

January 17, 2010

TO: School Board Directors

FROM: Maria Goodloe-Johnson, Ph.D.

RE: Grandfathering of Kindergarten Siblings

OVERVIEW

As promised after the January 6, 2010 Introduction of the proposed Transition Plan, staff has done further analysis of available data to inform the discussion about grandfathering of incoming kindergarten siblings.

We all share the concern and desire of families to have incoming kindergarten siblings assigned to the same school as older siblings. We are committed to making every reasonable effort to accommodate as many kindergarten siblings as possible, and have outlined a series of steps to accomplish this goal.

The remaining question is whether this is something we can guarantee before we have the actual Open Enrollment data. The data analysis confirms our recommendation that we cannot guarantee grandfathering of incoming kindergarten siblings.

The steps identified to maximize our ability to grandfather incoming K siblings are as follows:

1. Plan for temporary “surge” capacity wherever possible.
2. Analysis of simulated processing of Open Enrollment applications.
3. Where location of services is anticipated to change by 2015, consider if beginning phase-out in 2010-11 is appropriate.
4. Early and aggressive management of waiting lists, if applicable.

If these steps do not result in accommodating all incoming K students at the older child's school, we have recommended a transitional “safety net” to give families assurance that siblings would not have to attend different schools, as follows:

5. “Safety Net” Transition Rules for 2010-11

If the incoming K student applies just for the older sibling's school during Open Enrollment and is assigned to the new attendance area school instead, the older sibling will be assigned to the attendance area school upon request (assuming services needed are available at that school).

If the older student is attending a school outside of the attendance area to access special education services not available at the attendance area school, the “safety net” of assigning the older sibling to the attendance area school is not possible. If

the incoming K student applies just for the older sibling's school, and if the services the older student needs are not available at the attendance area school, the incoming K student will be assigned to the older sibling's school upon request.

RESULTS

Five Data Sets have been compiled and analyzed. No one data set by itself is conclusive; however, data from several different perspectives may provide a more comprehensive picture. The question addressed with each data set was to determine the likelihood of capacity challenges to accommodate incoming K siblings. Information on each data set follows.

The first Data Set ("**Classroom Analysis**") reflects the original task – to look at a roll-up of current students, K students by attendance area of residence, and the estimated availability of classrooms. Based on this, schools were grouped into three rough categories:

Group One

These are schools where we feel *reasonably* confident that incoming K siblings who apply during Open Enrollment can be accommodated. We do not anticipate a need for much or any reliance on the strategies outlined above to accomplish this.

Group Two

This is the largest group – schools where we can't yet make a judgment call. Some of these schools may end up in Group One, and others in Group Three. For others in this group, we may need some surge capacity – but probably not to an extreme degree.

Group Three

These are schools where it's clear we will have significant capacity challenges. The extent of surge capacity needed in these schools will likely require such steps as, for example:

- Using most or all PCP rooms for regular classrooms.
- Using libraries part of the day for part-time resource, ELL, or itinerant services.
- Using child care space during the day for other purposes.
- Converting computer labs to mobile labs.
- Putting portables on playground space or the front lawn.
- Eliminating full-day K classes (including Pay for K), and offering only half-day K classes at some schools.
- Filling classes to contractual limits at the beginning of the year (to provide more K seats and to condense number of homerooms needed at upper grades). This implies being prepared to pay overload costs if needed over the course of the year.

The second Data Set ("**Early Registration Data**") includes data on kindergarten students who pre-registered for 2010-11.

The third Data Set (“**2009-10 Kindergarten Siblings Data**”) looked at current (2009-10) kindergarten students assigned last spring for Fall 2009 with a sibling tiebreaker.

The fourth Data Set (“**District Survey**”) looked at survey responses to a district survey conducted during December 2009 and January 2010.

The fifth data set (“**Parent Survey Data**”) provides survey information gathered by various parent groups and sent to us by Keep Our Kids Together (KOKT), which compiled the results.

For each data set, a net difference was calculated for each attendance area school, comparing potential incoming siblings with potential outgoing siblings for each school. Where the net difference is a positive number (more K siblings coming in than going out at a particular school), this indicates a potential capacity challenge for grandfathering incoming K siblings. Schools showing 8 or more students coming in than going out are identified as having potential capacity challenges. Information for each data set follows, and a summary is provided in Appendix A.

The New Student Assignment Plan will likely change choice patterns in ways that will not be known for sure until the Open Enrollment applications are received this March for Fall 2010 assignments. However, looking at multiple data sets can help identify schools where it is likely that capacity challenges will exist for grandfathering of K siblings.

Appendix B provides information on issues and constraints regarding placement of portable classrooms at various schools.

DATA SET 1: CLASSROOM ANALYSIS

Grandfathering of Kindergarten Siblings: Preliminary School Capacity Analysis – Classroom Analysis

This chart shows the schools identified as having capacity challenges based on this data set. An "X" is shown wherever a particular analysis indicates capacity challenges. Note that the last column (# of Data Sets Indicating Capacity Challenges) simply totals the number of data sets indicating potential capacity challenges and is not an estimate of the number of additional classrooms that might be needed.

