want my son developing friendships at Creative Science, only to be removed from them for the 21-22 school year. This means I need to find a school for him now. I think it's a shame that PPS is doing this to families when we're already stretched thin. I don't want to go through the trouble and expense of finding him a private school when there's a possibility that he can continue at Creative Science. This is an unnecessary burden for families. I'm a single mom, we're hispanic and Asian. If these decisions are being made in the name of equity, I'll pass.</p>	Timing	Negative Response		
<p>4. The timing is atrocious; in the midst of a pandemic when people just don't have it in them to become informed and create constructive feedback.</p>	Timing	Negative Response		COVID
<p>We have concerns about the Japanese Immersion Program High School component moving from Grant to Madison, in as soon as two years! The program has long been established at Grant and we feel there needs to be more time (post-pandemic and virtual learning distractions), research, and input from invested families before considering a change that affects an established language program and a Northeast school.</p>	Timing	Negative Response		
<p>My middle school student has been looking forward to going to Franklin for years and after this time of unrest and Covid, it's very distressing to her to deal with this too.</p>	Timing	Negative Response		
<p>Trying to achieve goals that aren't part of the main priority at the expense of higher goals.</p>	Timing	Negative Response	Process	
<p>I am also concerned that this proposal is outside of the scope of Phase 1 for the committee. In Phase 1, the committee is charged with establishing feeder patterns for Kellogg and Harrison Park, but moving DLI programs was supposed to be part of Phase 2. I understand that it is hard to do the one without the other, and it my opinion, that is another flaw in PPS's process.</p>	Timing	Negative Response	Process	

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
1.While the focus of this proposal is to open Kellogg in Fall 2021, it is too narrow of a focus to ensure that all student effected by eventual boundary changes and feeder patterns get given the same care and consideration. Please slow down and make a more holistic plan that really addresses how each phase will effect other schools and students in the next before actually moving ahead.	Timing	Negative Response		
2) Please tell me why PPS is focusing on this right now when our children are not even attending school in person or even a hybrid situation. It is like throwing salt in a wound right now to be stressed enough with homeschooling to now think about the entire futre of my child's experience at PPS. It honestly makes me want to search out alternative options and leave the PPS system. I always defend public school up until this moment, I am now questioning it.	Timing	Negative Response		
My final point is the timing of all this. During a pandemic when learning is so hard and kids' social-emotional health is already strained, this seems like it could be an extra defeating blow to our kids. I also think not enough people have been contacted and asked about how this plan would affect their families, especially our families of color. Please slow down and make only the changes that you absolutely need to, which as I understand it is simply filling Kellogg. Move all the 6-8 out of their K-8s with the caveat that this may need to be adjusted in the future as boundaries shift. Keep the kids together. This will give Bridger the space we need and our middle school kids the opportunity to stay together and thrive in a brand new middle school as wel all come back together with the new normal that will exist in a post-pandemic world. Thank you for your work on this, but please don't forget what this is all about--- our children!	Timing	Negative Response		
This is a huge change being proposed during a pandemic, I think this process should be slowed down and there should be more emphasis on fully explaining the process to families and including family's voices and feedback. I need to understand more about how this proposal benefits other students to be able to embrace a proposal that has significant negative impacts on my students and their cohorts	Timing	Negative Response		
This has clearly not been thought out and discussed enough. If even the board members say they felt rushed, it shouldn't be made a decision right now. Fill the schools that need filled and wait on uprooting all of these kids to schools that for some don't even make sense!	Timing	Negative Response	Process	
I am concerned that families who are most able to weather changes are not being asked to make any, while families who have been most affected by the current pandemic are being told that they will have to change, regardless of what they want. I am concerned at how casually PPS makes changes without input from affected families. This habit of creating plans and then waiting for pushback is breaking our communities by setting us against each other.	Timing	Negative Response	Process	
Timing of this plan consideration. Parents and families are in crisis trying to pay bills in the middle of job cuts, manage their struggling businesses, deal with expiring benefits and--oh, yeah--stay safe in a deadly pandemic. We are also stretched thin to manage learning at home. And students feel the strain just as strong as adults; youth suicides are at their highest rates in Oregon this year. There is not sufficient time or energy to focus on the best decisions for the future. It is not the time to push this proposal forward just to stay on an arbitrary schedule.	Timing	Negative Response		
Response requested: Then there is what the map shows. Please explain how the new boundary for Grant High School can be described as anything but consolidating white privilege in a single high school on the east side. If this plan is enacted, Grant will almost certainly be the whitest and wealthiest high school on the east side with the smallest area from which to draw its students. Please provide the public with your demographic and socio-economic projections for Grant High School and the other PPS high schools on the east side under this proposal.	Timing			

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
<p>I don't understand why the JMP (JDLI) program is being moved from Grant. Grant is a central location compared to Madison--moving the program to Madison makes it impossible for children in SW Portland to continue with JMP. If my children were to use public transportation to get to Madison, it would take 1 1/2 hours and would involve a bus, MAX and a 1 mile walk to Madison. That means only families with flexible work schedules or a stay-at-home parent who can pick up/drop off their kids can continue in JMP. Also, my kids have been in the program since pre-K, and have been working hard to get their seal of biliteracy. Now they won't be able to earn that because they won't be able to have four years of high school Japanese (I have two students currently at Grant). After a year of distance learning and all the stress that the pandemic has caused, they will have to switch to their neighborhood school, where they know no one. The timing is really unfortunate. I also don't really see how removing a small program like JMP (there are about 20 kids each in the junior and senior years) would help with overcrowding at Grant; it would certainly take diversity away from Grant since most JMP kids are at least partly Asian (although most are economically advantaged).</p>	Transportation and Location	Negative Response		
<p>As a Glencoe/Mt Tabor family this would have a dramatically negative impact on our family for following reasons</p> <p>-Safety: We live near 49th and Hawthorne. Franklin is a 15 minute (0.8 Mile) walk through quiet streets. Madison would be a 1.5 hour (4.2 mile) walk across major intersections and over the Interstate-84 freeway. Our family would not be able to accommodate driving to/from and we are very concerned about safety of our kids if this proposal were accepted</p> <p>-</p>	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
<p>Community: We live in Southeast and are a proud part of this community. We appreciate PPS' commitment to neighborhood schools and believe in the sense of community that grows out of our kids attending schools within a reasonable geographic distance with their neighbors. The entire Southeast community would lose that if kids are sent 4 miles into the Northeast community.</p>	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
<p>Nobody on this coalition has been representing this neighborhood's commitment to our neighborhood schools, or our interest in walkability, having safe routes to school for our kids, and having good transportation options available. Madison is too far away from this neighborhood to be our neighborhood school.</p>	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
<p>My children have been in the Japanese Language Program for over 11 years. I have children at Richmond, Mount Tabor and Grant.</p> <p>We live in South West Portland. Commitment to language learning has involved extreme sacrifice in terms of time spent commuting to and from school. It is impossible to imagine commuting even farther to Madison. I'm sure Madison will be beautiful. However, adding more time to a already long commute makes it unworkable. It would be unfortunate to see all West Side And North Portland families drop out of Japanese Language learning for logistical reasons. If PPS cares about diversity and language learning, they need to consider how centralized the school is to the entire PPS district.</p>	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
<p>The transportation impact. Distance to each school is not an accurate metric of transportation burden. This moves my child from a 15 minute walk to a 40 minute TriMet bus ride that would decrease their ability to participate in after school activities, enrichments, and be a part of the HS community (especially since it is no where near where we live).</p>	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
<p>We would be moved outside of the Atkinson boundary by a half-block. Would my younger child have to go to a different school than his sibling? And why would we be sent to a middle school far away with no sound transit or bike accessibility when PPS is opening a new middle school virtually around the corner from us? We moved to this neighborhood for the walkability, bikeability, and great elementary school community. This would be a massive disruption.</p>	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
<p>This proposal breaks up our neighborhood into four elementary schools, makes my child cross multiple busy roads to attend elementary schools; ensures a significant loss of diversity at Atkinson and segregates Native Spanish speakers in further Southeast into a single school; it relies on feeder patterns instead of geographic boundaries to ensure that students have safe routes to school; it leaves Creative Science without a building; it maintains significant overcrowding at Franklin High School; it leaves untouched most of inner Southeast.</p> <p>Harrison Park is a not a viable middle school - there is no information on the funding available for its remodel, the timeline of such a remodel, or how this school provides an equitable opportunity compared with the other middle schools in Portland.</p> <p>This is fundamentally an unviable solution. The springboard proposal is the best option with minor adjustments to boundaries to relieve overenrollment pressure at Bridger elementary.</p>	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
<p>Number of high-traffic/very busy streets students will need to cross to get to elementary and middle schools.</p>	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
<p>I think a major decision for deciding boundaries for neighborhood schools should be distance to the school and how many major streets need to be crossed to walk or bike to school. PPS needs to make a commitment to the environment and make sure walking and biking is a real option for students, especially at elementary levels to establish good habits. The current proposal would have people on the south side of Hawthorne attend Creston instead of Glencoe. This would have those families cross Division and Powell Blvd (also Hwy. 26). There are not many parents who would have there kids walk or bike to school on their own, or with parental supervision, to cross those streets.</p>	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
<p>The distance from many students' homes who currently attend Glencoe Elementary is egregiously far away from the proposed new high school, Madison, compared to the current high school, Franklin. Most children would be able to walk or bike to Franklin but in this proposed model, there is no other option beyond taking a 45 minute bus ride. Asking kids and families to shuffle a much further distance from home to attend high school when one could have walked or rode to Franklin removes the concept of "neighborhood school."</p> <p>Why are there no proposed changes to the Grant boundary? If Laurelhurst K-8 was sent to Madison instead of Grant, you would you have students were are physically much closer to Madison than Glencoe / Mount Tabor students are to Madison.</p>	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
<p>I do not want to drive my kids to two different schools. Right now one of them is in the neighborhood program and would finish at Atkinson, since we live below Woodward she would be assigned to Kellogg middle school. The unfortunate thing is that she would see very few of her current classmates at her middle school. My other daughter is in Spanish immersion, if we had to drive her 15 minutes to Lent everyday we would pull her out and put her in the neighborhood program so we can continue to walk/ bike to school everyday.</p>	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
I have concerns as it appears my children (currently kinder and 2nd at Atkinson) would change schools in the fall. 1) I am concerned with them having to cross multiple busy streets to attend Arleta, 2) I am concerned with them having to change schools mid elementary school; as we chose this house so that they could attend Atkinson, Kellogg, and Franklin. Literally my only condition on house choice besides price was the location for these 3 specific schools. We are not in a financial situation to relocate. 3) Both of my children have an IEP and receive speech services, and I feel a change would negatively impact their progress.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
