North Quadrant Key Peformance Indicators

2015-16 Enrollment Snapshot

		K-12 St	udents in the	e Neighborh	ood									K-12	2 Stud	dent	s Enr	olled	at the School	
School	Туре	Students in Neighborhood (K-12)	Capture Rate	% in Poverty (Neighborhood) 2014-15 Data	% HU Race (Neighborhood)	Enrollment (K-12)	Avg Enroll / Grade (Entire School)	% Enrollment in Poverty - 2014-15 Data	% Enrollment HU Race	Facility Utilization	DLI Spanish	DLI Russian	DLI Mandarin	DLI Vietnamese	DLI Japanese	Themed Focus	Special Ed Focus Rooms	Pre K	Assigned Middle School	Assigned High School
Astor	К8	509	70.1%	33.3%	26.3%	493	54.8	36.2%	27.6%	108.6%							у		Astor	Roosevelt
Beach	K8	562	63.5%	32.1%	37.4%	631	70.1	34.3%	49.8%	97.8%	у								Beach	Jefferson / Roosevelt
César Chávez	K8	468	63.9%	65.2%	67.1%	5 2 2	58.0	60.1%	76.6%	103.1%	у								César Chávez	Roosevelt
Chief Joseph	K8	758	55.4%	31.5%	28.5%	604	67.1	35.9%	28.8%	62.1%									Chief Joseph	Jefferson / Roosevelt
Faubion	K8	644	59.3%	39.7%	52.6%	479	53.2	45.4%	61.0%	87.4%								у	Faubion	Jefferson / Madison, Jefferson / Roosev
George	MS	62 3	54.3%	54.9%	58.7%	369	123.0	64.6%	64.0%	76.3%							У			Roosevelt
James John	ES	544	61.9%	44.3%	42.1%	429	71.5	55.1%	51.5%	94.0%	у						у		George	Roosevelt
Ockley Green								0.0%												
Peninsula	K8	359	56.%	34.7%	43.5%	374	41.6	40.9%	48.4%	83.2%							у		Peninsula	Roosevelt
Rosa Parks	ES	488	57.4%	70.1%	69.9%	329	54.8	78.9%	74.2%	74.4%									George	Roosevelt
Sitton	ES	530	66.4%	54.8%	56.0%	390	65.0	64.4%	60.5%	104.9%	у						у	у	George	Roosevelt
Woodlawn	K8	661	44.%	44.7%	58.2%	426	47.3	57.1%	73.2%	89.6%							у	у	Woodlawn	Jefferson / Roosevelt

Notes:

Oct 1 2015 data and capture rates were used for this analysis. Enrollment figures do not include PreK.

HU Race is Historically Underserved by race/ethnicity, including Black, Hispanic, Native American, and Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander.

% in Poverty is the number of students who qualify for free meals through direct certification by the State of Oregon. Direct Certification numbers reflect 2014-15 data.

Number re-assigned refers to the sum of students both re-assigned *into* and *out of* the school neighborhood and is a measure of change to a school neighborhood. Note that summing the Number re-assigned schools does not equal the total number of students reassigned at the district level, as students are counted *both* for the neighborhood from which they were re-assigned and the neighborhood to which they were re-assigned.

More than 40% of students in poverty (see note)Underenrolled or overcrowded

The following elementary, K8, and middle schools have co-located focus option programs: Ainsworth, Atkinson, Beach, Beaumont, Bridger, Cesar Chavez, Hayhurst, Hosford, Kelly, King, James John, Lane, Lent, Mt. Tabor, Rigler, Roseway Heights, Scott, Sitton, West Sylvan, and Woodstock.

Average enrollment per grade using 2015-16 enrollment data is shown as under-enrolled if below 50 students per grade. The average enrollment per grade using 2020 forecast data is shown as under-enrolled if below 45 students per grade to allow flexibility for forecast enrollment and staffing formula changes.

(see page 2 for additional notes)

v. 1/9/2016 12:03 PM Page 1 of 20

					Iadrant Key I Scenario C Enrollment Per Gr	omparison						
Current Sta	te - Current Data		Current State - Fo	recast 2020 Data	Scenario 1 - Co	urrent Data	Scenario 1 - Fore	ecast 2020 Data	Scenario 2 - 0	Current Data	Scenario 2 - Fore	cast 2020 Data
School	Enrollment	Average Enrollment Per Grade	Enrollment 2020	Average Enrollment Per Grade 2020	Enrollment	Average Enrollment Per Grade	Enrollment	Average Enrollment Per Grade	Enrollment	Average Enrollment Per Grade	Enrollment	Average Enrollment Per Grade
Astor	493	54.8	529	58.7	480	53.3	510	56.6	480	53.3	510	56.6
Beach	631	70.1	649	72.1	478	79.6	473	78.9	478	79.6	473	78.9
César Chávez	522	58.0	589	65.4	360	60.0	413	68.8	360	60.0	413	68.8
Chief Joseph	604	67.1	\$91	65.7	332	55.3	332	55.3	332	55.3	332	55.3
Faubion	479			53.8		51.0			459	51.0		53.8
George	369			136.2		148.3			445	148.3	499	
James John	429	71.5	424	70.7	429	71.5			429		424	70.7
Ockley Green					481	160.4			600	199.8	709	
Peninsula	374	41.6		42.0		48.3			404	44.8	408	
Rosa Parks	329			50.5		54.8			329	54.8		
Sitton	390	65.0		60.8		65.0			390	65.0		
Woodlawn	426	47.3	398	44.3	373	62.2	353	58.8	373	62.2	353	58.8

Notes (continued):

Enrollment for each scenario is estimated using capture rates. Because these are applied to different boundary areas and to different grade configurations/schools in each scenario, the estimated total enrollment for the district changes between scenarios.

Current enrollment may not match the official October 1st 2015-16 enrollment because pre-K students are not included in the current enrollment.

Not all schools are shown. Schools without neighborhood assignments and high schools are not shown.

