NEWBERG-DUNDEE PUBLIC SCHOOLS: SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING MODEL RANKING

Individual Board Member Assessment · Complete independently before group discussion

Board Member Name:	Andy Byerley
Date:	11/6/2026

HOW TO USE THIS TOOL

1. On each model tab (C, D, G, H, and J), list the pros and cons that matter most to you in each of the nine areas. Write them in your own words. Individual items are not scored.
2. At the end of each area, give that model one rank compared with the other four: 5 = best of the five models in that area, 1 = weakest. Use each number once per area.
3. This page fills in as you go. The Check column tells you if an area is missing a rank or repeats a number.
4. Nothing here is added up. Look for the pattern: how many areas each model ranks first, how each model compares head to head, and how each model does in the areas you care about most.

MY RANKING BY AREA (5 = best of the five, 1 = weakest)

Area	Model C	Model D	Model G	Model H	Model J	Check
01 Budget	2	3	4	5	1	OK
02 Capacity	5	4	2	1	3	OK
03 Student Impact	3	5	1	2	4	OK
04 Class Size Distribution	2	5	3	4	1	OK
05 Facilities & Closed Buildings	3	5	1	4	2	OK
06 Community Impact & Equity	5	3	4	1	2	OK
07 Transportation & Access	4	5	2	3	1	OK
08 Enrollment Trends	5	4	2	1	3	OK
09 Implementation & Transition	4	5	2	3	1	OK

WHAT THE PATTERN SHOWS (counts of areas, not totals of scores)

Number of areas ranked...	Model C	Model D	Model G	Model H	Model J
best of the five (rank 5)	3	5	0	1	0
in the top two (rank 4 or 5)	5	7	2	3	1
weakest of the five (rank 1)	0	0	2	3	4

HEAD TO HEAD (areas where the model in the row ranked above the model in the column)

Row model ranked above column model in...	Model C	Model D	Model G	Model H	Model J
Model C	—	3	7	6	8
Model D	6	—	7	8	9
Model G	2	2	—	3	5
Model H	3	1	6	—	5
Model J	1	0	4	4	—

Example: a 7 in the Model D row and Model C column means Model D ranked above Model C in 7 of the 9 areas. If a model is dropped or renamed, rename its tab and the formulas follow. Ties are counted for neither model.

MY THREE MOST IMPORTANT AREAS

Pick the three areas that matter most to you. The table shows how each model ranked in those areas.

Area (pick from the list)	Model C	Model D	Model G	Model H	Model J
01 Budget	2	3	4	5	1
02 Capacity	5	4	2	1	3
09 Implementation & Transition	4	5	2	3	1

BOARD MEMBER SUMMARY & REFLECTION

The 3 factors that most shaped my rankings:

Does the model clear the $1M gate? Budget is critically important in this decision. Relatedly, many of my follow up questions have been regarding the assumptions used to put these models together and how accurately these will match the reality of enacting the decision. We may need to save more than the models predict.
Our schools need to be more densely utilized. With equivalent costs in administrative, custodial, and office staff, a school that serves more students just makes sense. While this financial benefit trades off the small community, it seems to be to be a necessary part of our current reality.
It's unlikely that we could orchestrate a move the magnitude of Model G or H by next year. I also believe that we will need to take a phased approach to this work. So, our implementation should keep doors open for future possibilities.
Items I need more information on:
I would like a breakdown of our assumptions regarding busing and how the transportation savings were calculated. Specifically, how are we factoring in the need to bus students who have been living within 1 mile of a (now) closed site? How would busing a single grade level (6th, in Model G) work? Would we just bus 6-8 together and make separate dropoffs at the two adjacent sites?
How are we calculating the non-instructional staff savings? In Model H, for example, both middle schools would need Assistant Principals which are a different cost from the current deans. How about numbers of office staff?
How much will it actually cost to close a school in terms of moving costs, teacher time, transportation, deep-clean custodial, etc.?
I do not know how to accurately score 6 Community Impact & Equity because we haven't really defined these terms. I would benefit from some dialog with other board members to reach consensus. Does equity mean that more students are facing some kind of change (i.e., sharing the burden)? Or does equity mean that we don't sacrifice the current programs and service levels for students who most need them? How do our District Office staff compare with that of these same neighboring districts with which we are comparing our school densities? Are we operating sustainably despite our current DO staff serving important roles and doing essential work?
Overall reflection: what do my rankings reveal about my priorities?
CAUTION: Data only tell part of the story. We need dialog to get at some of the factors the data just cannot capture.
I think it is unwise to think that this round of school closure and/or restructuring is going to be enough for us in the long run. We should anticipate that some families will move their students out of NDPS and that may drastically change our reality over the next couple years. We may be facing a similar situation in another year or two, and I believe our best bet is to keep some options open for restructuring our middle schools.
Relatedly, I believe there are partnerships with the City of Newberg, CPRD, and others that would open possibilities we have not yet considered. Making a decision now that leaves a door open for additional reconfiguration seems prudent as members of a larger community.

