





<p>The springboard does succeed at marking out what appears to be an equitable balance of feeder schools for Kellogg, and I was happy to see Lent included. It also does consolidate DLI programs in areas where they can more easily serve native speaking populations. The first draft seems to put the vast majority of upheaval and change on the already marginalized schools/communities. While in some cases this may serve a purpose in meeting our stated goals, it seems we should be looking at a broader picture of how we change enrollment and programs at SE schools. I also have some concerns over some of the "new" K-5s (Arleta, Creston, ect.) ultimately suffering from under enrollment, and therefore a lack of funding in the future.</p> <p>I would like more information on how the springboard was developed, and why certain schools were left out, while other schools are taking the brunt of the changes.</p> <p>I would like to know what plans the district has to improve Harrison Park so it is on par with Kellogg when it opens as a middle school. While as a specific topic it exists outside of the framework of our coalition goals, I'd be interested to know if the district has considered consolidating PTA/PTO/Booster/foundation funds to distribute evenly among all schools (at least within each zone), so that the financial security of more affluent neighborhoods can benefit all public school students. This kind of move would be very beneficial in filling funding gaps between schools in an area like SE, and help to balance the funding inequities in the Chinese DLIs at Harrison Park/Bridger vs. Woodstock.</p>	Equity
<p>Is it more equitable to have the DLI where there are increased stability factors - for me I see them as grocery stores, jobs, public transportation, community centers/churches.</p>	Equity
<p>Socioeconomic status of students, followed by race, should absolutely be considered in looking at school feeder options if equity is truly something we hope to implement in this process.</p>	Equity
<p>-further racial segregation in schools if DLI programs are no longer co-located. Transparency about the pros/cons of this and how one outweighs the other. How do DLI families, especially families of color, feel about this part of the proposal?</p> <p>-program moves require some students to travel further for DLI</p> <p>-further disparities between affluent inner SE schools with no boundary change in the scenario, and higher poverty outer SE schools, both those that lose enrollment due to the shift to k-5, and those that already have lower enrollment. This proposal seems to prioritize the comfort of the affluent white community who frequently push back on boundary changes, over the needs of students in under-enrolled schools. Mitigation--start by creating a proposal that centers students of color by establishing robust enrollments in schools that have been historically underserved first. Make necessary changes to affluent school boundaries to support the needs of students of color.</p> <p>-The Bridger community has been dealing with constant over-enrollment over the last several years, resulting in delayed portables, classes held in the gymnasium, relocation of kindergarten to a different building, etc. This proposal removes one DLI program that has been a vibrant part of the Bridger culture and community, and replaces it with another one, so that Bridger still has co-located programs but has to adapt to a completely new program, while creating a risk of future over-enrollment as the relatively new Chinese Immersion grows. Meanwhile, the students in Harrison Park's Chinese Immersion program have to shift to a new location that is likely further from home and has limited growth opportunity as a co-located program. This seems full of unintended consequences both for Chinese Immersion students and the Bridger neighborhood community. Mitigation--review other options for the Harrison Park Chinese Immersion program that do not require program co-location.</p> <p>-By focusing only on SE, I wonder if communities will be re-impacted when the remaining K-8 schools in NE Portland, especially those close to the NE/SE dividing line, convert to K-5. Where will they go to middle school? Will students in SE have to change schools again if boundaries are again redrawn to accommodate NE?</p>	Equity Bridger DLI
<p>"All schools with the exception of Sunnyside brings building utilization below 100% . Bridger will still be over 100% utilization if modulars are removed.</p>	