Service Area	School	Classroom Analysis Data	Early Registration Data (n=1512)	2009-10 K Siblings Data (n=1209)	District Survey (n=569)	Parent Survey Data	# of Data Sets Indicating Capacity Challenges (NOT # of classrooms)
Aki Kurose	Wing Luke	X					1
Denny	Sanislo	X					1
Denny	West Seattle Elem	X					1
Eckstein	Olympic View	X		X	X		3
Eckstein	Wedgwood	X		X	X		3
McClure	Catharine Blaine K-8	X					1
Mercer	Maple	X					1
Washington	Stevens	X		X			2
Whitman	Broadview-Thomson K-8	X					1
Whitman	Greenwood	X					1

Based on preliminary enrollment projections, attendance area elementary schools have been grouped into one of three categories below, depending on our expected ability to accommodate incoming kindergarten siblings of out-of-area grandfathered students. When planning the number of homerooms needed at each school, we used the Weighted Staffing Standards ratios for the current year (23 for kindergarten and first grade, 25 for second and third grades, 26 for fourth grade, and 28 for fifth grade) wherever possible. We also used the same functional capacity data that was used in developing the new attendance area boundaries. In some cases, additional rooms could be freed up by increasing class sizes to contractual limits, but because the NSAP guarantees assignment of all new students at any grade who move into these schools' attendance areas during the year, some flexible capacity is needed at each grade.

* The parent survey provides in-depth information for certain schools and services areas. However, it is important to note that all areas of the district are not reflected in this data, so no conclusions should be drawn about the absence of capacity challenges in the Aki Kurose, Denny, or Mercer Service Areas.

DATA SET 1: CLASSROOM ANALYSIS (continued)

Group One: Capacity Available

These are schools where we feel reasonably confident that incoming K siblings who apply during Open Enrollment can be accommodated. Schools included in this group have at least one extra classroom available, after accounting for the rollup of current students and the projected attendance area kindergarten students.

<u>School</u>	<u>Service Area</u>
Emerson	Aki Kurose
Arbor Heights	Denny
B. F. Day	Hamilton
West Woodland	Hamilton
Hawthorne	Mercer
Kimball	Mercer
Van Asselt	Mercer
Gatzert	Washington
John Muir	Washington
Leschi	Washington
Madrona	Washington
Whittier	Whitman

Group Two: Unknown

These are schools where we don't yet know if we'll be able to accommodate siblings. Schools included in this group do not appear to have any extra classrooms available without utilizing surge capacity strategies. Depending on the number of siblings who apply, they may be able to be accommodated by utilizing surge capacity strategies.

<u>School</u>	<u>Service Area</u>
Brighton	Aki Kurose
Dunlap	Aki Kurose
Graham Hill	Aki Kurose
Concord	Denny
Highland Park	Denny
Roxhill	Denny
Bryant	Eckstein
Green Lake	Eckstein
John Rogers	Eckstein
Olympic Hills	Eckstein
Sacajawea	Eckstein
View Ridge	Eckstein
John Stanford Int'l	Hamilton
Laurelhurst	Hamilton
Alki	Madison
Gatewood	Madison
Lafayette	Madison
Schmitz Park	Madison
Coe	McClure

DATA SET 1: CLASSROOM ANALYSIS (continued)

Group Two: Unknown

Hay	McClure
Lawton	McClure
Beacon Hill	Mercer
Dearborn Park	Mercer
Lowell	Washington
McGilvra	Washington
Montlake	Washington
T. Marshall	Washington
Adams	Whitman
Daniel Bagley	Whitman
Loyal Heights	Whitman
North Beach	Whitman
Northgate	Whitman

Group Three: Known Capacity Problems

These are schools where we already know we have significant capacity challenges. Schools included in this group need additional classrooms to accommodate the projected enrollment for 2010-11, even before considering adding out-of-area kindergarten siblings.

Appendix B provides information on the feasibility of adding portable classrooms at these sites. As shown in Appendix B, portables cannot be added at Stevens or Greenwood.

<u>School</u>	<u>Service Area</u>
Wing Luke	Aki Kurose
Sanislo	Denny
West Seattle Elem.	Denny
Olympic View	Eckstein
Wedgwood	Eckstein
Catharine Blaine	McClure
Maple	Mercer
Stevens	Washington
Broadview-Thomson	Whitman
Greenwood	Whitman

DATA SET 2: EARLY REGISTRATION DATA

Grandfathering of Kindergarten Siblings: Early Registration for 2010-11

This chart shows the schools identified as having capacity challenges based on this data set. An "X" is shown wherever a particular analysis indicates capacity challenges. Note that the last column (# of Data Sets Indicating Capacity Challenges) simply totals the number of data sets indicating potential capacity challenges and is not an estimate of the number of additional classrooms that might be needed.