Cost of personal resources to travel to Madison High School from SE	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
We have major concerns about splitting up Atkinson. We LOVE having the spanish immersion program as part of the school. It adds richness and creates a better and more inclusive community. We live mere blocks from Atkinson and the school change would be a hardship from a commute and community perspective. With everything going on in the world, changing the school community is short sighted and unimaginable. We also vehemently oppose changing the feeder path for middle school for the same reasons. It creates a commuting hardship and breaks up our beloved community. Please do not make feeder changes at Atkinson	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
Families have planned and worked very hard, sometimes for many years, to move into or stay in a certain neighborhood based on a desire to send their children to a preferred school, desires based on curriculum, community or responsible commuting options.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
<p>As a BIPOC, I am deeply concerned that whole DLI schools exacerbate inequalities by segregating minorities to the outskirts of Portland and lead to fewer opportunities for diverse experiences for our students.</p> <p>Having participated in a breakout group at Bridger's 11/16 Redistricting Town Hall meeting, we discussed this very concern about segregation. A native speaker family in our breakout group admitted they were fearful to oppose the open house scenario because they felt that having only whole school DLI at Lent was already set and they didn't want to disrespect authority/PPS. I bring this up here because I'm unsure if they will participate in formal PPS outreach. They feared diversity would be lost by grouping all Spanish DLI together on the outskirts, felt like they were being segregated/ targeted, and would likely pull their children out of DLI because Lent created a commute hardship.</p> <p>The impact on Lent neighborhood families who are not in the existing DLI program is a big concern. With the consolidation to 4 strands of Spanish DLI and removal of Lent's neighborhood program, the likelihood that Lent neighborhood families would be able to enroll in the DLI program is nominal at best. If anything, those families would be displaced as they need to travel further out to get to the next nearest neighborhood school — an additional burden given that Lent families (phone surveyed by PPS) noted they don't have a car/have limited transportation options.</p>	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
Transportation is a huge issue. Even if bussing to Lent is provided to DLI students hailing from the Bridger/Atkinson areas, these families would be less likely to participate in extracurricular programs as their kids would need to adhere to the bus schedule. An unintended consequence of moving DLI programs away from a central geographic location is that it limits the number of opportunities for our students to interact together outside of the classroom.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
I am so frustrated to learn that my kids could possibly be sent to Madison. That school is twice as far from our house as Franklin and ruins any plans for walking or biking to school, which was a major reason that we moved to this house 5 years ago. Spending nearly 2 hours a day on a Trimet bus to attend Madison when they could ride 10 minutes on their bikes each way to Franklin makes me think that the transportation issue has not been addressed. How exactly would that be a benefit for my kids? Furthermore, there are more affluent neighborhoods around Laurelhurst and Grant that are closer to Madison than we are and they are not being included in this plan. This proposal makes me feel powerless and quite honestly seems piece-meal and rushed. Why not look at the entire Eastside and come up with a comprehensive plan that actually promotes equity.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
Forcing my child to go to a high school 4 miles away when there is a high school less than a mile away. Forcing my child to spend 45 minutes traveling each way and crossing dangerous busy roads.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
I wish Atkinson fed into Kellogg. We want to stay a green city. Biking and walking to middle school is a priority to us.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
Transporting my son from Atkinson to Lent would create a huge economic burden for my family. We live next to Atkinson and want him to walk to school. We may need to enroll in the neighborhood program.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
It is also very far out - think of the crazy increase in traffic when every student is coming from all corners of the city, especially considering most parents work downtown.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
My son can walk to Franklin high school when he attends there. If his school is changed to Madison, it will be at least a 30 minute commute each day. Not counting sports. I DON'T LIKE THIS proposal.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
You say you want to limit transportation distances as one of your goals, but this proposal actually INCREASES distances from schools across the board. It is crazy that someone who lives a five minute walk from Franklin will now have to take a door to door commute to Madison that takes 45 minutes EACH WAY on Trimet. How can you ask that of those kids? Grant is much closer to Madison, is also overcrowded and has much less diversity both racially and socioeconomically than Franklin, and it is not even on the table for change.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
When I started reading about this, it is portrayed as a change to middle school boundaries. I am now learning that this will take my family out of our neighborhood high school and require us to drive to a school that is not even close to us. Our neighborhood high school is Franklin, we want to walk and bike there. This change should take community feedback into account, it does not seem like this proposal did that with the Glencoe/Mt Tabor community.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
<p>Taking the Spanish DLI immersion program out of Atkinson and sending the DLI students to Lents is a horrible idea for many reasons: many parents will be forced to drive their children to school so that the area around Lent will become unsafe for all attending children due to increased traffic congestion; SE Portland roads will become congested with the traffic of parents taking their children to school; single parents like me (who currently allow their children to walk to Atkinson on their own) will be forced to reduce their work hours because we will have to drive to Lent twice a day to drop off and pick our children up instead of allowing children to walk to and from school on their own; will require some families to have elementary school age children within a single family at different elementary schools; will result in Spanish DLI immersion students having to travel far from their homes to attend Lents school; will require current Atkinson students living between Powell Blvd and Woodward (who are currently within walking distance of Atkinson without needing to cross a single busy road) to cross Powell Blvd (with its numerous homeless camps), Foster Blvd, and SE 52nd avenue, to get to Creston school, or will require students to cross Powell Blvd (with its numerous homeless camps) and Foster Blvd to attend Arleta school; and will require students north of Hawthorne Blvd to cross Division Street to attend Atkinson, even though they are walking distance to Bridger.</p> <p>The current proposal to remove the Spanish DLI program from Atkinson is a terrible idea and will result in traffic related safety hazards at Lent, Arleta and Creston schools, and will force parents to reduce the hours they will be able to spend at their jobs.</p>	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
<p>On a personal level this change will mean that my student's commute to high school will double and no longer be walkable</p>	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
<p>Changing HS from Franklin, our neighborhood school to a HS miles away. We choose our home due to the schools and pay the property taxes to match these choices.</p>	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
<p>This plan will cause significant jumps in commute time for some students and incentivize driving when previous commutes incentivized walking, biking, or using a direct public transit route. Putting greater distance between kids and schools is tough on parents and works against some community and climate goals. I will send my kids to public school no matter what, and will respect whatever choices are made by PPS, but I'm registering that taking into account the number and type of transit modes required to get kids to school is important, and that making it harder for kids to get to school can have unintended consequences.</p>	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
<p>Having Atkinson kids go to Harrison Park. Kellogg is so much closer and a lot of us working parents were hoping to have our kids walk or bike to school together once they are in middle school. But this proposal has them crossing 82nd. Also, this proposal divides up the South Tabor neighborhood where kids have always gone to the same school. For example, three of my sons friends live south of Woodward Street, and this model has them going to Arleta and then Kellogg.</p>	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
<p>Students traveling from SE to Madison on the other side of the freeway.</p>	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
<p>Issues with commuting.</p>	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
<p>My understanding is that Glencoe feeds into Mt Tabor into Franklin and it would switch to the high school way over by the golf course. Doesn't make much sense based on what I have read. I don't understand why Harrison would be feeding into Franklin. If it is an equity issue, I am poor, can't afford a car and live where i do so my child can walk to school. This would affect my whole life going forward likely forcing me to move affecting my work commute and a whole cascade of life events. Just something to keep in mind in terms of North Tabor residents.</p>	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
I am very concerned about the expedited timing of this restructuring plan. There are many factors that warrant more consideration: transportation, the mental wellness of students(doing this in the midst of Covid where family, economic and distance learning stress is at a high), the consideration of neighborhood schools and community building, the safety of children on multiple public buses and a larger carbon imprint from families (that are able)to use vehicles to get their kids to these further locations. This is a fragile time to be creating so much shifting within our communities.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
New Boundary lines for South Tabor: I'm concerned that our neighborhood — which is neatly fit between 4 major streets, 52nd to the west, 82nd to the east, Powell to the South, and Division to the North — is being split up into 4 districts by this plan. Due to the drawing of these lines, residents in each quadrant of our neighborhood would need to cross a major street to get to one of their schools, all while a K-5 (Atkinson), 6-8 (Kellogg), and 9-12 (Franklin) live neatly within our neighborhood's boundaries.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
The further the plan pushes our kids to distant feeder High Schools, we as a family are faced with how we get our kids to school, if they can no longer walk or bike safely. It also affects the ability for our kids to attend extracurricular social and sports activities that are so important to their development.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
Don't shift the Atkinson boundary north from Powell to Woodward. Shifting the boundary would prevent our kids from walking to Atkinson and instead require our kids (west of 57th) to cross Powell Blvd, Foster Blvd, and 52nd ave to get to Creston, and would require our kids (east of 57th) to cross Powell Blvd and Foster Blvd to get to Arleta, resulting in more kids being driven to school since walking would be unsafe. This will result in congested neighborhoods and streets in SE Portland, and unsafe traffic congestion around Lents, Creston and Arleta schools.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
The current proposal to remove the Spanish DLI program from Atkinson will increase hardships and unnecessary burden on our community. In addition, this proposal will increase traffic related safety hazards at Lents, Arleta and Creston schools, and will force parents and caregivers to sacrifice much needed working hours to transport children to and from school. As a parent of DLI students and Atkinson neighborhood resident, my children would be sent to an elementary and middle schools far from our home. They will lose access to the familiarity of their school community and environment. They will spend more time in transit to and from schools, limiting their access to safe routes home and increasing overall safety risk and time commuting. As a parent, I will have to sacrifice valuable time designated for work and livelihood to transport my children. The impact will be far more significant for those in our community with less access to reliable transport and resources. This scenario would be a mistake for our community and for PPS as a whole.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
Safety. My child (age 6) lives within walking distance of Bridger school (east of your new Atkinson border). I was looking forward to him having age-appropriate responsibility and freedom to walk to school when he is a little older. However, the latest plan would require him and his classmates to cross 82nd Ave - a state highway (213) and a High Crash Corridor (people DIE here) to get to elementary and middle school. Why on earth would you have feeder patterns cross 82nd Ave? This is asking for kids to die or requiring parents to drive them to their new elementary school. Shame on you.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