<p>"I really appreciated the brainstorming we did in the small groups. I worry that we didn't have enough time as a larger group to try to reach some consensus on the way forward--e.g. I have no idea what FLO/PPS took from the ideas we shared out as next steps in refining the proposal.</p> <p>Re: valuing input, my concern is mainly that there are important questions that have been shared in small groups and in the email chain between meetings that have not even been acknowledged by FLO/PPS, much less answered--most notably around the district's plans for using the tons of extra capacity in K-5 schools that will result from any scenarios we're considering (and how PPS feels generally about having schools serving relatively higher percentages of students of color/students from low-income families underutilized compared to schools in whiter/more affluent parts of SE); and why we should feel confident we can treat the Kellogg boundary process as separate from the broader rebalancing effort in Phase 2 without closing off solutions that might be important to achieving equity across the region. I personally think we CAN draw a Kellogg boundary in a way that leave open or even anticipates changes we'd need to make in Phase 2, but regardless, this is clearly something a lot of folks in the coalition are getting stuck on."</p>	Guiding Coalition Engagement
<p>"I admit I feel less confident in the facilitation team with each meeting. I have lost a fair amount of confidence that they intend to fully allow us to do the work they charged us with, and also in them actually using the feedback we provide.</p> <p>I have concerns that we are being asked to create equity without being allowed to suggest changes that affect more affluent inner SE schools and focus option schools. Schools that are currently balanced are thriving and benefit from funding under enrolled/underutilized schools do not have. We should be allowed to consider changes to these schools in order to create equity, since equity is created by distributing/redistributing resources to those in need. The argument given for not including inner SE schools is that our current Phase 1 focus is on Kellogg and Harrison boundaries, but there is concern that without seeing the full picture we will not be able to create an equitable solution, or we will not be able to make adjustments to Phase 1 work once Phase 2 begins in the Spring. "</p>	Guiding Coalition Engagement
<p>I would like to say, I am so pleased and impressed with my fellow coalition members. My experience has been incredibly positive, and I've found everyone to be so thoughtful, insightful, and hard working. There have been some very challenging conversations and ideas, and I have thoroughly enjoyed working with my small group and hearing the thoughts from the rest of the coalition as well.</p>	Guiding Coalition Engagement
<p>"Accessibility to documents is not easy and inconsistant. There are many file sharing services that are more accessible and easier to access then drop box.</p> <p>I am a skeptic and think that the dialog is driven more by an immediate need to open Kellogg and less what the community has to say. If it is, the process needs to slow down and consider the impact it will have on neighborhoods, families and students"</p>	Guiding Coalition Engagement
<p>I am confused what is guiding the selection of schools and what metrics we are supposed to apply. If the goal is simply to load balance the schools and focus immersion programs in the neighborhoods that speak a specific language that is one thing. The notion of putting a lens on that decision based on Racial Equity and Social Justice throws a curve ball at this process by being a lens to view things through and not an outcome that "creates increased opportunities for all students by evaluating burdens, benefits and outcomes to underserved communities." Through this process How Do We examine if there are any potential unintended consequences for specific groups/populations? Are there strategies in place to mitigate any negative impacts? How do we know those impacts without deeper involvement from every community impacted by these decisions. It seems to me we need better metrics than simply #'s of subsidized lunches and where BIPOC students currently attend classes and where they live. Bottom line the lens will add confusion if it is not adopted as one of the outcomes and goals. I suggest revisiting the outcomes with emphasis on a more inclusive process that considers the well being of students and communities and this includes safety, respect.</p>	Guiding Coalition Engagement
<p>1. It would be nice to get more demo and group practice with the interactive web map. 3. The groups were not all operating under the same assumptions about the scenarios (i.e. that CSS was being dissolved vs. relocated, etc), so making sure everyone is on the same page before the small groups meet would be great. 5. There are still questions members are asking that are not being addressed by the district, so that's not helpful in building trust. 6. It would be nice to understand how these scenarios are chosen and why some suggestions for scenarios have been ignored. Also, I thought we were going to be using the web map program in real-time during these meetings to look at the impacts of changes as people suggest them. No one knew how to use that mapping program.</p>	Guiding Coalition Engagement
<p>It would be helpful to spend more time in the large group meeting to discuss the issues and questions people continue to ask about this process (i.e. why other focus option schools are off the table- and please don't say because they are right-sized and not co-located: 1. Richmond is co-located at Mt Tabor; and 2. that answer does not address how they impact enrollment at other schools or the economic/ racial segregation they facilitate in the system; also, please respond to the requests for input from communities of color and DLI teachers about what they want and think is the best for their students' success; provide the plan for improving enrollment at k-5's in phase 2 so we know we're not eliminating choices by changes made in phase 1 (is there a springboard type proposal for phase 2 that could be shared?).</p>	Guiding Coalition Engagement
<p>It might be beneficial to have two breakout sessions and brief report-outs in workshop meetings so we can hear other groups thoughts after the first session and incorporate to the second breakout discussion.</p>	Guiding Coalition Engagement

<p>I feel like we are trying to fit what currently is at PPS into what we need, we need to be thinking more out of the box and consider redrawing all of the boundaries, to address all of these issues. I feel like FLO and PPS have been really bad at listening to community input and decided to offer alterations to the springboard, instead of a new proposal reflecting what the community wants. I feel like this meeting was not a good use of my time, there are so much materials, so much to think about and consider, a December deadline is honestly laughable, and is perpetuating white supremacy. I don't understand why we need to be so hurried in this process. We should be focusing on students, and doing it right, not having to cause disruptions in students' lives every 5 years.</p>	<p>Guiding Coalition Engagement Transparency</p>
<p>The proposal fails to offer any remedy for the underutilization of Lane Middle School and I wonder about how this will exacerbate existing inequity in direct opposition to the stated outcome goals.</p>	<p>Lane MS</p>
<p>Schools with low numbers or odd numbers can cause large class sizes - effects resources supporting - how do we get the numbers right</p>	<p>Large class sizes</p>
<p>If Woodstock/Hosford parents are not concerned about the distance between school and home, then what is the objection to relocating to Harrison Park? Many HP families do have transportation challenges, so relocating to Hosford would be more of a hardship. Do families at Woodstock/Hosford feel that they have access to resources that HP students do not, and that relocating would cause them to be at a disadvantage? If that's the case, then that's a problem that needs to be addressed, right?</p>	<p>Resource differences between schools DLI proximity for native speakers Woodstock Harrison Park Transportation-Walk/bike routes</p>
<p>The bulk of financial support for schools is done through the number of students - need to ask the 5 whys - is this a question for now? Do we need to reconsider how finance schools? In Oregon and in Portland - good schools will change the area around it - perception can be one of the hardest things to change - leads to under enrolled schools</p>	<p>School financing</p>
<p>Conversation about merging smaller K-5s to open up a DLI hub.</p>	<p>Small K-5s DLI hub</p>
<p>I also want to make sure that we take into account the needs of our families with children receiving special education services. Many of our schools have co-located special education programs and are stronger for it. I want to make sure that the needs of these families especially when there is an intersection of race/socio-economics/special education are met through this process.</p>	<p>Special Education</p>
<p>This timeline is too compressed to focus students, have community engagement and end up with a proposal that is actually good for students. PPS should be ashamed at the timeline they have proposed. People don't have the capacity to devote days to go through materials and form an informed opinion. PPS is setting themselves up to fail.</p>	<p>Timeline</p>