Service Area	School	Class-room Analysis Data	Early Registration Data (n=1512)	2009-10 K Siblings Data (n=1209)	District Survey (n=569)	Parent Survey	# of Data Sets Indicating Capacity Challenges (NOT # of classrooms)
Eckstein	Bryant		X		X	X	3
Washington	Lowell		X		X		2

Population Studied

Incoming K students who registered early for 2010-11. (n=1512)

Each K student who completed early registration was manually cross-checked in eSIS to look for other students with a shared parent. If there were no such students, then for purposes of this analysis we considered those as non-sibling incoming K students. Since non-sibling incoming K students will initially be assigned to their attendance area school and will be assigned to another school only if they apply and if space is available, these non-sibling students were not relevant to this analysis.

Older siblings in 5th grade (for K-5 attendance area schools) or 8th grade (for K-8 attendance area schools) were also excluded. Since those students will not be at the same school next year, the sibling tiebreaker won't apply to incoming K students for 2010-11 assignments. Early K registrants were also excluded if the older sibling's school is an option school. Since all K seats at option schools are open and siblings get first priority, the issue of grandfathering of incoming K siblings does not apply at option schools.

After excluding the identified categories of students, 386 students remained in the pool to analyze. The analysis showed that the older siblings of 136 incoming K students were enrolled in their attendance area schools. All of those incoming K siblings will be assigned to their older sibling's school because it is also their attendance area school.

Analysis

That left 250 older siblings (of incoming K students) who go to an attendance area school other than their own. For this analysis, the assumption was that all incoming K siblings would want to go to the non-attendance area school that their older sibling attends.

* The parent survey provides in-depth information for certain schools and services areas. However, it is important to note that all areas of the district are not reflected in this data, so no conclusions should be drawn about the absence of capacity challenges in the Aki Kurose, Denny, or Mercer Service Areas

DATA SET 2: EARLY REGISTRATION (continued)

For each attendance area school, a net difference was then calculated, as follows:

- Identify the older siblings who live in another attendance area, but attend the school. Assuming that the incoming K student would want to attend the same school as the older sibling, the K student was counted as an “add” for the school.
- Identify the older siblings who live in the school’s attendance area, but attend another school. Assuming that the incoming K student would want to attend the same school as the older sibling, the K student was counted as a “subtract” for the school.
- If the net difference is a positive number (more K siblings coming in than going out at a school), this indicates a potential capacity challenge for grandfathering of incoming K siblings. Schools showing 8 or more students coming in than going out are identified as having potential capacity challenges.

DATA SET 2: EARLY REGISTRATION

2010-11 (Next Year) Attendance Area K Students Early Registration				
Service Area	Attendance Area (AA)	Older sibling lives in another AA but attends this school	Older sibling lives in AA but attends another AA school	Net Diff
Denny	West Seattle Elementary	3	8	-5
Denny	Concord	1	4	-3
Denny	Highland Park	2	5	-3
Denny	Roxhill	3	5	-2
Denny	Arbor Heights	3	3	0
Denny	Sanislo	4	4	0
Eckstein	View Ridge	1	6	-5
Eckstein	Olympic Hills	1	4	-3
Eckstein	Sacajawea	3	4	-1
Eckstein	Green Lake	3	3	0
Eckstein	John Rogers	3	1	2
Eckstein	Olympic View	5	3	2
Eckstein	Wedgwood	10	8	2
Eckstein	Bryant	12	4	8
Eckstein	Sand Point	N/A	5	N/A
Hamilton	B.F. Day	4	4	0
Hamilton	John Stanford	3	1	2
Hamilton	Laurelhurst	5	1	4
Hamilton	West Woodland	6	2	4
Hamilton	McDonald	N/A	9	N/A
Madison	Alki	7	9	-2
Madison	Lafayette	8	6	2
Madison	Gatewood	6	2	4
Madison	Schmitz Park	11	5	6
Mercer	Hawthorne	2	11	-9
Mercer	Maple	4	7	-3
Mercer	Van Asselt	3	6	-3
Mercer	Kimball	11	9	2
Mercer	Dearborn Park	9	6	3
Mercer	Beacon Hill	7	4	3
Whitman	Adams	1	11	-10
Whitman	Greenwood	1	7	-6
Whitman	Northgate	4	3	1
Whitman	Daniel Bagley	3	2	1
Whitman	Broadview-Thomson K-8	5	3	2
Whitman	North Beach	4	2	2
Whitman	Whittier	6	3	3
Whitman	Loyal Heights	5	1	4
Whitman	Viewlands	N/A	4	N/A
Washington	Stevens	1	4	-3
Washington	Leschi	3	3	0
Washington	Madrona K-8	2	2	0
Washington	John Muir	5	4	1
Washington	Thurgood Marshall	2	1	1
Washington	McGilvra	2	0	2
Washington	Montlake	3	1	2
Washington	Gatzert	5	2	3
Washington	Lowell	8	0	8
McClure	Catharine Blaine K-8	2	11	-9
McClure	Coe	5	3	2
McClure	Hay	7	3	4
McClure	Lawton	8	3	5
Aki Kurose	Wing Luke	3	7	-4
Aki Kurose	Brighton	7	6	1
Aki Kurose	Emerson	3	2	1
Aki Kurose	Dunlap	7	5	2
Aki Kurose	Graham Hill	8	4	4
Aki Kurose	Rainier View	N/A	4	N/A
		250	250	0

• Note: Data as of Jan. 11, 2010

DATA SET 3: 2009-10 KINDERGARTEN SIBLINGS DATA

This chart shows the schools identified as having capacity challenges based on this data set. An "X" is shown wherever a particular analysis indicates capacity challenges. Note that the last column (# of Data Sets Indicating Capacity Challenges) simply totals the number of data sets indicating potential capacity challenges and is not an estimate of the number of additional classrooms that might be needed.