Utilization figures account for existing immersion programs that are growing, special education learning centers and focus classrooms, and existing pre-K classrooms.

			North Q	uadrant Key P Scenario Co		dicators			
		Over-Crowdin	g (Facility Utilization				# Students	Reassigned in or out of	Neighborhood
School	Current State - Current Data	Current State - Forecast 2020 Data	Scenario 1 - Current Data	Scenario 1 - Forecast 2020 Data	Scenario 2 - Current Data	Scenario 2 - Forecast 2020 Data	School	Scenario 1 - Number Reassigned	Scenario 2 - Number Reassigned
Astor	108.6%	114.5%	105.9%	110.8%	105.9%	110.8%	Astor	19	19
Beach	97.8%	100.4%	70.9%	70.0%	70.9%	70.0%	Beach	258	258
César Chávez	103.1%	114.1%	70.3%	78.5%	70.3%	78.5%	César Chávez	140	140
Chief Joseph	62.1%	60.4%	89.0%	88.9%	89.0%	88.9%	Chief Joseph	424	424
Faubion	87.4%	90.5%	87.4%	90.5%	87.4%	90.5%	Faubion	0	0
George	76.3%	82.1%	88.7%	96.9%	88.7%	96.9%	George	140	140
James John	94.0%	92.4%	94.0%	92.4%	94.0%	92.4%	James John	0	0
Ockley Green			77.0%	83.1%	93.6%	107.6%	Ockley Green	775	
Peninsula	83.2%	83.7%	62.5%	62.0%	88.6%	89.1%	Peninsula	139	53
Rosa Parks	74.4%	69.4%	74.4%	69.4%	74.4%	69.4%	Rosa Parks	0	0
Sitton	104.9%	99.3%	102.8%	97.3%	102.8%	97.3%	Sitton	0	0
Woodlawn	89.6%	86.4%	74.2%	71.0%	74.2%	71.0%	Woodlawn	261	

		North Qua	drant Key Pefo	rmance Indicators			
			Scenario Compa	rison			
Neighborh	nood Poverty Levels (Usi	ng Direct Certification	n)	Neighbo	rhood Percent Historically	y Underserved Ra	ice
School	Current State - % Direct Certified 2014-15 Data	Scenario 1 - % Direct Certified 2014-15 Data	Scenario 2 - % Direct Certified 2014-15 Data	School	Current State - % Historically Underserved	Scenario 1 - % Historically Underserved	Scenario 2 - % Historically Underserved
Astor	33.3%	32.1%	32.1%	Astor	26.3%	25.7%	25.7%
Beach	32.1%	29.9%	29.9%	Beach	37.4%	33.7%	33.7%
César Chávez	65.2%	67.2%	67.2%	César Chávez	67.1%	67.4%	67.4%
Chief Joseph	31.5%	26.9%	26.9%	Chief Joseph	28.5%	24.0%	24.0%
Faubion	39.7%	39.7%	39.7%	Faubion	52.6%	52.6%	52.6%
George	54.9%	55.8%	55.8%	George	58.7%	60.2%	60.2%
James John	44.3%	44.3%	44.3%	James John	42.1%	42.1%	42.1%
Ockley Green		37.7%	39.5%	Ockley Green		43.1%	41.5%
Peninsula	34.7%	39.0%	37.6%	Peninsula	43.5%	40.8%	43.7%
Rosa Parks	70.1%	70.1%	70.1%	Rosa Parks	69.9%	69.9%	69.9%
Sitton	54.8%	54.8%	54.8%	Sitton	56.0%	56.0%	56.0%
Woodlawn	44.7%	44.2%	44.2%	Woodlawn	58.2%	55.5%	55.5%

North Quadrant Key Peformance Indicators

Scenario Comparison

Configuration and Boundary Changes

School	Current State	Scenario 1 Configuration	Scenario 1 Boundary Change	Scenario 2 Configuration	Scenario 2 Boundary Change
Astor	K8	K8	X	K8	x
Beach	K8	ES	x	ES	X
César Chávez	K8	ES		ES	
Chief Joseph	K8	ES	x	ES	х
Faubion	K8	K8		K8	
George	MS	MS	x	MS	x
James John	ES	ES		ES	
Ockley Green		MS	х	MS	х
Peninsula	K8	ES	х	K8	x
Rosa Parks	ES	ES		ES	
Sitton	ES	ES		ES	
Woodlawn	K8	ES	x	ES	x