<p>I don't like the elimination of the K-8 school. It provides a more stable environment for kids. Instead of making two transitions in three years they make one - from their first school to their last. We have massive reservations sending our kids across 82nd. We presenting live 4 blocks from Bridger.</p> <p>We like our neighborhood classroom in a DLI school because the class sizes are smaller and we know all the teachers from year to year.</p> <p>This feels very unsettling considering the year we're already having. Additionally, why would the Spanish program move out? Why can't the Spanish program stay and the Mandarin program be created by gutting someone else's neighborhood school?</p>	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
<p>I have a significant concern about the geographic impacts of funneling Mt.Tabor Middle School to Madison High School when there is already a high school in the tabor neighborhood. Portland prides itself on it's neighborhood's walkability. Many families move to our inner city neighborhoods with the understanding that our children can safely walk / ride their bikes to school. It clearly makes more sense to funnel schools from NE neighborhoods to Madison.</p> <p>In addition, I am concerned about splitting up Glencoe to two different middle schools. Middle school is a challenging, vulnerable time for children and separating them from their friends during this difficult transition is unhealthy. And not only does this proposal send them to different middle schools, but different high schools. Seems like there are better alternatives to this option.</p>	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
<p>How do we get our voices heard and fight this? Have PPS boundary proposals ever been thwarted before? I worry that if the coalition members thoughts are being over-ridden, the neighborhood voices will be squashed as well. Huge safety issues, environmental, traffic, a community/neighborhood divided, etc.</p>	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
<p>30-45 minutes daily travel time</p>	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
<p>I live on 55th, north of powell, the new boundary would put my 2 children who will be attending school soon across Powell. Right now, my children would be able to walk with us to school within 5 minutes. But your proposed boundary would require us to drive our children to school across a street/highway that is too dangerous to cross. The environmental and physical impact would create a significant hardship for our family. Also, it would be a pity that my children's only neighborhood friends would be attending a different school than them.</p>	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
<p>My primary concern is that my daughter will spend two hours on a bus to get to Madison if the JMP is moved there. We planned much of our lives, including where to buy a house, around the Richmond/Tabor/Grant JMP progression.</p>	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
<p>I'm concerned that no studies were conducted into whether the Grant Japanese structure is transferrable to Madison. I'm also concerned about the impact moving Mt. Tabor to Madison will have on commuting.</p>	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
<p>A lot. This feels rushed. Uprooting kids from what they know and love in a stressful time of COVID= additional trauma. Safety issues, traffic, congestion, and environmental issues- crossing extremely busy streets to go to a school 15 minutes away, when there is an under-enrolled, perfectly good school that we have counted on being a part of for a long time is preposterous.</p>	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
Madison will be farther for the majority of students in the program, students from Tabor won't be able to walk to Madison and I worry about JMP attrition and increased traffic. In addition, the JDLI program has a long history at Grant and is embedded in the community there. I worry about leaving this path.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
My child is in the Japanese Immersion program. Moving the program to Madison will make it challenging for him and his friends to go to high school without adversely impacting parents, as we will have to transport. Grant is more centrally located, is closer to its feeder schools, and has better transportation options (bus lines and MAX) for our students who are coming from all over portland.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
Shifting the japanese immersion program to Madison; given its distance from the Richmond and Mt. Tabor feeder schools, will cause transportation difficulties for many families. Grant is a far more central location, and will serve the current feeder schools more efficiently. Many families have organized their lives & home ownership choices around the current system & this shift would introduce logistical difficulties that may well drive students out of the program.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
Madison is very far for us to get to for high school. I would prefer if the high school was closer to both Mt. Tabor and Richmond. Franklin makes the most sense, as it is the closest high school to both.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
Regarding Atkinson feeding into Harrison Park: my current 4th grade son would have to cross 82nd to get to school. If he could go to Kellogg, he could get safely to school on Woodward. Regarding any families south of Woodward having to go to school at Arleta instead of Atkinson: we live 4 houses south of Woodward, so if this change happens, Arleta would be our new elementary school. We would have to cross 2 extremely busy streets: Powell (which is actually a highway) and Foster. This would be an extremely unsafe commute.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
The Jdli should stay at Grant due to its proximity to feeder schools. Madison is located father out, which would make it difficult for students using public transportation to get to school	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
Our daughter (now in Kindergarten) would have to cross a very busy roads (Powell) and 50th and 52nd to walk to Creston, which would not be safe, probably all through elementary school. As a middle schooler, I was picturing her biking to the close school (Kellogg) but Harrison Park is much farther.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
Personally, it would also be unfortunate to lose the immersion program at Atkinson (making the school much whiter...) if she was still there but I don't know how the native Spanish speakers in the program feel or how it affects their transportation				
I also have a younger child, so it would be a bummer for them to have to go to different schools.				
Madison is just too far away, minimum 2 bus, 40 min ride total, each way! They should all be going to Franklin if anywhere. It's walkable and equitable for all Tabor students. Did anyone even consider the transportation issue? It's a huge barrier and completely against PPS policy of "staying in your neighborhood school" which they have been adamant about ever since they took away school choice.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
all DLI Spanish in SE could be at Lent, which is substantially more difficult to perform drop off and pick up than either Bridger or Atkinson. Also, bussing neighborhood (non DLI) Lent students elsewhere seems systematically unfair to them and their families.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
Of concern is the Phase 2 proposal moving the High School JDLI program to Madison (from Grant) in 2022. The K-12 JDLI program has always been centrally located in the PPS district. Richmond, MT Tabor and Grant are in close proximity to each other which allows working families with JDLI students at different schools to coordinate transportation with siblings. The central location of the JDLI program schools also allows greater equity in accessing transportation for students traveling from various parts of the PPS district (particularly the Westside) Moving the High School JDLI program will also impact the Japanese Language offering to Neighborhood students at Grant. Japanese language has been offered at Grant prior to the JDLI program inception.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
If the Japanese Language program moves to Madison high school it will move too far from us. My children will spend twice the time commuting out there. We will consider dropping from the program if it is moved to Madison. I am also concerned that the culture of the children in Richmond will be vastly different from that of Madison.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
Why would PPS move the Japanese program with a history of 20+ years to another location even farther away from the elementary and middle schools that feed into the program/high school? It seems if it were to be moved that Franklin high school would be the appropriate option since then all 3 schools would be in the Franklin cluster. When families sign up for the program they are banking on the school being closer to the other two schools when they have multiple siblings in the program.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
Transferring the Spanish Dual Language Immersion program to Lent would result in a decrease of diversity in the Atkinson community and also cause a number of issues around the Lent area. Shifting the Atkinson boundry would mean students that previously lived in the Atkinson area would have to cross multiple busy streets to get to school, and therefore would need to be driven instead. As a result, the neighborhoods and streets of Southeast Portland will become unsafe and conjested, as well as around Lents, Creston, and Arleta schools.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
<p>This proposal is terribly disruptive to children in the South Tabor Neighborhood and I ask that you do not shift the Atkinson boundary north from Powell to Woodward. My daughter lives four blocks from Atkinson and we bought our house and arranged our work schedules so she can walk to school. This aligns with our values of reducing our carbon footprint and promoting healthy living.</p> <p>Crossing Powell by foot is unsafe. This boundary shift would make it impossible for my kindergartener to walk to school because she would have to cross a busy HIGHWAY, SE Foster, 52nd ave, and walk 15 blocks to get to Creston Elementary. We live on SE 56th Ave and Atkinson is only 3 blocks plus a park walk away. I previously worked as a state attorney representing ODOT and I can tell you that crossing Powell Blvd., is unsafe. Cars on both Powell and SE Foster often travel at speeds over 40 mph. Putting kids in the line of such traffic, when there is a safer route to a much closer elementary school is a dangerous policy.</p> <p>One of the factors for drawing boundary lines that PPS must consider are natural boundaries; Powell and 50th are the natural boundaries in the South Tabor neighborhood. Chopping up our neighborhood boundaries does not follow the natural boundaries.</p> <p>Furthermore, this proposal does not promote climate justice, which is one of the policies that PPS promotes in classrooms. This proposal forces parents to drive their kids to school when they could otherwise walk under the current Atkinson boundary. If parents are unable to work part time so they can drive kids to and from school, those kids will face unsafe conditions crossing busy streets to attend school. This will disproportionately impact low income students because their parents often cannot afford to shorten their workday to drive them to school.</p> <p>Finally, this boundary proposal is so disruptive that many families, ours included, will consider pulling kids out of public school and finding a private school alternative. I always intended that our family would bike and walk to school together. Under this proposal I will have to shorten my workday and our family will have to buy a second car. I'm so troubled by PPS's disregard for my child I will explore safer options.</p> <p>Adrienne DelCotto 3346 SE 56th Ave</p>	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
2) The boundaries change would make my kids go to Kellogg if one of them decides not to stick with the JDLI program in middle school. Separating the kids when many in the area choose Richmond for the proximity to their house would divide the neighborhood.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
<p>My concern is that the current proposal is inconsistent with the District's commitment to sustainability and reducing the District's carbon footprint because it establishes boundaries that have students attending schools that are much farther away and harder to get to than the schools closest to their homes. For example, under the current proposal, students that live very near Atkinson elementary school in South Tabor, north of Powell but south of Woodward and between 50th and 57th will have to attend Creston. These students will have to cross two busy streets (powell and foster) and travel farther to get to school, making it more likely that they will be driven to school in a car. This scenario is repeated in other areas of the proposal as well. (students that live in East South Tabor, east of 75th will have to attend Harrison Middle School, crossing 82nd avenue and Division, instead of getting to attend Kellogg, which is easily walkable to their homes.</p> <p>However, if the proposal were amended to take this immediate proximity and walkability into account - ensuring the student's home and school close and not intersected by major thoroughfares like powell and foster when possible - the students will more likely be able to walk/bike or be walked/biked to school, thereby lowering the District's carbon footprint and reducing vehicle emissions in the communities the District serves.</p> <p>As a parent of two children who will soon begin their learning experience in the District, I am hopeful that the District will take these sustainability concerns seriously. Our kids are inheriting an ever warming and inhospitable planet and I believe it is the duty of our District to promote sustainable/walkable communities.</p>	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