Service Area	School	Classroom Analysis Data	Early Registration Data (n=1512)	2009-10 K Siblings Data (n=1209)	District Survey (n=569)	Parent Survey Data	# of Data Sets Indicating Capacity Challenges (NOT # of classrooms)
Eckstein	Olympic View	X		X	X		3
Eckstein	Wedgwood	X		X	X		3
Washington	Stevens	X		X			2
Hamilton	West Woodland			X	X	X	3
Madison	Lafayette			X			1
Mercer	Beacon Hill			X	X		2
Mercer	Kimball			X	X		2
Mercer	Van Asselt			X			1
Whitman	Loyal Heights			X			1
Whitman	North Beach			X			1

Population Studied

Current (2009-10) K students assigned with sibling tiebreaker last spring. (n=1209)

Since all K seats at option schools are open and siblings get first priority, the issue of grandfathering of incoming K siblings does not apply at option schools; therefore, the analysis excluded 100 students assigned to option schools. Another 69 students no longer enrolled in the district were also excluded.

After excluding the identified categories of students, 1040 students remained in the pool to analyze. The analysis showed that there were 437 K students who, along with their older siblings, were enrolled in their attendance area schools.

Analysis

That left 603 K students (along with their older siblings) who go to an attendance area school other than their own.

* The parent survey provides in-depth information for certain schools and services areas. However, it is important to note that all areas of the district are not reflected in this data, so no conclusions should be drawn about the absence of capacity challenges in the Aki Kurose, Denny, or Mercer Service Areas.

DATA SET 3: 2009-10 KINDERGARTEN SIBLINGS DATA (continued)

For each attendance area school, a net difference was then calculated, as follows:

- Identify the K students who live in another attendance area but attend the school. Since this is a retrospective look at actual data, we know which current K students attend the same school as the older sibling. Each such K student was counted as an “add” for the school.
- Identify the K students who live in the school’s attendance area, but attend another school. Each such K student was counted as a “subtract” for the school.
- If the net difference is a positive number (more K siblings coming in than going out at a school), this indicates a potential capacity challenge for grandfathering of incoming K siblings. Schools showing 8 or more students coming in than going out are identified as having potential capacity challenges.

DATA SET 3: 2009-10 KINDERGARTEN SIBLINGS DATA (continued)

2009-10 (Current Year) Attendance Area K Students with Sibling Priority				
Service Area	Attendance Area (AA)	Older sibling lives in another AA but attends this school	Older sibling lives in AA but attends another AA school	Net Diff
Denny	West Seattle Elementary	3	14	-11
Denny	Arbor Heights	3	10	-7
Denny	Sanislo	4	6	-2
Denny	Roxhill	7	8	-1
Denny	Concord	7	8	-1
Denny	Highland Park	11	6	5
Eckstein	Sand Point	N/A	10	N/A
Eckstein	John Rogers	4	15	-11
Eckstein	Olympic Hills	4	14	-10
Eckstein	Green Lake	14	9	5
Eckstein	Sacajawea	12	7	5
Eckstein	View Ridge	14	8	6
Eckstein	Bryant	13	6	7
Eckstein	Olympic View	18	8	10
Eckstein	Wedgwood	20	10	10
Hamilton	McDonald	N/A	24	N/A
Hamilton	B.F. Day	6	6	0
Hamilton	John Stanford	7	6	1
Hamilton	Laurelhurst	10	3	7
Hamilton	West Woodland	14	4	10
Madison	Schmitz Park	8	14	-6
Madison	Gatewood	10	10	0
Madison	Alki	16	9	7
Madison	Lafayette	18	8	10
Mercer	Dearborn Park	7	12	-5
Mercer	Maple	9	12	-3
Mercer	Hawthorne	7	8	-1
Mercer	Beacon Hill	18	8	10
Mercer	Kimball	23	12	11
Mercer	Van Asselt	34	14	20
Whitman	Viewlands	N/A	25	N/A
Whitman	Adams	7	22	-15
Whitman	Greenwood	16	18	-2
Whitman	Northgate	8	8	0
Whitman	Whittier	14	11	3
Whitman	Daniel Bagley	15	10	5
Whitman	Broadview-Thomson K-8	20	13	7
Whitman	North Beach	19	9	10
Whitman	Loyal Heights	14	4	10
Washington	Lowell	2	8	-6
Washington	Gatzert	6	10	-4
Washington	Leschi	7	10	-3
Washington	John Muir	10	11	-1
Washington	McGilvra	2	3	-1
Washington	Madrona K-8	9	9	0
Washington	Montlake	6	6	0
Washington	Thurgood Marshall	10	5	5
Washington	Stevens	16	8	8
McClure	Catharine Blaine K-8	10	17	-7
McClure	Coe	11	10	1
McClure	Lawton	12	8	4
McClure	Hay	18	11	7
Aki Kurose	Rainier View	N/A	10	N/A
Aki Kurose	Brighton	13	19	-6
Aki Kurose	Emerson	7	12	-5
Aki Kurose	Wing Luke	8	13	-5
Aki Kurose	Dunlap	12	13	-1
Aki Kurose	Graham Hill	10	11	-1
		603	603	0