Scenario 1 Reconfigurations: 6
Scenario 1 Boundary Changes: 7

Scenario 1 Reconfigurations: 5
Scenario 1 Boundary Changes: 7

Northeast Quadrant Key Peformance Indicators

2015-16 Enrollment Snapshot

		K-12 St	udents in th	e Neighborh	ood									K-12	Stud	lents	s Enr	rolled	at the School	
School	Туре	Students in Neighborhood (K-12)	Capture Rate	% in Poverty (Neighborhood) 2014-15 Data	% HU Race (Neighborhood)	Enrollment (K-12)	Avg Enroll / Grade (Entire School)	% Enrollment in Poverty - 2014-15 Data	% Enrollment HU Race	Facility Utilization	DLI Spanish	DLI Russian	DLI Mandarin	DLI Vietnamese	DLI Japanese	Themed Focus	Special Ed Focus Rooms	Pre K	Assigned Middle School	Assigned High School
Alameda	ES	744	86.2%	2.8%	5.8%	730	121.7	4.9%	4.9%	99.4%							У		Beaumont	Grant
Beaumont	MS	642	71.2%	27.6%	32.2%	571	190.3	25.8%	34.0%	84.1%	у						У			Grant, Madison
Beverly Cleary	K8	1003	78.3%	7.7%	9.6%	859	95.4		9.8%	118.4%							у		Beverly Cleary	Grant
Boise-Eliot/Humboldt	K8	649	54.5%	48.6%	53.5%	540	60.0	58.9%	71.6%	87.2%							у	у	Boise-Eliot/Humbold	Jefferson / Grant
Irvington	K8	497	70.6%	13.9%	21.3%	493	54.8	22.5%	28.0%	85.1%							у		Irvington	Grant
King	К8	374	58.3%	51.6%	61.0%	400	44.4	62.2%	74.7%	69.9%			у				у	у	King	Jefferson / Grant
Laurelhurst	К8	703	85.4%	6.8%	8.8%	691	76.8	8.9%	8.5%	105.9%									Laurelhurst	Grant
Lee	K8	568	66.%	45.5%	37.5%	456	50.7	49.0%	37.1%	103.9%							у		Lee	Madison
Rigler	ES	565	71.%	56.9%	64.6%	451	75.2	61.9%	70.5%	89.5%	у								Beaumont	Madison
Rose City Park																				
Roseway Heights	К8	561	72.9%	22.3%	9.8%	697	77.4	30.5%	13.5%	100.1%				у			у		Roseway Heights	Madison
Sabin	K8	705	64.8%	18.5%	24.1%	568	63.1	18.1%	24.1%	88.3%									Sabin	Grant
Scott	K8	663	60.%	49.6%	53.4%	473	52.6	60.3%	69.3%	96.8%	у						у		Scott	Madison
Tubman					ľ			0.0%												
Vernon	К8	644	53.7%	30.9%	32.1%	407	45.2	38.1%	38.1%	77.2%								у	Vernon	Jefferson / Madison
Vestal	K8	633	53.7%	40.0%	26.7%	412	45.8	52.6%	35.9%	96.5%							у	у	Vestal	Madison

				Northeast (Quadrant Ke	y Peformai	nce Indicator	S				
						Comparison						
				Average	Enrollment Per G	rade (Neighborh	nood Strand)					
Current Sta	ite - Current Data		Current State - Fo	recast 2020 Data	Scenario 1 - C	urrent Data	Scenario 1 - Fore	ecast 2020 Data	Scenario 2 -	Current Data	Scenario 2 - Fore	cast 2020 Data
School	Enrollment	Average Enrollment Per Grade	Enrollment 2020	Average Enrollment Per Grade 2020	Enrollment	Average Enrollment Per Grade	Enrollment	Average Enrollment Per Grade	Enrollment	Average Enrollment Per Grade	Enrollment	Average Enrollment Per Grade
Alameda	730	121.7	707	117.8	730	121.7	707	117.8	680	113.3	650	108.3
Beaumont	571	190.3	592	197.5	571	190.3	592	197.5	550	183.5	568	189.2
Beverly Cleary	859	95.4	880	97.8	507	168.9	581	193.7	677	75.2	692	76.8
Boise-Eliot/Humboldt	540	60.0	554	61.6	400	66.7	422	70.4	530	58.9	571	63.5
Irvington	493	54.8	476	52.9	473	78.9	457	76.1	493	54.8	476	52.9
King	400	44.4	512	56.9	358	59.7	469	78.2	358	59.7	469	78.2
Laurelhurst	691	76.8	717	79.6	931	155.2	896	149.3	652	72.4	678	75.4
Lee	456	50.7	483	53.6	415	69.1	432	72.0	337	56.2	352	58.7
Rigler	451	75.2	468	78.0	451	75.2	468	78.0	451	75.2	468	78.0
Rose City Park									486	81.0	487	81.1
Roseway Heights	697	77.4	816	90.7	580	193.2	609	203.0	666	222.1	713	
Sabin	568			64.7	466	77.7	449		568			
Scott	473	52.6	467	51.9		85.5	495	82.6	394	65.7	382	63.7
Tubman					543	181.1	689	229.6				
Vernon	407	45.2	421	46.8	343	57.2	343	57.2	343	57.2	343	57.2
Vestal	412	45.8	421	46.8	320	53.3	486	80.9	320	53.3	486	80.9

			Northeast	Quadrant Key	y Peformance	Indicators			
				Scenario C	omparison				
		Over-Crowdin	g (Facility Utilization	n)			# Students F	Reassigned in or out of	Neighborhood
School	Current State - Current Data	Current State - Forecast 2020 Data	Scenario 1 - Current Data	Scenario 1 - Forecast 2020 Data	Scenario 2 - Current Data	Scenario 2 - Forecast 2020 Data	School	Scenario 1 - Number Reassigned	Scenario 2 - Number Reassigned
Alameda	99.4%	96.7%	99.4%	96.7%	93.5%	90.0%	Alameda	0	58
Beaumont	84.1%	86.3%	84.1%	86.3%	81.7%	83.3%	Beaumont	0	29
Beverly Cleary	118.4%	121.1%	69.0%	77.9%	94.7%	96.5%	Beverly Cleary	1071	232
Boise-Eliot/Humboldt	87.2%	91.1%	64.7%	67.3%	88.6%	93.5%	Boise-Eliot/Humboldt	244	96
Irvington	85.1%	81.1%	71.2%	69.0%	85.1%	81.1%	Irvington	342	0
King	69.9%	92.1%	61.9%	81.2%	61.9%	81.2%	King	187	187
Laurelhurst	105.9%	109.6%	102.9%	99.2%	79.3%	82.3%	Laurelhurst	729	45
Lee	103.9%	108.2%	87.3%	89.6%	75.4%	77.5%	Lee	274	158
Rigler	89.5%	92.1%	89.5%	92.1%	89.5%	92.1%	Rigler	0	0
Rose City Park					82.0%	80.3%	Rose City Park		570
Roseway Heights	100.1%	121.3%	78.9%	82.1%	88.2%	93.2%	Roseway Heights	936	1034
Sabin	88.3%	90.5%	66.6%	64.6%	88.3%	90.5%	Sabin	181	0
Scott	96.8%	95.7%	93.1%	90.4%	76.5%	74.6%	Scott	429	243
Tubman			74.5%	92.6%			Tubman	652	
Vernon	77.2%	79.3%	60.7%	61.1%	60.7%	61.1%	Vernon	149	149
Vestal	96.5%	97.6%	70.1%	101.4%	70.1%	101.4%	Vestal	199	199