<p>We moved to South Tabor neighborhood 5 years ago and we had planned to send our 2 children to Atkinson next year, which is a short 3 min walk through Clinton Park for us. Since we have moved here, we feel like we are being pushed out.</p> <p>I don't drive a car, so with the new redistricting that pulls my kids out of Atkinson, I'll have to cross highway 26 with my 2 elementary school kids, one with special needs, go through the VA homeless shelter, probably through several homeless camps, passing strip club, liquor store, cross another dangerous Foster St/Powell intersection, in order to get them to school. Instead of 4 minutes it will take 15 minutes and that's a big safety concern for me.</p>	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
<p>Madison is not ranked nearly as well as Grant & Madison's location is much further away from our residence (we commute by bicycle) that is Grant.</p>	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
<p>Our home school which is blocks away would change to a school miles away.</p>	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
<p>With these changes losing the DLI program would decrease diversity at Atkinson and require kids to be driven to school at Lent. This prevents us from attending the program any longer due to long commute times and we cannot commit to that with our work schedules. It also adds to the carbon load of the city.</p>	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
<p>Loong commute to Madison high school</p>	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
<p>I think the commute of the students should be considered. It's one thing for families that chose focus/ language immersion to have a longer commute but I think neighborhood schools should be maintained.</p>	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
<p>Also, moving the dividing line to Woodward instead of Powell will cause more families that were able to walk and bike to Atkinson, now to have to drive and or cross three major roads. I can see Atkinson from my driveway, but now my neighborhood elementary would be Creston 2 miles away? It makes no sense!! This will increase traffic, accidents, and congestion with more parents driving to school, and more buses needed for schools which is more expensive. Geography is important!</p>	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
doesn't seem like families were consulted enough, and some of the school transfers don't make sense (for our particular scenario, grant to madison...that's ridiculously far.)	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
I am concerned about student transportation. I'm concerned about students having really long commutes. I think it's important for kids to walk to school when they can or have short commutes to school, and be able to still attend school with neighborhood friends. Safe Routes to school are important. I hope transportation challenges will be addressed and safe options will be provided. I'm concerned that wealthy families may pull their kids from PPS and send them to private schools, and that the hopes of improving equity won't actually happen. I'm concerned that areas with wealthy mostly white families will not be a part of any of the changes. I am concerned that the proposal isn't addressing the need to make every single PPS school a quality school with good teachers and good programs and AP options in High School for every single student. I'm concerned about having quality education for all public school students in Portland in every neighborhood and at every school. I'm concerned about students having a lot of challenges due to Covid and than possibly having challenges due to big school changes and possibly being separated from friends. I do like that the coalition is trying to make schools more diverse, and trying to improve equity. I'm just not sure if the current proposal will accomplish these goals.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
My family lives on SE Woodward Street and it's not clear which grade school my children would attend. Currently they are at Atkinson, and we moved to this neighborhood specifically for the schools. If they remain at Atkinson, we would drive/walk/ride bikes passed Kellogg to get to Harrison Park when it comes time for middle school. That makes zero sense.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
Consider PPS student that live near downtown, or on Skyline Blvd, or SW PDX. Richmond Japanese dual language immersion is close to downtown, Mt Tabor is reasonably so Grant as well Madison is not.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
unclear if and how transportation factors were analyzed	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
Atkinson Spanish immersion helped my kids assimilate into both their Mexican heritage as well as US culture. If you move the program fully to Lent, not only will you be decreasing diversity at Atkinson, you will also be causing many more families to become mobile and provide transportation for students. I could not imagine how this would change families schedules like mine as well as the overall well-being of the community and neighborhoods. My kids have walked to school for years. Now you want us to drive 15 minutes in morning traffic instead of walking 7 minutes through our community? Not very eco friendly	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
harrison park would be our new middle school, when Kellogg is 3 blocks from our home. Walking and biking is very important to us as well as community and neighborhood. We have lived in our house for over seventeen years	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
I'm concerned that my Mt Tabor 8th grader will be transferred to Madison after starting at Franklin. We live few minutes walk from Franklin and Madison makes no sense geographically and effectively increases the carbon footprint of kids by switching them from a neighborhood school. Not only is it better for the planet, it is better for kids physical health to be able to walk to school. In addition, it is disruptive to start kids at one school only to have them switch to another after a year or two. Haven't these kids been through enough?	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
Woodstock K-5 Chinese Immersion relocates to Bridger K-5 beginning in 2022. Students in program are isolated with normal kids in neighborhood programs where they are physical located. More driving for parents.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
My concerns are that geography is not being emphasized enough for families in the neighborhood program. We live in the South Tabor neighborhood and a large reason that we chose the location of our home (and pay very high property taxes!) is that we could live in a walkable neighborhood. We love being able to walk to Atkinson, and have been looking forward to walking Kellogg one day. Having to bus to Harrison Park for middle school destroys this idea. I also feel strongly that the boundary for Atkinson should be Powell, not Woodward. For families who live south of Woodward, it feels very unfair that their children couldn't walk through the park to the school that is so close to them and really feels like their neighborhood school.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
Moving an neighborhood to a high school outside of the neighborhood with transportation issues and livability at stake. Moving neighborhoods to accommodate DLI programs that are choices for families. Neighborhood families made the conscious choice to stay in their neighborhood for school. DLI programs should be placed where space allows.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
Moving the immersion program from Atkinson to Lent will prevent us from being able to continue in the immersion program and we will need to change to a traditional program. We will not be able to commute so far and it complicates our ability to get Dylan home after school. I am so frustrated with this proposal, especially after we lotteried into this program since we are south of Powell. I fail to understand why PPS makes such dramatic changes seemingly without clear communication with the population that these changes actually affect. Our child is bilingual, biracial, and a dual citizen and this change will have a negative effect on his opportunities that we felt so blessed to be a part of. While I understand that there are many factors involved in these decisions, moving immersion from Atkinson to Lent essentially takes this unique opportunity away from our family.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
1.5 to 2 hours of bus time a day for our neighborhood kids will increase stress on students and families alike and pose safety concerns. Carbon emissions of our kids need to bus to other parts of town when they would have otherwise had a healthy 15 minute walk needs to be taken seriously. Families who commute to their school rarely have the same relationship.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
Safety: We live near 49th and Hawthorne. Franklin is a 15 minute (0.8 Mile) walk through quiet streets. Madison would be a 1.5 hour (4.2 mile) walk across major intersections and over the Interstate-84 freeway. Our family would not be able to accommodate driving to/from and we are very concerned about safety of our kids if this proposal were accepted.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
going to a high school far from us and along 82nd avenue. Biking or walking will no longer be an option.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
The lack of equitable access to walking and biking options for traveling to school within neighborhoods	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
This would change the high school that my children attend from one that is less than a mile away (and easy bike ride or walk), to one over 3 miles away across portions of the city that are not nearly as bike friendly. Without schools providing transportation, this means that my high school student would no longer be able to independently get themselves to school, but would rely on transport from me or other parents to travel a route that would likely take 30-40 minutes. This cannot be in everyone's best interest.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
The idea of my son going from a school (Franklin) to which he can safely walk to a school (Madison) which would take him 40 min on a public bus is absolutely insane.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
I am concerned that my daughter will have to attend Marshall. Franklin is walking distance from our home. We live in the Mt Tabor neighborhood so we can be near her schools. The commute to Marshall will be less than ideal for us. I am also very disappointed that the decision to send Mt Tabor students to Marshall has been all but made without consultation with or input from the families that will be effected.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
I don't like that the new boundaries would change my children from going to Franklin to go traveling MUCH further away to Madison high school	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
Walkability to school is important as it fosters independence as well as connection with neighborhood kids. Requiring kids to attend a school too far to access by walking erodes the neighborhood connection and the commute adds time to kids' already busy schedules.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
Other problems with this plan Madison is twice as far from our house as Franklin with no direct bus route from our neighborhood to it. A bus trip to Franklin will be as easy as riding down 60th for our kids. All of Glencoe students live within blocks of the proposed boundaries for going to either Franklin or Grant -- both schools that have been recently remodeled to handle a larger capacity. This map cuts the Glencoe geographic area from feeding to these closer high schools, and instead, feeds the population to a high school miles farther.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
Distance to school and hardship of transportation is not taken into account. This moves a HUGE amount of students, creating instability in a very traumatic and unstable time.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
Commute to Kellogg location	Transportation and Safety			
My kids will go from walking a mile to school to riding a bus for 3 miles. It doesn't make sense.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
I strongly oppose Glencoe and Mt tabor students being forced to drive or bus to Madison high school when Franklin is walking distance for many many families. Keeping students within their communities builds strong community. It puts undue burden on families who are less able and less affluent, such as mine. Additionally making these changes during a pandemic seems short sighted. There is like to be a huge change in the population of Portland in the coming years with such a bleak economic outlook. There maybe less overcrowding due to this. I hope this is also considered. My son is very much looking forward to going to his neighborhood school with students he's known much of his life and being able to walk is huge.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
Kids not having safe routines to school because they got relocated outside their neighborhood school. It will take longer to get to and from school.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
I'm not happy about making the trip to school harder/more dangerous for my family. Instead of being a neighborhood walking/biking distance away, we will be faced with a much longer commute. Biking/walking will be out of the question as there are several busy streets and intersections that would have to be crossed. My family moved to our neighborhood (Glencoe) in part because of the distance of our schools. I'm unsure if we would stay in the area at this point. We still have time to decide.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
My kids safely walking to school.	Transportation and Safety	Positive Response		
Distance from home.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
Moving the Mt. Tabor kids up to Madison.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
Our kids commute will be increased significantly by the high school boundary changes. We live close to Franklin and do not want our kids having to drive/etc to Madison.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
I'm concerned that my son. With autism will have to walk 1.5 miles across 2 busy streets instead of walking 5 blocks to Kellough.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