DATA SET 4: DISTRICT SURVEY

This chart shows the schools identified as having capacity challenges based on this data set. An "X" is shown wherever a particular analysis indicates capacity challenges. Note that the last column (# of Data Sets Indicating Capacity Challenges) simply totals the number of data sets indicating potential capacity challenges and is not an estimate of the number of additional classrooms that might be needed.

Service Area	School	Class-room Analysis Data	Early Registration Data (n=1512)	2009-10 K Siblings Data (n=1209)	District Survey (n=569)	Parent Survey*	# of Data Sets Indicating Capacity Challenges (NOT # of classrooms)
Aki Kurose	Graham Hill				X		1
Eckstein	Bryant		X		X	X	3
Eckstein	Olympic View	X		X	X		3
Eckstein	Wedgwood	X		X	X		3
Hamilton	Laurelhurst				X		1
Hamilton	West Woodland			X	X	X	3
McClure	Hay				X	X	2
Mercer	Beacon Hill			X	X		2
Mercer	Kimball			X	X		2
Washington	Lowell		X		X		2
Washington	Thurgood Marshall				X		1
Whitman	Daniel Bagley				X	X	2

Population Studied: Responses to district K survey (n=569)

Surveys were sent to families of students currently in grades K-4 (and K-7 in attendance area K-8 schools) who are attending a school other than their new attendance area school. For K-4 and K-7 students whose current school is the same as their new attendance area school, incoming kindergarten siblings will be assigned to that school with or without an older sibling, because they live in the attendance area.

Surveys were not sent to families of students who are attending an option school. Since all K seats at option schools are open and siblings get first priority, the issue of grandfathering of incoming K siblings does not apply at option schools.

The birth date of reported incoming kindergarten students was checked to be sure the younger student met the kindergarten age cut-off for 2010-11 K enrollment.

* The parent survey provides in-depth information for certain schools and services areas. However, it is important to note that all areas of the district are not reflected in this data, so no conclusions should be drawn about the absence of capacity challenges in the Aki Kurose, Denny, or Mercer Service Areas.

DATA SET 4: DISTRICT SURVEY (continued)

Analysis

The process yielded 569 valid surveys. The assumption was that all incoming K siblings would want to go to the non-attendance area school that their older sibling attends.

For each attendance area school, a net difference was then calculated, as follows:

- Identify the older siblings who live in another attendance area, but attend the school. Assuming that the incoming K student would want to attend the same school as the older sibling, the K student was counted as an “add” for the school.
- Identify the older siblings who live in the school’s attendance area, but attend another school. Assuming that the incoming K student would want to attend the same school as the older sibling, the K student was counted as a “subtract” for the school.
- If the net difference is a positive number (more K siblings coming in than going out at a school), this indicates a potential capacity challenge for grandfathering of incoming K siblings. Schools showing 8 or more students coming in than going out are identified as having potential capacity challenges.

2010-11 (Next Year) Attendance Area K Students Based on District Survey				
Service Area	Attendance Area (AA)	Older sibling lives in another AA but attends this school	Older sibling lives in AA but attends another AA school	Net Diff
Denny	West Seattle Elementary	8	20	-12
Denny	Highland Park	3	10	-7
Denny	Arbor Heights	6	10	-4
Denny	Roxhill	6	8	-2
Denny	Concord	2	4	-2
Denny	Sanislo	10	4	6
Eckstein	Olympic Hills	3	14	-11
Eckstein	John Rogers	5	13	-8
Eckstein	View Ridge	14	17	-3
Eckstein	Sacajawea	7	8	-1
Eckstein	Green Lake	12	7	5
Eckstein	Olympic View	18	5	13
Eckstein	Wedgwood	28	15	13
Eckstein	Bryant	21	7	14
Eckstein	Sand Point	N/A	19	N/A
Hamilton	B.F. Day	5	9	-4
Hamilton	John Stanford	10	3	7
Hamilton	Laurelhurst	13	4	9
Hamilton	West Woodland	15	5	10
Hamilton	McDonald	N/A	21	N/A

DATA SET 4: DISTRICT SURVEY (continued)