		Northeast Q	uadrant Key Pe	formance Indicators
Neighborh	ood Poverty Levels (Us	ing Direct Certificatio	n)	Neighborhood
School	Current State - % Direct Certified 2014-15 Data	Scenario 1 - % Direct Certified 2014-15 Data	Scenario 2 - % Direct Certified 2014-15 Data	School
Alameda	2.8%	2.8%	2.8%	Alameda
Beaumont	27.6%	27.6%	28.9%	Beaumont
Beverly Cleary	7.7%	9.3%	7.9%	Beverly Cleary
Boise-Eliot/Humboldt	48.6%	46.5%	48.8%	Boise-Eliot/Humboldt
Irvington	13.9%	11.4%	13.9%	Irvington
King	51.6%	46.0%	46.0%	King
Laurelhurst	6.8%	7.2%	6.1%	Laurelhurst
Lee	45.5%	39.5%		Lee
Rigler	56.9%	56.9%	56.9%	Rigler
Rose City Park			15.2%	Rose City Park
Roseway Heights	22.3%	38.3%	33.7%	Roseway Heights
Sabin	18.5%	18.4%	18.5%	Sabin
Scott	49.6%	40.8%	47.9%	Scott

30.9%

40.0%

38.4% 27.8%

41.3%

27.8%

41.3%

Tubman

Vernon

Vestal

School	Current State - % Historically Underserved	Scenario 1 - % Historically Underserved	Scenario 2 - % Historically Underserved
Alameda	5.8%	5.8%	5.8%
Beaumont	32.2%	32.2%	33.6%
Beverly Cleary	9.6%	12.6%	10.6%
Boise-Eliot/Humboldt	53.5%	55.9%	55.8%
Irvington	21.3%	17.1%	21.3%
King	61.0%	55.2%	55.2%
Laurelhurst	8.8%	9.0%	9.1%
Lee	37.5%	29.9%	35.8%
Rigler	64.6%	64.6%	64.6%
Rose City Park			7.2%
Roseway Heights	9.8%	36.1%	31.5%
Sabin	24.1%	24.2%	24.1%
Scott	53.4%	38.0%	48.3%
Tubman		40.8%	
Vernon	32.1%	30.3%	30.3%
Vestal	26.7%	23.5%	23.5%

Neighborhood Percent Historically Underserved Race

Northeast Quadrant Key Peformance Indicators

Scenario Comparison

Configuration and Boundary Changes

School	Current State	Scenario 1 Configuration	Scenario 1 Boundary Change	Scenario 2 Configuration	Scenario 2 Boundary Change
Alameda	ES	ES		ES	x
Beaumont	MS	MS		MS	x
Beverly Cleary	K8	MS	x	K8	x
Boise-Eliot/Humboldt	K8	ES	X	K8	X
Irvington	K8	ES	x	K8	
King	K8	ES	x	ES	х
Laurelhurst	K8	ES	x	K8	x
Lee	K8	ES	х	ES	
Rigler	ES	ES		ES	
Rose City Park				ES	х
Roseway Heights	K8	MS	х	MS	х
Sabin	K8	ES		K8	
Scott	K8	ES		ES	
Tubman		MS	х		
Vernon	K8	ES		ES	
Vestal	K8	ES		ES	

Scenario 1 Reconfigurations: 12 Scenario 1 Reconfigurations: 7 Scenario 1 Boundary Changes: 8 Scenario 1 Boundary Changes: 8

Southeast Quadrant Key Peformance Indicators 2015-16 Enrollment Snapshot

		K-12 St	udents in th	e Neighborh	ood								I	K-12 S	tude	nts E	nroll	d at the School	
School	Туре	Students in Neighborhood (K-12)	Capture Rate	% in Poverty (Neighborhood) 2014-15 Data	% HU Race (Neighborhood)	Enrollment (K-12)	Avg Enroll / Grade (Entire School)	% Enrollment in Poverty - 2014-15 Data	% Enrollment HU Race	Facility Utilization	DLI Spanish	DLI Russian	DLI Mandarin	DLI Vietnamese	DLI Japanese	Inemed rocus	Special Ed Focus Rooms Pre K	Assigned Middle School	Assigned High School
Abernethy	ES	627	74.5%	8.2%	6.1%	5 13	85.5	7.4%	6.0%	91.2%								Hosford	Cleveland
Arleta	K8	548	62.6%	34.7%	17.9%	456	50.7	39.6%	23.0%	93.1%						у		Arleta	Franklin
Atkinson	ES	346	70.8%	16.0%	9.2%	435	72.5	26.4%	29.2%	89.5%	у					у		Mt Tabor	Franklin
Bridger	K8	515	53.%	30.3%	23.5%	476	52.9	43.9%	44.3%	104.7%	у							Bridger	Franklin
Buckman	ES	291	82.8%	20.8%	18.6%	481	80.2	22.1%	15.6%	76.4%					у	у		Hosford	Cleveland
Clark																			
Creston	К8	490	54.3%	25.2%	18.8%	392	43.6	40.0%	24.7%	106.1%							У	Creston	Franklin
Duniway	ES	572	75.2%	8.5%	6.5%	494	82.3	8.1%	6.5%	84.6%								Sellwood	Cleveland
Glencoe	ES	667	65.5%	13.7%	13.5%	500	83.3	15.9%	14.2%	79.2%								Mt Tabor	Franklin
Grout	ES	517	60.9%	38.5%	23.4%	376	62.7	48.3%	30.1%	87.9%						у	у	Hosford	Cleveland
Harrison Park	К8	1016	65.7%	57.8%	39.2%	729	81.0	64.6%	43.5%	108.4%						у		Harrison Park	Madison
Hosford	MS	772	63.5%	21.4%	13.2%	640	213.3	23.0%	12.5%	91.7%			у			у			Cleveland
Kellogg								0.0%											
Kelly	ES	504	71.2%	56.8%	38.9%	610	101.7	53.1%	25.7%	93.8%		У					У	Lane	Franklin
Lane	MS	599	71.%	53.6%	36.6%	481	160.3	56.7%	34.7%	77.2%		у				у	у		Cleveland, Franklin
Lent	K8	577	74.5%	59.6%	44.4%	564	62.7	59.5%	54.8%	99.4%	у							Lent	Franklin
Lewis	ES	349	79.7%	23.2%	10.3%	382	63.7	25.4%	12.3%	101.6%						у		Sellwood	Cleveland
Llewellyn	ES	491	84.9%	7.3%	6.5%	531	88.5	11.8%	7.2%	102.5%						у		Sellwood	Cleveland
Marysville	K8	513	62.4%	50.5%	34.3%	390	43.3	56.0%	36.7%	98.4%							у	Marysville	Franklin
Mt Tabor	MS	460	76.7%	16.4%	12.4%	694	231.3	16.3%	16.1%	99.4%	у			У		У			Franklin
Sellwood	MS	677	76.8%	10.6%	8.6%	560	186.7	13.6%	10.0%	78.8%	-			<u> </u>		İ			Cleveland
Sunnyside Environment	t K8	458	78.6%	15.3%	5.9%	574	63.8	17.9%	7.1%	105.8%					У			Sunnyside Environme	Franklin
Whitman	ES	373	66.%	55.2%	32.7%	271	45.2	57.9%	38.0%	62.8%							у	Lane	Cleveland
Woodmere	ES	371	69.8%	51.8%	35.3%	312	52.0	54.4%	38.1%	82.3%						у	у	Lane	Franklin
Woodstock	ES	399	74.2%	20.5%	10.8%	496	82.7	20.1%	5.9%	75.6%			у					Hosford	Cleveland