There was no neighborhood communication about switching boundaries for children who have a 0.5 walk to Franklin high school to a 3.5 mile commute crossing two major highway routes se powell and se 82nd at rush hour. That is not equity and does not place value on children having to walk over one hour to school with our current traffic patterns and pps talking/selling safety corridors so children can walk to school. There are no busing to high school school and would require to trimet bus transfer for a 45 minute commute versus a 8 minute walk. Pps values not equity but California data company tech 400k contract over neighborhood in put. Give parents choice and flexibility is a simple solution to a bureaucratic mess "data analytics" is creating.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
equity; transportation	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
my child having to take a 40 minute bus drive vs a 5 minute walk	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
lengthy commute, safety, lack of walkability, lower house value, lower fitness, lack of sleep, stress, mental health, friendships, lack of regard from PPS for real needs of current Mt Tabor students.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
The distance our family would need to travel for High School (we live in NE. Richmond and Tabor were already a concern, but we took consolation knowing our children would eventually be near home at Grant).	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
Distance for travel. Students passing busy roadways. Walking to school is ideal. HS does not provide transportation outside of bus passes so distance matters.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
Safety and time of commuting	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
I live in the section of the Atkinson neighborhood between Powell and Woodward that is being changed to Arleta. I am very grateful that this change situates us to attend Kellogg, but what would make even more sense to me would be to keep us in the Atkinson neighborhood and send all of Atkinson to Kellogg. Powell is wide and busy, difficult to cross in a vehicle, and all but impossible to cross safely on foot or on bike. Our neighborhood is between Powell and Division and the ability of my kids to walk to school is of paramount importance to me. If I had to choose, I'd pick Arleta -> Kellogg -> Franklin over Atkinson -> Harrison Park -> Madison in a heartbeat, but that said, neither of those really make sense for us. Atkinson -> Kellogg -> Franklin means that all of our schools are in our neighborhood and can be easily/safely walked to (<6 blocks to each). Please don't take this option away from us and our neighbors!	Transportation and Safety			
I want to get to go to school with out my parents taking me sometimes but if I have to cross I highway to get to school I won't ever get to ride a bike. Also right now I have no idea where CSS would be. You need to figure that out. No one asked kids what they think!	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
Having Japanese immersion students go to Madison HS is ridiculous. It is far out of the neighborhood for most Japanese families, and the environmental impact of transport so far away greatly outweighs any benefit.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
We are concerned regarding the redistricting of Glencoe to Madison HS. Our home is located closer to Grant, Cleveland and Franklin. We bike or walk in our neighborhood for everything (work, grocery, ect). If this passes, we would likely move our children to private schools.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
Bussing and transporting to a rezoned school outside our neighborhood. We live walking distance to Franklin high school.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
We moved to this location to feed into either Franklin OR Grant for Japanese Immersion program. This was high priority and don't want our kids to attend Madison.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
I strongly disagree with pps taking away our neighborhood school. I place a high value on walkabout. We try to do just about everything within walking or biking distance. Going to Madison does not fit with our family's transportation style. Madison is not within our community. Taking trimet is not an option. If this plan moves forward we will be forced to unenroll our children from pps and put them in a school the fits within our boundaries. I believe children should always be given the opportunity to attend their neighborhood school. Neighborhood schools should not be used for focus schools. If you choose a focus school you are agreeing to transport your child to the school that houses that program. I am deeply disturbed that pps would try to take away neighborhood schools and bus kids far from their home and neighborhood. I will not allow my kids to be pushed out of their neighborhood.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
transportation fiascos with Glencoe/Tabor feeding into Madison (example.. our daughter would be spending up to 1 1/2 hrs a day riding multiple buses to get to Madison high school 4 miles away when she could just walk to Franklin in 5 minutes! 45 minute bus ride each way will prohibit her from after school activities, getting a job, etc..	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
Transportation is a big factor in my displeasure of this plan. It will take my child twice as long to get to high school with the proposed boundary changes. This is unacceptable to me.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
For anyone who lives in southeast (like myself) or on the west side, the trek to Madison is really a difficult pill to swallow.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
I'm concerned that my son. With autism will have to walk 1.5 miles across 2 busy streets instead of walking 5 blocks to Kellough.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
That Glencoe would no longer feed into Franklin. This would be two bus transfers for my kids in an area they are unfamiliar with. Currently it would be a short bus ride or a 20 minute walk, in a familiar neighborhood. Madison HS is not a good school, their test scores are horrible. I would be ok sending my kids to Grant or even Cleveland.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
Kids west of 82nd not having a safe walking biking route to and from school. .	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
I have concerns about our teenage child having to travel across heavily trafficked artillery (82nd). Our youngest child attends Glencoe and will be commuting with our oldest. This boundary change would create a risk in transporting children across town. Additional our oldest child is able to walk through Mt. Tabor to attend Franklin, if ever needed and this would not be the case to relocate her to Madison. This is not a favorable option for our families well being and would create an undue hardship on our family dynamics.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
I live at the corner of SE 60th and Main, less than a block from the southern line of Glencoe's district border. Our daughter is enrolled in kindergarten there this year. I realize high school is years away, but I am alarmed by your suggested plan which would have my child going to Madison HS instead of Franklin HS. This is fully unacceptable. I live about 6 blocks from Franklin HS. In the winter, when the leaves are down, I can see Fanklin's spire from my home. Rather than have my child enjoy a less than 10 minute walk, you would instead have me drive her 20+ minutes each way, or a 45+ minute bus ride each way, every day. I find this to be both socially and environmentally unconscious. You would have my child create a significant carbon footprint when it could otherwise be zero, waste productive time for both parents and child, and increase exposure to all the risks involved with vehicular transport. This increased commuting time will additionally destroy opportunities for after-school activities as well. Please appreciate that many people take school zones into consideration when making real estate purchases, and my proximity to her current schools, so that she could walk to/from and have friends in the neighborhood played a huge role in my purchase of this property 6 years ago so we could start our family. I am simply aghast at this current proposal. I realize our child is a decade or so away from high school, but I am very clear that she will be attending the high school that is 6 blocks from my home, not commuting to one that is over 3 miles away, and I will diligently fight any ill conceived plan that attempts to suggests otherwise.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
<p>Last night I heard a lot of White parents in affluent neighborhoods complaining that this proposal would require their kid "to cross a busy road" or "leave a neighborhood community that they love." These arguments, to me, reek of White entitlement. Another very unsettling line that I heard last night was "we just voted for PPS to get more money and it feels like PPS isn't returning the trust." In other words, these parents expect PPS to favor their children in exchange for receiving their tax dollars. Please, please, please know that some of us really want to address systemic bias and inequity inherent in the PPS school locations right now. Do not elevate these loud entitled voices.</p> <p>If equity calls for busing our more affluent White students to attend DLI programs in neighborhoods where the historically marginalized BIPOC lives, and for whom the programs are intended to help, please do so. I would be very disappointed if PPS engaged these parents with such a quid pro quo. My family is impacted by proposal, we have skin in the game! Living in South Tabor our 1st grade son will be traveling to Lent. No, it's not the location we signed-up for but YES, it is the program we signed-up for and committed to -- a program we knew was designed to serve a native-speaking population.</p>	Transportation and Safety	Positive Response		
Taking kids away from their walkable, bikeable neighborhood schools and having them be distant commuters on city busses seems ludicrous and counter to safe routes to school. This is a significant hurdle that needs to be discussed.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
With middle school, my children would have to cross many busy streets so I would not feel comfortable with them walking thus necessitating more driving.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
Kids in SE who currently walk to school having to take bus to NE will be a tough sell.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
Increased traffic to move students around to different schools. PPS should provide school bus to transport all the kids to the new school locations.	Transportation and Safety			Statement
Since Grant is our neighborhood school, there is a high likelihood that, if the proposal goes forward has outlined, we will elect to remove our daughters from JMP in order to remain at Grant. If nothing else, Grant is literally blocks away from our house, so there is a very significant transportation cost in moving to Madison.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
I also have concerns about the kids crossing 82nd Ave. to attend Harrison Park. I was looking forward to my kids having freedom and independence to go to and from Middle school on their own and I am not sure there is a safe route for walking from the Bridger neighborhood to Harrison Park. Coupled with my safety concerns I am also getting the sense that we will now be asking nearly everyone losing their neighborhood schools, to travel to their new feeder schools. Is this environmentally the right thing to do?	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
I have already submitted an answer but needed to add one more thought. I failed to mention that under the current proposal and boundaries our new neighborhood school would be Clark. This would require us to cross 82nd and traverse a neighborhood that has very limited sidewalks and or safe routes to either bike or walk to school. Is the City of Portland or PPS planning to provide a safe route to school for families walking from the Bridger neighborhood? I highly doubt it! Shouldn't our children be able to walk or bike to their neighborhood school?Shouldn't the safety of the children take a front seat in these discussions?	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
Do not send Mount Tabor Middle school kids all the way out to Madison. This is a terrible idea. My kids would have to take 2 buses for a 45 minute commute. Franklin is right down the street.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
Our kids long commute to school and impact on their academic achievement	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
We recently moved in anticipation of having our Middle Schooler be able to walk or bike to Franklin. She is looking forward to be allowed to ride her bike to high school alone. If she is sent to Madison we would need to drive her and pick her up every day, never mind additional driving for sports. The neighborhood is important, and breaking up the neighborhoods will harm these children and increase traffic problems around the schools as more parents have to drive their kids, or even worse, send more teenage drivers around because their parents won't be able to drive them so far two to three times a day.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
It looks like a lot of students will be changing school buildings, and transportation will be an issue, especially with covid and bussing. I think that it is important that kids be able to walk to school, if at all possible.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
As a MTMS parent, Madison is the 4th closest high school to us. Franklin, Grant and Benson are all physically closer. Our son has been riding his bike to school solo since 4th grade and as a dual working household, that independence for him is not only physically and mentally healthy, but is vital for our household to function smoothly. If he can not safely bike to and from Madison by himself and the bus simply is either not safe or just takes too long, we'll consider moving him to the All Saints/Central Catholic system. The committee needs to consider the geographic hardship the current proposal places on families in the lower SE that it would zone to Madison. We generally have few concerns about the school itself, we are concerned with the lifestyle result of the commute and many of us would simply leave.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