2010-11 (Next Year) Attendance Area K Students Based on District Survey				
Service Area	Attendance Area (AA)	Older sibling lives in another AA but attends this school	Older sibling lives in AA but attends another AA school	Net Diff
Madison	Alki	12	17	-5
Madison	Schmitz Park	13	10	3
Madison	Gatewood	14	9	5
Madison	Lafayette	20	14	6
Mercer	Van Asselt	7	18	-11
Mercer	Hawthorne	6	15	-9
Mercer	Maple	9	10	-1
Mercer	Dearborn Park	7	6	1
Mercer	Kimball	17	7	10
Mercer	Beacon Hill	15	4	11
Whitman	Greenwood	4	19	-15
Whitman	Adams	6	18	-12
Whitman	Northgate	6	13	-7
Whitman	North Beach	10	8	2
Whitman	Loyal Heights	7	5	2
Whitman	Broadview-Thomson K-8	13	9	4
Whitman	Whittier	16	11	5
Whitman	Daniel Bagley	20	10	10
Whitman	Viewlands	N/A	11	N/A
Washington	Gatzert	4	12	-8
Washington	Stevens	5	12	-7
Washington	John Muir	5	11	-6
Washington	Madrona K-8	6	8	-2
Washington	Leschi	11	9	2
Washington	McGilvra	6	3	3
Washington	Montlake	6	2	4
Washington	Thurgood Marshall	17	4	13
Washington	Lowell	23	1	22
McClure	Catharine Blaine K-8	4	19	-15
McClure	Coe	11	11	0
McClure	Lawton	15	8	7
McClure	Hay	21	9	12
Aki Kurose	Brighton	3	7	-4
Aki Kurose	Wing Luke	7	6	1
Aki Kurose	Emerson	10	6	4
Aki Kurose	Dunlap	11	6	5
Aki Kurose	Graham Hill	16	5	11
Aki Kurose	Rainier View	N/A	13	N/A
		569	569	0

Note: Data as of Jan. 13, 2010

DATA SET 5: PARENT SURVEY DATA

This chart shows the schools identified as having capacity challenges based on this data set. An "X" is shown wherever a particular analysis indicates capacity challenges. Note that the last column (# of Data Sets Indicating Capacity Challenges) simply totals the number of data sets indicating potential capacity challenges and is not an estimate of the number of additional classrooms that might be needed.

Service Area	School	Classroom Analysis Data	Early Registration Data (n=1512)	2009-10 K Siblings Data (n=1209)	District Survey (n=569)	Parent Survey Data	# of Data Sets Indicating Capacity Challenges (NOT # of classrooms)
Hamilton	West Woodland			X	X	X	3
Eckstein	Bryant		X		X	X	3
McClure	Hay				X	X	2
Whitman	Daniel Bagley				X	X	2

Population Studied

Parents representing a group called Keep Our Kids Together (KOKT) forwarded the results they compiled from sibling surveys conducted by KOKT, school PTAs, and other school coalitions.

The parent data provides in-depth information for certain schools and services areas. However, it is important to note that all areas of the district are not reflected in this data, so no conclusions should be drawn about the absence of capacity challenges in the Aki Kurose Service Area, the Denny Service Area, or the Mercer Service Area.

Aki Kurose Service Area – No Data

Denny Service Area – Limited or No Data

Mercer Service Area – No Data

Analysis

The results from the survey were compiled by KOKT to show how many kindergarten students would flow into or out of each school represented based on each respondent's entering kindergarten student's attendance area and the older sibling's current school.

DATA SET 5: PARENT SURVEY DATA (continued)

Parent Survey				
Service Area	Attendance Area (AA)	Older sibling lives in another AA but attends this school	Older sibling lives in AA but attends another AA school	Net Diff
Denny	Sanislo	1	0	1
Eckstein	Bryant	18	6	12
Eckstein	Green Lake	5	5	0
Eckstein	John Rogers	4	10	-6
Eckstein	Olympic Hills	0	3	-3
Eckstein	Olympic View	0	3	-3
Eckstein	Sacajawea	3	1	2
Eckstein	View Ridge	14	12	2
Eckstein	Wedgwood	17	11	6
Hamilton	B.F. Day	0	8	-8
Hamilton	John Stanford	9	3	6
Hamilton	Laurelhurst	11	6	5
Hamilton	West Woodland	15	3	12
Madison	Alki	0	3	-3
Madison	Gatewood	0	0	0
Madison	Lafayette	0	3	-3
Madison	Schmitz Park	5	0	5
McClure	Catharine Blaine K-8	0	6	-6
McClure	Coe	0	8	-8
McClure	Hay	16	4	12
McClure	Lawton	2	4	-2
Washington	John Muir	0	1	-1
Washington	Leschi	0	1	-1
Washington	Lowell	6	0	6
Washington	Madrona K-8	0	1	-1
Washington	McGilvra	0	2	-2
Washington	Montlake	4	0	4
Washington	Stevens	3	3	0
Whitman	Adams	3	12	-9
Whitman	Broadview-Thomson K-8	0	5	-5
Whitman	Daniel Bagley	20	4	16
Whitman	Greenwood	0	14	-14
Whitman	Loyal Heights	6	3	3
Whitman	North Beach	9	6	3
Whitman	Northgate	0	0	0
Whitman	Whittier	14	7	7
		185	158	27*

* Data submitted by KOKT

APPENDIX A

SUMMARY OF CAPACITY CHALLENGES IDENTIFIED IN EACH DATA SET

This chart shows the schools identified as having capacity challenges based on this data set. An "X" is shown wherever a particular analysis indicates capacity challenges. Note that the last column (# of Data Sets Indicating Capacity Challenges) simply totals the number of data sets indicating potential capacity challenges and is not an estimate of the number of additional classrooms that might be needed.