Page 11 of 20 v. 1/9/2016 12:03 PM

	Southeast Quadrant Key Peformance Indicators											
					Scenario (Comparison						
				Average	Enrollment Per G	rade (Neighborh	nood Strand)					
Current Sta	te - Current Data		Current State - Fo	recast 2020 Data	Scenario 1 - C	urrent Data	Scenario 1 - I	orecast 2020 Data	Scenario 2	- Current Data	Scenario 2 - Fore	cast 2020 Data
School	Enrollment	Average Enrollment Per Grade	Enrollment 2020	Average Enrollment Per Grade 2020	Enrollment	Average Enrollment Per Grade	Enrollment	Average Enrollment Per Grade	Enrollment	Average Enrollment Per Grade	Enrollment	Average Enrollment Per Grade
Abernethy	513	85.5	512	85.4	477	79.5		171 78.5	45	7 76.2	448	74.6
Arleta	456			52.4		53.3		302 50.3				
Atkinson	435			71.5		72.5		129 71.5				73.5
Bridger	476			65.4	360	60.0		166 77.6				
Buckman	481	80.2	532	88.6	481	80.2		532 88.6	48	1 80.2	532	88.6
Clark									45	5 75.8	449	74.9
Creston	392	43.6	387	43.0	350	58.3		351 58.4	1 34	.5 57.5	349	58.1
Duniway	494	82.3	480	80.0	494	82.3		180 80.0	49	4 82.3	480	80.0
Glencoe	500	83.3	508	84.6	505	84.2		516 86.3	49	82.2	499	83.1
Grout	376	62.7	374	62.3	376	62.7		62.3	37	62.7	374	62.3
Harrison Park	729	81.0	757	84.1	626	69.6		70.2	56	7 189.1	622	207.4
Hosford	640	213.3	702	234.1	611	203.6		75 225.0	73	244.9	795	265.0
Kellogg					729	243.1		786 262.0				
Kelly	610	101.7	609	101.5	608	101.3		509 101.5	60	101.3	609	101.5
Lane	481	160.3	404	134.6	600	200.1		181.9	60	201.5	551	183.6
Lent	564	62.7	562	62.4	413	68.8		107 67.8	41	.3 68.8	407	67.8
Lewis	382	63.7	380	63.4	381	63.5		380 63.4	38	63.5	380	63.4
Llewellyn	531	88.5	512	85.4	531	88.5		512 85.4	53	1 88.5	512	85.4
Marysville	390	43.3	391	43.5	305	50.8		52.7	7 30	50.4	314	52.3
Mt Tabor	694	231.3	756	252.1	587	195.8		532 210.5	69	5 231.6	757	252.3
Sellwood	560	186.7	608	202.5	560	186.7		508 202.5	56	186.7	608	202.5
Sunnyside Environmental	574	63.8	586	65.1	509	56.6		526 58.4	50	56.6	526	58.4
Whitman	271	45.2	241	40.2	299	49.9		267 44.5	29	9 49.9	267	44.5
Woodmere	312	52.0	302	50.3	311	51.8		312 52.0	31	1 51.8	312	52.0
Woodstock	496	82.7	492	82.0	481	80.2		176 79.3	48	80.2	476	79.3