I don't like that my kids commute changes from 1.5 miles (previously Franklin) but will now be 4 miles if it's changed to Madison.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
further distance from Franklin would mean needing to bus instead of walk	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
I am extremely concerned about the proposal to have Glencoe feed into Madison instead of Franklin. We live within a 10-minute walk away from Franklin, whereas Madison would be a 15-20 minute drive away. The vision of Portland planners is for Portland's neighborhoods to be walkable, and this proposal would take the Glencoe cohort in the *opposite* direction, which is a huge problem, and would, I hope, be a dealbreaker to the PPS Board in their decisionmaking.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
My largest concern at this point is the significant distance that my children will now need to travel to school with a change from going to Franklin to Madison. Again, this is in direct opposition to one of the goals lined out by the coalition. My children have about a seven minute walk along a safe street to Franklin. In order to get to Madison, it is going to be a minimum of 30 minutes one way without traffic or a 45 minute bus trip that includes a transfer. There is no safe bike route to get to Madison from my house. We are a one car family and we believe in biking and walking as much as possible, and with this proposal, we will be looking at seven years of dropping off and picking up 30 minutes minimum each way. My husband and I are strong advocates of neighborhood schools, and this is the main reason we moved into our Mt. Tabor home just a year ago. Given that the coalition is proposing a north east high school as a solution, I do not understand why northeast schools are not being considered as an alternative solution. Specifically, Beaumont should be considered as a transfer to Madison, especially as it would be a safe bike commute for those children. That being said, other schools could then more easily shuffle and still maintain safe travel distances, such as Buckman transferring to Grant.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
We could walk to school and now my kids would have to bus	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
3) Consolidation of all Spanish DLI strands at Lent creates a transpiration burden for both the students in the program and the displaced neighborhood students in Lents who will need to go to a new school outside of their neighborhood (a possibly significant burden given that in PPS's phone surveys of Lent families the feedback was that they don't have a car/have limited transportation options). Lent is not conveniently located for much of SE (let alone the east side of Portland), and since it would be enrolled by lottery its location would likely present a significant challenge to its community when compared with a more centrally located school (e.g. Atkinson). A consequence of moving the DLI programs away from a central geographic location is that it limits the number of opportunities students have to interact together outside of the classroom. Even if bussing to Lent is provided, these families would be less likely to participate in before/after-school activities as their kids would need to adhere to the bus schedule. This is currently an issue at Bridger, and while moving the program may address the issue of students being bussed from Lent to Bridger it will create the inverse issue (Bridger to Lent) as well as create a similar issue for Atkinson. I'm not as familiar with the Chinese DLI programs, but I could see the same situation occurring with the consolidation of the schools.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
The distance needed to travel to get to HS. It seems there are other middle schools closer to Madison and two high schools closer to Mt Tabor. Not happy about the commute.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
We are generally concerned about transportation issues across many of the ideas in the proposal. We will be able to manage the transportation of our children, if necessary. Will others with less privilege?	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
students should be able to go to the school closest to them. Franklin is 1.5 miles from our house, going to school in your neighborhood creates and builds community, making kids leave the neighborhood does the opposite. Madison is 3.7 miles away, so 2.5x as far. This causes much more climate impact bc kids can no longer walk, takes longer for them to get to school, and erodes community. Why not pull kids from middle schools closer to Madison? or just move immersion programs as families who signed up for that already have opted in for a special program and are getting enhanced services so traveling for that makes more sense. We are in the middle of a pandemic and recession and ripping kids away from the school they expected to go to is another trauma that is unnecessary.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
I am extremely concerned about the commute for Glencoe neighborhood students - most of whom can walk to Franklin - to be redirected to Madison. The commute will only serve to highlight inequities among students. We spent the last year looking for a new house with the Glencoe boundaries so our students would be able to walk. We had no information about this proposal. Both our adults in the house work full time and we need the kids to be able to transport themselves. We do not have money to buy a car for kids to drive, and after having used Trimet for many years for our own commutes, we are not convinced it is safe and reliable enough for kid transport without adults. I am appalled that Portland would be considering teaching kids that the best way to get around is to drive. This is the time when they have the best chance of having a walking-biking commute, and making them move from their neighborhood school when it is not their choice (as it is, for instance, when kids enroll in the language programs) is stealing that from the kids.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
The commute for my child.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
Changing the boundary for Atkinson to Woodward which forces kids north of Powell to cross Powell, and likely not be able to walk to school.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
• Most of Mt. Tabor Middle School neighborhood students live within walking distance of Franklin High School. The proposal has Franklin students transitioning to Madison, which requires a 45-minute TriMet commute, including transfer. This goes counter to PPS's own assertion that "most students find their best fit close to home."	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
We live near 54th and Hawthorne. The redrawn middle school boundary moves our school from Mt. Tabor to Harrison Park. It would make it very unlikely that our daughter could walk to school because it is a 50 minute walk, and she'd have to walk along Division and cross 82nd. We understand this is a complex decision, but we hope the coalition does not minimize the impacts on children's ability to walk to school, which we think is very important for their health and development of important life skills.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
We live much closer to Franklin HS than we do to Madison HS. But the proposal changes our HS from Franklin to Madison, which is very inconvenient. Also we are concerned that most of our daughters' friends will end up at Franklin but she'll end up at Madison.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response	Location	
Our plan was to have our kids walk and bike to school, as they currently do. My concern is their safety, for the options that route them to Madison, of the longer route to school. It will double their mileage and they will have to cross a highway to get there. Taking public transportation would require a bus change and an at best commute time of 45 mins.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
Sending my children so far across town. Way too far. .	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
Along with what I said above, I want to know if PPS will provide transportation from S. Tabor to Lent? We don't have a way to drive our kids to school (we rode bikes before).	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
My concern is that families nearest to Madison High School are not having to share the burden of change the way that schools and students farther from Madison are. My fear is that the Coalition and thus PPS do not want to burden more affluent, vocal, and theoretically "lawyered up" families because that will make things harder to push resolutions forward faster. I don't think making decisions soon should be more important than making lasting decisions that will actually work for more people long-term.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
the stretch of 82nd is unsafe with many car accidents for street crossing. 4) combing MIP does not address how Woodstock MIP is 50/50 whereas HP is not.	Transportation and Safety			
If families want their childs in DLI programs have to drive further out eastward.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
significant increase in commute to school,	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
I am concerned that elementary students are traveling outside of their communities to continue to attend their programs. We live in the Woodstock neighborhood and intentionally bought a house there with the hopes of attending the MIP as my daughter is native Chinese and it is a priority for our family to maintain her home language. However, we bought to build community with our neighbors and for her to be able to walk to school safely. I am a solo parent and cannot ferry her around the city. This change would force us to move or drop out of the program.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
The added transportation burden this places on so many families whose students will lose the ability to walk/bike to schools right in their neighborhoods. The current proposal negatively impacts many families in this way, more than it appears to help in other ways.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
<p>6. The second of the CSS-related "Proposal Theme" points is: "We need to consider the effects of relocating the Creative Science School program". I feel that CSS families understand that it may be the most equitable for us to move. Our concerns are:</p> <p>The location of a school should not be discounted. This goes for any school. Yes, as a focus option some parents do provide transportation. However, many families chose to attend because our location is doable for them. Many of our families live within walking distance, and some moved to be close to CSS. Our location in an underserved neighborhood, versus a wealthier one, makes us more accessible to those students.</p>	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
<p>What concerns me is the distance from our home to Madison, we would be driving past another High School to get there which doesn't make sense to me. I always feel that if you were to adjust from Grant to Madison you would lose a lot of students who would like to matriculate into the Japanese HS program but would opt to drop out bc of the high school location. Doesn't make sense!!</p>	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
<p>My concern about this proposal is that Creative Science School will have to move to a location that is too far away from where CSS students currently live.</p>	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
<p>Sending my kids out of the neighborhood for school</p>	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
<p>Why is an original goal of the proposal to eliminate co-located programs? Having more than one DLI program for a certain language enables PPS to serve more families in need across the entire district. For example, consolidating the Chinese DLI program to east Portland will hurt native Chinese families living in west Portland and other areas, because the program is simply too far away from them. If there are concerns about low-performing DLI programs, or "school within a school", then they should be addressed on a case-by-case basis, not eliminate all programs just because they're co-located. The Woodstock DLI program is neither low-performing nor a "school within a school." The program is deeply integrated into the entire school, and parents of students in the neighborhood program have expressed appreciation for the added diversity and cultural experiences the DLI program brings to the entire school.</p> <p>There are native Chinese families who specifically moved to the Woodstock area with the intent to enroll in the Woodstock DLI program. Over the past two decades that the Woodstock DLI program has existed, this has generated ethnic diversity in inner SE Portland. If the DLI program is only offered in east Portland, that will encourage future native Chinese families to live in that area, and over time create segregated schools and an even more segregated city, with white people living inner city and people of color encouraged to live in the outskirts of the city. If native Chinese families aren't able to move to east Portland to attend the proposed sole DLI program, then they will be less likely to maintain their Chinese language skills and achieve as English Language Learners. Every single DLI program is proposed to move to east Portland. This is a prime example of institutional racism and its long term effects on society.</p>	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
<p>The new location is a 30 minutes (two-transfers) away via bus from Woodstock Elementary. I say via bus because that's our only way to commute. There is no way with two full-time working parents that we could get our son to school at the new location and/or pick him up from aftercare in time at the end of the day. He is in his fourth year of the Chinese program and doing very well, but we would have to pull him from immersion if you make him switch school locations because there is no way for us to commute that far. You're going to see a number of kids not be able to continue with the program in their third or fourth year for this reason.</p>	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