Service Area	School	Class-room Analysis Data	Early Registration Data (n=1,512)	2009-10 K Siblings Data (n=1209)	District Survey (n=569)	Parent Survey	# of Data Sets Indicating Capacity Challenges (NOT # of classrooms)
Aki Kurose	Brighton						
Aki Kurose	Dunlap						
Aki Kurose	Emerson						
Aki Kurose	Graham Hill				X		1
Aki Kurose	Rainier View						
Aki Kurose	Wing Luke	X					1
Denny	Arbor Heights						
Denny	Concord						
Denny	Highland Park						
Denny	Roxhill						
Denny	Sanislo	X					1
Denny	West Seattle Elem	X					1
Eckstein	Bryant		X		X	X	3
Eckstein	Green Lake						
Eckstein	John Rogers						
Eckstein	Olympic Hills						
Eckstein	Olympic View	X		X	X		3
Eckstein	Sacajawea						
Eckstein	Sand Point						
Eckstein	View Ridge						
Eckstein	Wedgwood	X		X	X		3
Hamilton	B.F. Day						
Hamilton	John Stanford						

APPENDIX A (continued)

Service Area	School	Class-room Analysis Data	Early Registration <u>Data</u> (n=1,512)	2009-10 K Siblings Data (n=1209)	District Survey (n=569)	Parent Survey*	# of Data Sets Indicating Capacity Challenges (NOT # of classrooms)
Hamilton	Laurelhurst				X		1
Hamilton	McDonald						
Hamilton	West Woodland			X	X	X	3
Madison	Alki						
Madison	Gatewood						
Madison	Lafayette			X			1
Madison	Schmitz Park						
McClure	Catharine Blaine K-8	X					1
McClure	Coe						
McClure	Hay				X	X	2
McClure	Lawton						
Mercer	Beacon Hill			X	X		2
Mercer	Dearborn Park						
Mercer	Hawthorne						
Mercer	Kimball			X	X		2
Mercer	Maple	X					1
Mercer	Van Asselt			X			1
Washington	Gatzert						
Washington	John Muir						
Washington	Leschi						
Washington	Lowell		X		X		2
Washington	Madrona K-8						
Washington	McGilvra						
Washington	Montlake						
Washington	Stevens	X		X			2
Washington	Thurgood Marshall				X		1
Whitman	Adams						
Whitman	Broadview-Thomson K-8	X					1
Whitman	Daniel Bagley				X	X	2
Whitman	Greenwood	X					1
Whitman	Loyal Heights			X			1

APPENDIX A (continued)

Service Area	School	Class-room Analysis Data	Early Registration <u>Data</u> (n=1,512)	2009-10 K Siblings Data (n=1209)	District <u>Survey</u> (n=569)	Parent Survey*	# of Data Sets Indicating Capacity Challenges (<u>NOT</u> # of classrooms)
Whitman	North Beach			X			1
Whitman	Northgate						
Whitman	Viewlands						
Whitman	Whittier						

*The parent survey provides in-depth information for certain schools and services areas. However, it is important to note that all areas of the district are not reflected in this data, so no conclusions should be drawn about the absence of capacity challenges in the Aki Kurose, Denny, or Mercer Service Areas.

APPENDIX B

ISSUES WITH ADDING PORTABLE CLASSROOMS TO “GROUP THREE” SCHOOLS IDENTIFIED IN DATA SET 1

Analysis by Tingyu Wang, Marc Walsh, Mike Barrett, Kathy Johnson

School	Can it accommodate portables	How Many (potential)	Issues to be addressed
Wing Luke	Yes	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reversal of BEX II policy to remove portables • Remove playground and/or landscaping to locate • No adjacent park
Sanislo	Yes	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only location for portables very far away from main building • Would need to remove significant amount of the playground • School has large wetland ECA which will impact lot size • Likely exceeds hydrant access • No adjacent park
West Seattle Elementary	Yes	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Likely location has access issues for ADA due to topography and large retaining wall • May exceed hydrant access • Would require removal of some playground • No adjacent park
Olympic View	Yes	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is an ECA site for steep slopes • No adjacent park
Wedgwood	Yes	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is an ECA site for steep slopes • Location for portables is on far side of playground and would remove some playground area • No adjacent park
Blaine	Yes	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would remove a significant portion of the playground that has had multiple self help site plan, city grants and improvements • Property lines are co-mixed with Parks and Community Center which may impact ability to place portables
Maple	Yes	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reversal of BEX II policy to remove portables • Remove playground and/or landscaping to locate

APPENDIX B (continued)

School	Can it accommodate portables	How Many (potential)	Issues to be addressed
Stevens	No		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> BEX I school constructed at maximum lot coverage No adjacent park
Broadview-Thomson	Yes	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ECA site for wetlands, habitat and steep slope Property lines co-mixed with Parks and Community Center Would remove a significant amount of the playground Would put at the upper limit of the desired school size for K-8's at 850 students
Greenwood	No		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> BEX I school constructed at maximum lot coverage No adjacent park

Placement of Portables at sites

Placement of portable or modular classrooms at schools requires permitting under the Seattle Municipal Code (Building Code). The SMC has limits to how much of a site may be covered with structures and non-porous surfaces. The size of buildings and structures are limited to about 35% of the site size.