	Southeast Quadrant Key Peformance Indicators Scenario Comparison											
		Over-Crowdin	g (Facility Utilizatior				# Student	s Reassigned in or out of	Neighborhood			
			<u> </u>	<u>. </u>								
School	Current State - Current Data	Current State - Forecast 2020 Data	Scenario 1 - Current Data	Scenario 1 - Forecast 2020 Data	Scenario 2 - Current Data	Scenario 2 - Forecast 2020 Data	School	Scenario 1 - Number Reassigned	Scenario 2 - Number Reassigned			
Abernethy	91.2%	91.1%	85.4%	84.5%	82.2%	80.6%	Abernethy	48	75			
Arleta	93.1%	95.6%	60.4%	57.9%	62.4%	59.5%	Arleta	319	336			
Atkinson	89.5%	88.8%	89.5%	88.8%	91.5%	91.2%	Atkinson	0	19			
Bridger	104.7%	124.6%	75.0%	93.2%	75.0%	93.2%	Bridger	142	142			
Buckman	76.4%	82.8%	76.4%	82.8%	76.4%	82.8%	Buckman	0	0			
Clark					101.3%	99.9%	Clark		592			
Creston	106.1%	105.0%	92.4%	92.3%	91.3%	91.6%	Creston	269	332			
Duniway	84.6%	82.4%	84.6%	82.4%	84.6%	82.4%	Duniway	0	0			
Glencoe	79.2%	80.3%	79.9%	81.5%	78.2%	79.0%	Glencoe	148	130			
Grout	87.9%	87.0%	87.9%	87.0%	87.9%	87.0%	Grout	0	0			
Harrison Park	108.4%	111.7%	95.2%	95.7%	79.7%	86.4%	Harrison Park	156	1173			
Hosford	91.7%	99.6%	88.0%	96.1%	104.0%	111.6%	Hosford	46	185			
Kellogg			93.7%	100.7%			Kellogg	886				
Kelly	93.8%	93.4%	93.8%	93.4%	93.8%	93.4%	Kelly	0	0			
Lane	77.2%	67.5%	93.9%	86.6%	94.4%	87.2%	Lane	168	174			
Lent	99.4%	98.7%	71.2%	70.0%	71.2%	70.0%	Lent	245	245			
Lewis	101.6%	100.7%	101.6%	100.7%	101.6%	100.7%	Lewis	0	0			
Llewellyn	102.5%	99.4%	102.5%	99.4%	102.5%	99.4%	Llewellyn	0	0			
Marysville	98.4%	98.4%	75.7%	77.4%	75.3%	76.9%	Marysville	370	366			
Mt Tabor	99.4%	105.0%	83.0%	88.8%	99.6%	105.1%	Mt Tabor	215	73			
Sellwood	78.8%	85.2%	78.8%	85.2%	78.8%	85.2%	Sellwood	0	0			
Sunnyside Environmental	105.8%	105.5%	93.3%	93.9%	93.3%	93.9%	Sunnyside Environn	ner 82	82			
Whitman	62.8%	57.0%	68.3%	61.9%	68.3%	61.9%	Whitman	43	43			
Woodmere	82.3%	79.8%	81.6%	81.4%	81.6%	81.4%	Woodmere	84	84			
Woodstock	75.6%	75.4%	73.8%	72.8%	73.8%	72.8%	Woodstock	31	31			

Southeast Quadrant Key Peformance Indicators												
			Scenario Compa	arisc	on							
Neighborl	nood Poverty Levels (Usi	ng Direct Certification	١)		Neighborhood Percent Historically Underserved Race							
School	Current State - % Direct Certified 2014-15 Data	Scenario 1 - % Direct Certified 2014-15 Data	Scenario 2 - % Direct Certified 2014-15 Data		School	Current State - % Historically Underserved	Scenario 1 - % Historically Underserved	Scenario 2 - % Historically Underserved				
Abernethy	8.2%	8.5%	8.8%		Abernethy	6.1%	5.7%	5.8%				
Arleta	34.7%	31.6%	31.2%	- 1	Arleta	17.9%	17.9%	17.7%				
Atkinson	16.0%	16.0%	17.1%		Atkinson	9.2%	9.2%	9.9%				
Bridger	30.3%	30.7%	30.7%		Bridger	23.5%	23.6%	23.6%				
Buckman	20.8%	20.8%	20.8%		Buckman	18.6%	18.6%	18.6%				
Clark			56.5%		Clark			41.0%				
Creston	25.2%	21.5%	20.1%		Creston	18.8%	16.4%	15.4%				
Duniway	8.5%	8.5%	8.5%		Duniway	6.5%	6.5%	6.5%				
Glencoe	13.7%	13.6%	13.0%		Glencoe	13.5%	13.3%	13.5%				
Grout	38.5%	38.5%	38.5%		Grout	23.4%	23.4%	23.4%				
Harrison Park	57.8%	57.4%	51.2%		Harrison Park	39.2%	39.2%	37.3%				
Hosford	21.4%	21.8%	21.2%		Hosford	13.2%	13.4%	13.6%				
Kellogg		37.0%			Kellogg		28.6%					
Kelly	56.8%	56.8%	56.8%		Kelly	38.9%	38.9%	38.9%				
Lane	53.6%	50.6%	50.3%		Lane	36.6%	33.2%	33.2%				
Lent	59.6%	60.0%	60.0%		Lent	44.4%	41.8%	41.8%				
Lewis	23.2%	23.2%	23.2%		Lewis	10.3%	10.3%	10.3%				
Llewellyn	7.3%	7.3%	7.3%		Llewellyn	6.5%	6.5%	6.5%				
Marysville	50.5%	55.5%	55.5%		Marysville	34.3%	32.6%	32.9%				
Mt Tabor	16.4%	14.4%	17.6%		Mt Tabor	12.4%	12.5%	12.8%				
Sellwood	10.6%	10.6%	10.6%		Sellwood	8.6%	8.6%	8.6%				
Sunnyside Environmental	15.3%	16.0%	16.0%		Sunnyside Environmental	5.9%	5.3%	5.3%				
Whitman	55.2%	54.1%	54.1%		Whitman	32.7%	33.4%	33.4%				
Woodmere	51.8%	50.4%	50.4%		Woodmere	35.3%	31.7%	31.7%				
Woodstock	20.5%	18.9%	18.9%		Woodstock	10.8%	10.9%	10.9%				