too much movement/stress on families without solving overcrowding issues at franklin and no regard for proximity/ease of commute for kids to get to school, particularly at the middle and high school levels where they will often need to find their own ways there	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
My child is a 3 minute walk from Kellogg middle school and yet could be sent to a school almost 2 miles away in which she would have to cross a major busy road...this makes no sense.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
My child would be forced out of atkinson to a school south of Powell which is highly dangerous with no proper cross walks for children all because we are 1 block south of the proposed lines. That is not acceptable.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
I am concerned with Bridger becoming solely Chinese language immersion. I live very close to the school and was looking forward to sending my child to Bridger either for Spanish immersion or as a non-immersion neighborhood school. My specific concern is that my child may not be able to attend the elementary school that I can see from my house (if not admitted to the Chinese Language Program) which would cause great inconvenience and presumably additional burning of fossil fuel to travel further from home. Please reconsider the restructuring of schools that are split immersion/neighborhood, so that children are able to attend the school closest to their home. Additionally, when school is in session traffic dramatically increases from parents picking up their children (sometimes to a dangerous level) - if Bridger were to become entirely non-immersion it seems reasonable to assume more parents would be driving to pick up and drop off their kids, which would increase traffic even more.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
My son's high school commute will be 30-40 minutes each way instead of 10-15. Commutes equal lost sleep and stress. I moved to SE last year to reduce my commute for quality of life for my family	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
I'm most concerned about proximity to neighborhood schools. All students deserve to go to the schools that are closest to them geographically. Not only in reference to Language immersion programs but in reference to middle schools and high schools. My neighborhood schools are Glencoe and Mount Tabor middle school however under the new plan my students would go to Madison high school which is 4 miles from our house. Franklin high school is 10 blocks. Students deserve to go to the schools that are closest to them.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
I am concerned that SE schools are being considered, including feeder patterns to high schools, without simultaneously considering NE and the proximity of some K-8s and MS to Madison as compared to SE schools proposed re-routed to Madison that are much farther away. ---I am concerned that transportation hasn't been considered, especially TRI-Met and availability/efficiency of north-south v. east-west routes.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
3. By changing the feeder program for Mt Tabor away from Franklin High, you are really altering the commute for children. Instead of moving to a high school that is not too far from their middle school, they are now going to a high school 4 miles away. Given how much Portland has grown and how difficult timely commuting is in the city, this change represents a possible huge time addition to these kids commute.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
A longer commute in traffic. Displacing kids at Bridger. Displacing the creative science school	Transportation and Safety			
-Don't shift the Atkinson boundary north from Powell to Woodward. Shifting the boundary would prevent our kids from walking to Atkinson and instead require our kids (west of 57th) to cross Powell Blvd, Foster Blvd, and 52nd ave to get to Creston, and would require our kids (east of 57th) to cross Powell Blvd and Foster Blvd to get to Arleta, resulting in more kids being driven to school. This will result in congested neighborhoods and streets in SE Portland, and unsafe traffic congestion around Lents, Creston and Arleta schools.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
I'm concerned about the segregation of native speaking students to all-immersion schools, some in outer East Portland	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
The transportation and environmental impact. We can walk to Franklin (less than a mile), the Madison campus is 3 miles away, which would prevent walking. The Franklin campus and Clinton park have been part of our community.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
Additionally I am disappointed by the change of our high school from Franklin, which is an easily walk or bikeable 1.5 miles away to Madison, which is over 4 miles away and the path would cross multiple major roads. I realize however that low housing density and the current system of fewer, larger, schools means that perhaps this problem can only be minimized and shifted, not eliminated.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
Many of the Woodstock families would simply drop from the MIP program due to a transportation issues and they want to stay in a current feeder path. Half of the families if not more, live in the neighborhood and made one of their biggest investment of purchasing a home or renting in that neighborhood for the dream of their child attending Woodstock and learning Mandarin. This is true for Chinese and non-Chinese families	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
It will cause hardships for families to get children to schools farther away.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
It is awesome that he can walk to school right now, but I would be more than willing to drive him to Lent or wherever the program ends up because it is very important to our family that he continues to become bilingual. I am also ABLE to drive him there because I have a car, and ample gas money and can be a little bit later to work and it won't matter. Therefore, he won't have to ride a bus for long portion of the morning and afternoon as I've heard many of his classmates and other Bridger families say their children will now have to do this. So I don't mind moving the DLI in favor of equity and what is best for native spanish speaking families, but I have yet to hear from any families from Bridger or the other DLI-S including those at Lent who are in favor of this change which makes me wonder if it is truly equitable. I have also heard about various racial incidents in the Lent neighborhood/park that would leave me fearing for the safety of the kids if this was made an all DLI school and some of the neighborhood families were moved to other school and how this would be perceived by the racists in this community who felt like white kids were being "forced" out so kids could learn Spanish?!?! I have heard this from people with strong ties to Lent including a current teacher there so I am not making it up. They could be targeted by white supremacists.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
Huge concerns about Mt Tabor students feeding to Madison instead of Franklin. This change would make my children's commute to HS much longer, reduce options for public transportation, not be a safe route to school.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
Madison would be my neighborhood school as well as with the JMP program. It's quite far from where we are located on lower Tabor; it's much further than Franklin. It's unsettling for my kids to be so far away in case of an emergency and for general commuting issues.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
People moved to certain areas because of the schools and the DLI. Moving these programs will create much disruption and heartache.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
That our school, Creative Science School has no determined building or location. We live very close and if the school moved far away this would be a big challenge for us. It doesn't exactly create confidence in the planning that this plan would leave a whole population of kids un-accounted for at the onset. This is a deal-breaker for my interest or approval of this plan.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
This is a huge move and doesn't take into account the further travel.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
6) As high school students can take public transportation to school, you should look at high school balancing separately. Many families have moved to neighborhoods because the parents want these programs locally, and now that they have moved, if you move the program, these lowest SES of this group will be left behind without the DLI program, as their parents cannot trek them across town. 7) I'd like to see a city transportation report as to the increased cars on the road if 1000's of children no longer can bike or walk to school	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
I have concerns about transportation given that families moved to the Woodstock area specifically to attend Woodstock. It makes a walkable solution the exact opposite.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
I have concerns about my children having to commute 300% farther than they would in the current set up. Research shows the negative impact of such long commutes on adolescent sleep. Which we also know that poorer sleep in adolescents increases the risk for depression and anxiety.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
and would make the commute to/from school harder for us as parents since it would be a greater distance away	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
The reason we chose to live where we do is because Franklin is an easy bike or walk from our house. Madison is not and that will affect how our children can participate in school programs and extracurricular activities. It also breaks apart the community that we have built here.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
I'm concerned for the families that have children in dual language programs, it feels like it could put a lot of stress on these families to have to relocate, or choose to lose their communities do to difficulties with logistics/transportation.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
CSS needs a home or to be part of a school.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
As much as possible, families plan their lives, including the largest investment they will make in their lives - their homes - based on where they plan for their children to go. They make huge financial sacrifices based on what they can manage for access. These decisions that disrupt a family's long term decisions are really upsetting, and in the case of a Language Immersion program, don't reflect what will actually materialize in the school if children are redirected.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
5) In moving students from their neighborhood schools to different locations miles away, the plan exacerbates transportation impacts rather than limiting them.	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
Longer distance to school. Students will have to cross a major highway	Transportation and Safety	Negative Response		
This shows Franklin moving from 108.8% capacity to 107.2%, and the 2024 forecast being 116% either way. Given that PPS will surely need to address this overcrowding in the near future why are we considering sweeping boundary changes that don't address this problem? When does PPS plan to redraw boundaries to fix overcrowding?	Utilization	Negative Response	Overcrowding	
I have a senior at Franklin. These changes do not affect her. I also have a sophomore at Grant High School (not at option above to choose from). She is in the Japanese Immersion Program. It appears from what I can discern, that the JMP may not move to Madison until 2022. I feel very strongly that she is able to finish high school at Grant AND remain in the JMP.	Utilization	Negative Response		

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
<p>I'm concerned that JMP program will be moved from Grant to Madison and that is a very recent change which was not included in the earlier proposals. I think this will make a big impact on the program since Madison will be much farther for most existing families in the program who live more in central city and therefore have a large transportation impact on students. We actually live in Grant neighborhood, but my children will have to choose between staying in the program or going to Grant. I am sure this will cause my current Grant student to quit JMP to stay at Grant. It seems like most of the DLI programs are being moved to the outskirts of the city which limits access to these programs for those who live more centrally. I'm also concerned that this evaluation/proposal is being done for SE in isolation but both Grant and Madison are in NE. If we are making changes that impact NE schools, I think we should be looking at both NE & SE holistically. I'm concerned that we could be impacted again in the future if they decide more NE schools need to feed to Madison. This proposal also doesn't seem to address the issue of utilization of the highschoools. Utilization changes are pretty minor at Madison and Cleveland and Franklin is still forecasted to be significantly over utilized. If we are making so many changes to feeder schools and impacting so many families, we need to address utilization at all of the highschoools.</p>	Utilization	Negative Response		
<p>It does not improve (reduce) over-utilization at Franklin. Boundary changes to schools west of 52nd are generally not being considered. It creates under-utilization at an otherwise well-balanced site (Atkinson) and leaves another highly successful program (CSS) without a definite home.</p>	Utilization	Negative Response		