It has been the practice in our past Building Excellence (BEX) capital construction program to reduce the District's reliance on portables and to build our new elementary schools (and some of additions to elementary schools) to the maximum allowable lot coverage. In many cases, we have also had to obtain departures (variances) approved by both the neighborhoods and the city Department of Planning and Development (DPD) from height restrictions, on-site parking and bus loading requirements to do this. The BEX buildings have been constructed since 1997. In these cases where we are at maximum lot coverage, we are unable to place portables on these sites. In the case of the building additions, the stated purpose of the project was to eliminate portables at these schools.

Maximum lot coverage does not only apply to new buildings, but to all existing schools as well. We may already be at maximum lot coverage at schools that have portables since all structures on the site are counted toward the calculation. Since all portables need to be permitted prior to installation, the City does verify lot coverage with each portable placement. It typically requires 3 months to obtain a building permit to place a portable once the portable has been secured and the design for the placement is complete. The District has an internal deadline for portable decision by April 1 for the following September.

APPENDIX B (continued)

The City limits the addition of 4,000 square feet or less under general building permits - this is approximately 4 single portables (approximately 100 seats). If the District wishes to place more than 4 portables at any one time, we are required to obtain a Master Use Permit (MUP) from the city. The MUP will require environmental analysis that includes parking impacts and the impact of additional capacity on the neighborhood. It typically takes 18 months to go through the entire process from design to construction when a MUP is required.

Most of our sites contain “Environmentally Critical Area” as defined by the City of Seattle. The City has mapped areas of wetlands and riparian corridors (streams), buffers, steep slopes and potential slide areas, peat areas, as well as wildlife habitat and corridors and tree canopy areas. These areas are not available for construction and are discounted from buildable areas in the maximum allowable lot coverage. This calculation however, is done at the time of permitting and we would not know the exact impact until we apply for the permit and do the necessary site evaluation.

The City Fire Marshall has strict regulations on placement of portables. It is necessary to have specific driveways and corridors around the building and the portables to allow fire truck access. A portable cannot be further than 400 feet from a fire hydrant. If the location of the portable is beyond this, the District is required to install a new fire hydrant to serve it. An average cost of a hydrant is \$500,000. There are also some cases where the portable needs to be sprinkled.

Other concerns regarding portables

Portables’ impact on playgrounds: At most Seattle school sites, the lot is below the state’s recommended site size for elementary of 14 acres. The District, given our urban environment, has adopted a 4 acre minimum for an elementary school. This provided adequate but not generous outdoor play space and a small on-site parking lot. In many cases, the school communities have come together and designed all available playground space and fund-raised for improvements through the self help program. Placement of portables always removes play space from the school since we do not have “excess unused” land available for future use. This creates two impacts – both the playground has now shrunk and there is more students to use the playground and need supervision. There are instances where the school uses the adjacent park for recess which can mitigate the impact.

Portables’ impact on the school: The addition of more students to a campus due to additional space can stress the main building. Typically the school was “sized” to its capacity. Meaning that the cafeteria, library, number of restrooms, office space, support spaces parking lot, bus drop off and parent loading areas and gymnasium was designed to serve the number of classrooms with the original building. When more students are added, it creates hardship on those using the building and it becomes more cramped. Mitigations include additional shifts in lunches and recess, library and computer use, and restrictions general access to support spaces. Addition of 30 – 60 students may not be noticeable, but adding 100 will create hardships on both the staff and student body.

APPENDIX B (continued)

Reliance on portables for permanent capacity: Typically, when a portable is placed at a school it becomes part of the functional capacity of the school and increases its capacity. Last year the state auditor's report on the state's largest school districts indicated that a school should not have in excess of 10% of its capacity in portables. There were audit findings for school districts that relied too heavily on portables. Currently, SPS is at 8.6% of total seat capacity being in portables.

Costs of portables

We typically budget \$50,000 - \$250,000 to add a portable to a site without a hydrant issue. If the site needs a hydrant, it could be as much as \$500,000 additional cost. Since portables need to meet specific requirements of both the local building code and the Department of Labor and Industries for modular structures, the cost can range between \$50,000 - \$125,000 to buy. The District routinely looks for used portables from other districts hoping to save on the cost of the structure. The remainder of the cost will be for city permits, the moving of the portable (which is highly restricted to specific days and times by the city), the set up, foundation and skirting, stair and ramp installation, plumbing for sanitary sewer and water, fire sprinkler and / or hydrant costs, electrical and data hook up and installation, phone system and security alarms, student and teacher furniture and technology hardware. If the District is moving a portable it already has at a site to another site, it will cost approximately \$50,000 for the move.