Southeast Quadrant Key Peformance Indicators

Scenario Comparison

Configuration and Boundary Changes

School	Current State	Scenario 1 Configuration	Scenario 1 Boundary Change	Scenario 2 Configuration	Scenario 2 Boundary Change
Abernethy	ES	ES	х	ES	х
Arleta	К8	ES	х	ES	х
Atkinson	ES	ES		ES	х
Bridger	К8	ES		ES	
Buckman	ES	ES		ES	
Clark				ES	x
Creston	К8	ES	x	ES	x
Duniway	ES	ES		ES	
Glencoe	ES	ES	x	ES	x
Grout	ES	ES		ES	
Harrison Park	K8	K8	x	MS	х
Hosford	MS	MS	x	MS	x
Kellogg		MS	x		
Kelly	ES	ES		ES	
Lane	MS	MS	x	MS	x
Lent	K8	ES	х	ES	x
Lewis	ES	ES		ES	
Llewellyn	ES	ES		ES	
Marysville	К8	ES	х	ES	х
Mt Tabor	MS	MS	х	MS	х
Sellwood	MS	MS		MS	
Sunnyside Environmenta	К8	K8	х	K8	х
Whitman	ES	ES	х	ES	х
Woodmere	ES	ES	х	ES	х
Woodstock	ES	ES	х	ES	x

Scenario 1 Reconfigurations: 6
Scenario 1 Boundary Changes: 15
Scenario 1 Boundary Changes: 16

West Quadrant Key Peformance Indicators 2015-16 Enrollment Snapshot

		K-12 St	udents in th	e Neighborh	nood									K-12	Stud	dent	s Eni	rolled	at the School	
School	Туре	Students in Neighborhood (K-12)	Capture Rate	% in Poverty (Neighborhood) 2014-15 Data	% HU Race (Neighborhood)	Enrollment (K-12)	Avg Enroll / Grade (Entire School)	% Enrollment in Poverty - 2014-15 Data	% Enrollment HU Race	Facility Utilization	DLI Spanish	DLI Russian	DLI Mandarin	DLI Vietnamese	DLI Japanese	Themed Focus	Special Ed Focus Rooms	Pre K	Assigned Middle School	Assigned High School
Ainsworth	ES	394	92.6%	1.4%	11.4%	600	100.0	1.7%	16.0%	87.9%	у								West Sylvan	Lincoln
Bridlemile	ES	512	86.1%	7.4%	12.5%	480	80.0	9.3%	11.9%	83.1%							у		West Sylvan	Lincoln
Capitol Hill	ES	449	81.8%	16.4%	13.4%	437	72.8	17.6%	12.6%	102.0%							У		Jackson	Wilson
Chapman	ES	766	78.2%	17.5%	12.3%	643	107.2	18.2%	10.7%	107.8%							У		West Sylvan	Lincoln
Forest Park	ES	478	92.3%	1.6%	5.6%	449	74.8	1.6%	5.8%	92.4%									West Sylvan	Lincoln
Gray	MS	585	79.%	15.2%	10.6%	566	188.7	16.3%	10.1%	97.8%							у			Wilson
Hayhurst	ES	395	81.3%	27.5%	14.9%	499	83.2	18.8%	10.0%	101.8%						у			Gray	Wilson
Jackson	MS	639	87.2%	15.4%	14.7%	606	202.0	16.2%	15.7%	59.7%							У			Wilson
Maplewood	ES	460	71.7%	11.8%	10.0%	359	59.8	14.0%	9.8%	99.5%									Gray	Wilson
Markham	ES	513	67.1%	32.3%	25.9%	377	62.8	43.5%	35.0%	82.7%							у	У	Jackson	Wilson
Rieke	ES	428	80.1%	7.9%	9.1%	402	67.0	9.5%	9.5%	92.5%									Gray	Wilson
Skyline	K8	280	85.4%	11.2%	11.4%	300	33.3	14.2%	11.3%	100.0%									Skyline	Lincoln
Stephenson	ES	302	90.4%	2.7%	7.9%	322	53.7	3.2%	8.1%	74.9%								у	Jackson	Wilson
West Sylvan	MS	1077	82.6%	7.8%	10.2%	966	322.0	6.5%	10.9%	97.6%	у									Lincoln

v. 1/9/2016 12:03 PM Page 16 of 20

	West Quadrant Key Peformance Indicators														
						Scenario	Comparison								
	Average Enrollment Per Grade (Neighborhood Strand)														
Current S	State - Current Data		Current Sta	te - Foi	recast 2020 Data	Scenario 1 - 0	Current Data	Scenario 1	- Fore	cast 2020 Data	O Data Scenario 2 - Current Data			Scenario 2 - Forecast 2020 Data	
School	Enrollment	Average Enrollment Per Grade	Enrollment :	2020	Average Enrollment Per Grade 2020	Enrollment	Average Enrollment Per Grade	Enrollmei	nt	Average Enrollment Per Grade	Enrollment	Average Enrollment Per Grade	Enrollme	Average nt Enrollment Pe Grade	
Ainsworth	600	100.0		614	102.4	638	106.3		649	108.1	638	3 106.3		649 108	
Bridlemile	480	80.0		533	88.8	507	84.5		569	94.8	507	84.5		569 94.	
Capitol Hill	437	72.8		499	83.2	436	72.7		499	83.2	436	72.7		499 83.	
Chapman	643	107.2		745	124.2	562	93.6		665	110.8	562	93.6		665 110.	
Forest Park	449	74.8		394	65.6	449	74.8		394	65.6	449	74.8		394 65.	
Gray	566	188.7		634	211.3	571	190.2		625	208.3	571	190.2		625 208.	
Hayhurst	499	83.2		538	89.7	277	46.2		316	52.7	277	46.2		316 52.	
Jackson	606	202.0		628	209.3	764	254.6		821	273.8	764	254.6		821 273.	
Maplewood	359	59.8		391	65.1	359	59.8		391	65.1	359	59.8		391 65.	
Markham	377	62.8		394	65.7	377	62.8		394	65.7	377	62.8		394 65.	
Rieke	402	67.0		418	69.7	402	67.0		418	69.7	402	67.0		418 69.	
Skyline	300	33.3		324	36.0	198	33.0		215	35.8	300	33.3		324 36.	
Stephenson	322	53.7		338	56.4	322	53.7		338	56.4	322	53.7		338 56.	
West Sylvan	966	322.0		1011	336.9	895	298.3		928	309.5	811	270.2		837 278.	