<p>I am very concerned that the proposal does not alter the 2024 projections for the over-utilization of Franklin. I find it befuddling that during this process, Madison and Cleveland would boast utilization of 90%, while Franklin is over capacity at 116%. This has long been a problem at Franklin (as a Franklin alum myself, I have memories of my desk in math class being a windowsill) and I would think that if it wasn't sufficiently addressed when the building was redesigned and added to, now would be the moment for correction. The Cleveland feeder pattern draws from mostly wealthier and whiter neighborhoods in Portland; I see that there is some diversity improvement over the current socioeconomic statistics of Cleveland, but I'm not sure the changes go far enough, in light of how Franklin's capacity will be strained.</p> <p>Speaking as a parent, I would really value the presence of a DLI program at my neighborhood school, even if my child were not a participant. I think the presence and embrace of additional languages, and all of the rich cultural exposure that comes along with it, has great potential to meaningfully enhance my white children's ability to navigate a world where they will not be the majority. I do believe that siloing these programs in their own buildings may reduce the integration of bilinguality as a norm and value in our community that continues to perceive white as majority; I think we would do well to equip white children with the opportunities to navigate cross-cultural and cross-lingual experiences in order to educate them as anti-racists.</p> <p>I am extremely disappointed about the transition away from K-8 to K-5, but I assume that ship has sailed, so I will withhold further comment on that subject.</p>	Utilization	Negative Response		
<p>It seems that in the pursuit of utilization there seems to be less regard preserving communities (either locational or cultural). In addition, the Japanese DLI program is pushed further and further out from where it seems many of the families live.</p>	Utilization	Negative Response		
<p>Moving the Chinese DLI 9-12 from Cleveland to Franklin crowds Franklin even though there's no crowding issue at Cleveland currently.</p> <p>Arleta, HP, Lane, Vestal and Woodstock will be very under-utilized.</p>	Utilization	Negative Response		

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
I am concerned about under-enrolled elementary schools - Creston and Woodstock for example. Hard to build community with an empty school - and knowing that it's a full year makes it hard to 'move forward' as a school knowing that more changes are coming with boundary adjustments the following year. At Woodstock we'd lose half of our school. What does that do to funding/staffing? Would we be at risk of closing? Or getting another program added? Why not just keep our successful co-location program as is?	Utilization	Negative Response		
Changes to Creston boundaries that leave the school under enrolled and disrupts our minority students	Utilization	Negative Response		
Domino effect of under-enrollment/redistricting in phase 2 if the MIP is moved	Utilization	Negative Response		
I'm concerned that you're taking DLI out of their neighborhood schools and displacing the current school communities that you're putting the DLI into. I'm very concerned with the overpopulation of Franklin.	Utilization	Negative Response		
Atkinson and other neighborhood schools eventually closing based on dwindling enrollment	Utilization	Negative Response		
Atkinson would be severely under-enrolled. What are the plans to address this, or is the District thinking that Atkinson would eventually close?	Utilization	Negative Response		
<p>The SE Guiding Coalition's Phase 1 mandate was to enroll Kellogg Middle School, identify a second comprehensive middle school in Southeast, and convert current K-8 schools to K-5. PPS communications on the Coalition's work have consistently tied it to the reopening of Kellogg, concealing the true breadth of change included in the Coalition's proposal. The current proposal vastly outsteps that mandate, by introducing school boundary changes and altering feeder patterns without input from each community impacted.</p> <p>This breakdown, in both process and communication, has created uncertainty and mistrust in PPS. This has been a rushed process in a time when families are already overwhelmed with distance learning, battling unemployment, political uncertainty, and the pressure of a global pandemic.</p> <p>The coalition should stick to its original mandate and stop any re-boundarying and feeder changes without first ensuring all impacted communities – including students – have a seat at the table.</p> <p>PPS should publish data that clearly demonstrates how any decisions made by PPS's SE rebalancing efforts will optimize the use of school facilities and help achieve racial equity and social justice.</p> <p>If NE schools are solutions to SE's "rebalancing" efforts, then all Eastside schools should be part of the conversation. Why are Laurelhurst, Beaumont, Alameda, Sunnyside, Cleveland, Grant, etc. immune?</p> <p>This proposal does nothing to address overcrowding at Franklin, leaving it on pace to be at 116% capacity by 2024. There is no point in adopting sweeping changes that do not address this problem.</p> <p>Most of Mt. Tabor Middle School neighborhood students live within walking distance of Franklin High School. The proposal has Franklin students transitioning to Madison, which requires a 45-minute TriMet commute, including transfer. This goes counter to PPS's own assertion that "most students find their best fit close to home."</p>	Utilization	Negative Response		

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
The numerous unresolved enrollment issues: multiple underenrolled K-5s, underenrolled Lane MS, overcrowded Franklin. Without closing any of the K-5s, I don't see how we can achieve healthy enrollment numbers at these schools.	Utilization	Negative Response		
I'm an Atkinson + Mt Tabor parent, neighborhood programs. I'm Vietnamese and my kids are mixed race. We have friends in the Spanish DLI. We moved to this neighborhood specifically for the SAFE walking and biking distance. Atkinson used to have a Mandarin program when we started. We loved the diverse community and over the past 2 to 3 years, but Asian families moved away without the Chinese language. We face under-enrollment and closure without DLI.	Utilization	Negative Response		
No confirmed location for Creative Science and no existing building currently within PPS that could be used to move it too. A location needs to be nailed down, and not just a stop gap location, before any proposals of dislocating an entire school community are approved/finalized.	Utilization	Negative Response		
We are concerned that the proposal could cause long-term under-enrollment at Atkinson that could lead to the closure of the school in the future.	Utilization	Negative Response		
I don't like that it looks like schools like Woodstock will be extremely underutilized. Is the intention to close Woodstock????	Utilization	Negative Response		
Taking kids away from Atkinson would potentially lead to it's closure, which would be a huge loss for this community.	Utilization			
SE doesn't have the numbers to fill 2 new middle schools (Kellogg & Harrison Park). What about poor Lane? (Enrollment projections indicate Harrison Park could house HP & Lane middle-schoolers.) Does finalization of elem-to-MS feeder patterns in deep SE in Phase 1 stick Lane with continued underenrollment that can't be corrected in Phase 2? Franklin overenrollment is concerning. Woodstock underenrollment is concerning. Creative Science conversion to Clark K-5 seems unnecessary at this point - particularly with massively underenrolled Vestal RIGHT THERE . Underenrolled K-5s are going to be a problem in SE. Let's not create another one.	Utilization	Negative Response		
•This proposal does nothing to address overcrowding at Franklin, leaving it on pace to be at 116% capacity by 2024. There is no point in adopting sweeping changes that do not address this problem.	Utilization	Negative Response		
concern 2: detrimental effects to dual immersion program, therefore will significantly reduce enrollment.	Utilization	Negative Response		
That there is no building for Creative Science and that you will split us up or dismantle our lovely school.	Utilization	Negative Response		
Combining all locations for each DLI program into one building. That segregates each ELL population, as well as adding a transportation burden for them, since they have only one location option to travel to.	Utilization	Negative Response	Transportation	
CSS doesn't have a home! I can't even evaluate this plan as it basically leaves our school completely out. This is causing significant stress to the two students in our home. I'm worried that CSS will be co-housed within another school, thus reverting it back to a "program" and adding stress to the administration and teachers. I'm worried about separating the K-8 program that works so well for so many of the CSS families.	Utilization	Negative Response		
Does not serve the Mandarin students well by removing them from Woodstock, Hosford & Cleveland. My child is in the Mandarin Immersion 6th grade at Hosford program. Forcing her out of Hosford and into a new middle school does not serve this program or students. We were also looking forward to our student having the Cleveland HS IB experience along with the Mandarin program. Franklin is not an IB school so that opportunity is now no longer an option for any of the Mandarin program students.	Utilization	Negative Response		
My other concern is about whether a new space for Creative Science School will be large enough to have a K-8 program.	Utilization	Negative Response		

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
The Arleta boundaries seem to change slightly.	Utilization	Positive Response		
Creative science has no building	Utilization	Negative Response		
We do not like the idea of moving our dual language immersion program out of our neighborhood school. It enriches the whole school with cultural programs and increased diversity. We value having the program at Woodstock.	Utilization	Negative Response		
1. It seems incredibly irresponsible to take Creative Science School, a long standing and beloved program with more than 400 students, out of it's current building with no new location planned. That is only half a plan. But going forward so quickly with scenario 10, you are simply displacing a different group of students and opening up the very real possibility that their school lives will be incredibly altered. Without having an actual location in place BEFORE moving CSS out of it's space, you are also creating a very real scenario where it is later decided that CSS needs to be split up or moved far or dissolved when it is found that there is no space for them	Utilization	Negative Response		
Concerned about stress on PPS staff - teachers, principals. This seems like so much to rebuild (new schools, new configurations, after distance learning) in such a short time. I really hope principals and teachers are given voice so they will be able to best serve all students.	Utilization	Negative Response		
No identified location for Creative Science School. Strange that Whitman feeds to Lane, and then to Cleveland (split from peers). Franklin still looks to be overcrowded in short time. If Woodstock loses Chinese DLI, will it be under-enrolled? Or would boundaries change to capture more students in Woodstock school?	Utilization	Negative Response		
If combining Harrison Park and Woodstock's MIP program, there will be about 70 students per grade, assuming that all students will transfer there (which is unlikely). How can the current Bridger school be able to accommodate so many students if PPS' goal is not to use modular buildings?	Utilization	Negative Response		
Not clear to me that the current proposal actually meets the stated goals - why would we move Tabor kids to Madison to reduce overcrowding at Franklin if data forecasts future overcrowding at Franklin anyway.	Utilization	Negative Response		
If we need more spaces in the immersion programs then we should create more options in collaboration with neighborhood schools.	Utilization	Negative Response		
I am concerned that PPS has allowed the Clark building to be a part of this process without identifying an available campus for Creative Science.	Utilization	Negative Response		
3) This proposal does not answer the aims set out at the meeting, as it does not minimize the use of portable classrooms, nor does it bring balance to school enrollment. Many elementary schools would be under-enrolled once DLI leaves. And other schools will need portables to accommodate the DLI students.	Utilization	Negative Response		
2) This proposal has not taken the attrition and reduced enrollment from dual language immersion programs into account in the rebalancing numbers and statistics. Because the academic requirements do not allow for classes to be backfilled as students withdraw, the classes will be noticeably empty when students choose to withdraw to continue on with their neighborhood school track. Meanwhile, the problem this rebalancing seeks to address will continue to persist as the immersion schools are well under the forecast utilization and neighborhood programs are well above it and the income and diversity will respectively continue to polarize at the respective schools.	Utilization	Negative Response		
4. Inner city schools, esp Hosford, Cleveland, and Woodstock will lose a majority of their diversity and Woodstock will be underutilized.	Utilization	Negative Response		

Survey Response - What concerns do you have about this proposal? *If multiple topics please breakout statements so we can identify multiple themes	Theme	Positive or Negative Response	Alternative Theme (if not listed in column B) Please describe	Notes
4) The theme of avoiding high school overcrowding isn't present as the plan does nothing to address overcrowding at Franklin High School and the utilization at Cleveland is virtually unchanged. The proposal only hits the target 60-80% utilization in fewer schools named in the proposal than the utilization report says would achieve it in 2024 if nothing were done.	Utilization	Negative Response		
I don't like that the proposal pulls a diverse mix of kids out of the Lent neighborhood school (which they can walk to) and buses them miles up the road to Clark, leaving the Lent school under-enrolled with many kids from outside of the neighborhood. It seems to me that the proposed scenario will see Lent School even further reduced in enrollment as parents who had their kids in Spanish DLI programs choose instead to send them to closer schools.	Utilization	Negative Response		
No idea				
Where the new school will be located in relation to my home or work and if you will be splitting up the grades into two schools.				
Current evaluation of Madison high school.				Statement