	West Quadrant Key Peformance Indicators Scenario Comparison												
		Over-Crowdin	g (Facility Utilizatio				# Students	Reassigned in or out of	Neighborhood				
School	Current State - Current Data	Current State - Forecast 2020 Data	Scenario 1 - Current Data	Scenario 1 - Forecast 2020 Data	Scenario 2 - Current Data	Scenario 2 - Forecast 2020 Data	School	Scenario 1 - Number Reassigned	Scenario 2 - Number Reassigned				
Ainsworth	87.9%	90.4%	93.6%	96.9%	93.6%	96.9%	Ainsworth	73	73				
Bridlemile	83.1%	90.9%	87.1%	98.3%	87.1%	98.3%	Bridlemile	31	31				
Capitol Hill	102.0%	115.2%	102.0%	115.2%	102.0%	115.2%	Capitol Hill	0	0				
Chapman	107.8%	122.1%	96.1%	110.6%	96.1%	110.6%	Chapman	104	104				
Forest Park	92.4%	82.2%	92.4%	82.2%	92.4%	82.2%	Forest Park	0	0				
Gray	97.8%	106.2%	96.4%	104.8%	96.4%	104.8%	Gray	370	370				
Hayhurst	101.8%	105.5%	60.9%	64.6%	60.9%	64.6%	Hayhurst	0	0				
Jackson	59.7%	61.9%	73.7%	79.0%	73.7%	79.0%	Jackson	182	182				
Maplewood	99.5%	109.6%	99.5%	109.6%	99.5%	109.6%	Maplewood	0	0				
Markham	82.7%	84.7%	82.7%	84.7%	82.7%	84.7%	Markham	0	0				
Rieke	92.5%	95.8%	92.5%	95.8%	92.5%	95.8%	Rieke	0	0				
Skyline	100.0%	106.7%	63.9%	65.6%	100.0%	106.7%	Skyline	102	0				
Stephenson	74.9%	80.6%	74.9%	80.6%	74.9%	80.6%	Stephenson	0	0				
West Sylvan	97.6%	102.0%	90.6%	93.9%	82.3%	84.9%	West Sylvan	290	188				

	West Quadrant Key Peformance Indicators Scenario Comparison													
Neighb	borhood Poverty Levels (Usi	ng Direct Certification		Neighborhood Percent Historically Underserved Race										
School	Current State - % Direct Certified 2014-15 Data	Scenario 1 - % Direct Certified 2014-15 Data	Scenario 2 - % Direct Certified 2014-15 Data	School	Current State - % Historically Underserved	Scenario 1 - % Historically Underserved	Scenario 2 - % Historically Underserved							
Ainsworth	1.4%	4.1%	4.1%	Ainsworth	11.4%	11.3%	11.3%							
Bridlemile	7.4%	8.2%	8.2%	Bridlemile	12.5%	12.5%	12.5%							
Capitol Hill	16.4%	16.4%	16.4%	Capitol Hill	13.4%	13.4%	13.49							
Chapman	17.5%	17.1%	17.1%	Chapman	12.3%	12.4%	12.49							
Forest Park	1.6%	1.6%	1.6%	Forest Park	5.6%	5.6%	5.6%							
Gray	15.2%	12.2%	12.2%	Gray	10.6%	10.8%	10.8%							
Hayhurst	27.5%	27.5%	27.5%	Hayhurst	14.9%	14.9%	14.9%							
Jackson	15.4%	15.7%	15.7%	Jackson	14.7%	14.1%	14.19							
Maplewood	11.8%	11.8%	11.8%	Maplewood	10.0%	10.0%	10.0%							
Markham	32.3%	32.3%	32.3%	Markham	25.9%	25.9%	25.9%							
Rieke	7.9%	7.9%	7.9%	Rieke	9.1%	9.1%	9.1%							
Skyline	11.2%	11.5%	11.2%	Skyline	11.4%	12.4%	11.49							
Stephenson	2.7%	2.7%	2.7%	Stephenson	7.9%	7.9%	7.9%							
	7.00/	0.00/	7.70/	V44 4 G 1	40.00/	0.70/	0.70							

7.7%

West Sylvan

West Sylvan

7.8%

8.0%

v. 1/9/2016 12:03 PM Page 19 of 20

10.2%

9.7%

9.7%

West Quadrant Key Peformance Indicators

Scenario Comparison

Configuration and Boundary Changes

School	Current State	Scenario 1 Configuration	Scenario 1 Boundary Change	Scenario 2 Configuration	Scenario 2 Boundary Change
Ainsworth	ES	ES	x	ES	x
Bridlemile	ES	ES	x	ES	x
Capitol Hill	ES	ES		ES	
Chapman	ES	ES	X	ES	X
Forest Park	ES	ES		ES	
Gray	MS	MS	x	MS	х
Hayhurst	ES	ES		ES	
Jackson	MS	MS	x	MS	х
Maplewood	ES	ES		ES	
Markham	ES	ES		ES	
Rieke	ES	ES		ES	
Skyline	K8	ES		K8	
Stephenson	ES	ES		ES	
West Sylvan	MS	MS	х	MS	x

High School Key Performance Indicators

2015-16 Enrollment Snapshot

School	Enrollment	% Direct Certified 2014-15 Data	% HU Race	DLI Spanish	DLI Japanese	DLI Mandarin	DLI Russian	DLI Vietnamese	Themed Focus	Special Ed Focus rooms
Benson	914	38%	46%						у	
Cleveland	1,600	19%	13%			У				у
Franklin	1,570	33%	29%	У						у
Grant	1,481	15%	19%		У					у
Jefferson	524	53%	71%						У	
Lincoln	1,696	5%	11%	У						
Madison	1,134	46%	44%	у						у
Roosevelt	940	51%	62%	у						у
Wilson	1,324	15%	16%							У

Scenario 1 Reconfigurations: 1
Scenario 1 Reconfigurations: 0
Scenario 1 Boundary Changes: 6
Scenario 1 Boundary Changes: 6