NEWBERG-DUNDEE PUBLIC SCHOOLS: SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING MODEL RANKING

Individual Board Member Assessment · Complete independently before group discussion

Board Member:	Andy Byerley
Model Being Evaluated:	**Model C: Close Ewing Young and Antonia Crater. K-5 elementary and 6-8 middle schools unchanged.**

KEY FACTS FOR THIS MODEL (models workbook, updated October 28, 2026)

Net recurring savings	**$1,081,500**
Average elementary class size (today 25.03, target 24.5)	**24.65**
Class size spread, standard deviation (today 5.30; lower is more even)	**1.85**
Grade levels with fewer than two teachers (today 17 of 36)	**2 of 24**

HOW TO USE THIS PAGE

For each area, list the pros and cons that matter most to YOU. Column A: Pro or Con. Column B: describe the item in your own words. Do not score individual items. Then give this model ONE rank for the area, compared with the other four models: 5 = best of the five, 1 = weakest of the five. Use each number once per area. Complete the same area on all five model tabs.

01 Budget

e.g. Net recurring savings · One-time closure costs (moving, severance) · Whether the savings are enough to restore instructional days

Pro / Con	Item
Con	Second lowest savings of all 5 models.
Pro	Does clear the $1M gate.

My rank for Budget (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **2**

02 Capacity

e.g. Enrollment vs. rated capacity at receiving schools · Cafeteria and gym load

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	Plenty of room to accommodate new growth.
Pro	All buildings utilized around the same percentage.

My rank for Capacity (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **5**

03 Student Impact

e.g. Academic disruption and transition stress

Pro / Con	Item

Con	EY students relocated to JA have to go even further than they would if they relocated to AC.
Con	Relocates more students than Model D.

My rank for Student Impact (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **3**

04 Class Size Distribution

e.g. Average class size vs. the 24.5 target · Spread between the smallest and largest classes · Grade levels with fewer than two teachers · Blended classes

Pro / Con	Item
Con	Large range and highest maximum for class size.
Pro	Only 2 grade levels below 2 teachers.

My rank for Class Size Distribution (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **2**

05 Facilities & Closed Buildings

e.g. Cost to secure, heat, and maintain a vacant building · Liability and vandalism · Condition and deferred maintenance of buildings that stay open · Future use of a closed building · Cost to reopen if enrollment rebounds

Pro / Con	Item
Con	Closes two buildings on the west side of the district.
Con	Closes an elementary adjacent to to a middle school.
Pro	Closes an elementary without fenced school grounds.
Pro	EY is the least densely utilized school site.

My rank for Facilities & Closed Buildings (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **3**

06 Community Impact & Equity

e.g. Disproportionate impact on low-income, ELL, or Title I students · Loss of a neighborhood anchor · Community groups that use the building · Trust of families and staff

Pro / Con	Item

My rank for Community Impact & Equity (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **5**

07 Transportation & Access

e.g. Longer commutes for younger students · Added bus routes and costs · Walkability and safety of new routes · Access for families without a car

Pro / Con	Item
Con	May lead to some longer routes given that EY students relocated to JA have to travel further (and longer).
Pro	Student drop-off and pick-up is less disruptive to neighborhood traffic at JA.

My rank for Transportation & Access (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **4**

08 Enrollment Trends

e.g. Current enrollment vs. 5-year projection · Does the model still work if enrollment keeps declining? · Reversibility of the decision

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	Gives the most flexibility to continue adding to each building's capacity (e.g., moving grade 6 to elementaries).

My rank for Enrollment Trends (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **5**

09 Implementation & Transition

e.g. Realism of phasing and timeline · Boundary changes · Reduction in force and staff retention · Union contract and closure-process requirements · Short-term disruption vs. long-term benefit

Pro / Con	Item
Con	Closes two schools in the western half of the district.
Pro	Keeps AC available for potential middle grades restructuring.

My rank for Implementation & Transition (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **4**

NEWBERG-DUNDEE PUBLIC SCHOOLS: SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING MODEL RANKING

Individual Board Member Assessment · Complete independently before group discussion

Board Member:	Andy Byerley
Model Being Evaluated:	**Model D: Close Ewing Young and Joan Austin. K-5 elementary and 6-8 middle schools unchanged.**

KEY FACTS FOR THIS MODEL (models workbook, updated October 28, 2026)

Net recurring savings	**$1,182,526**
Average elementary class size (today 25.03, target 24.5)	**24.79**
Class size spread, standard deviation (today 5.30; lower is more even)	**1.43**
Grade levels with fewer than two teachers (today 17 of 36)	**5 of 24**

HOW TO USE THIS PAGE

For each area, list the pros and cons that matter most to YOU. Column A: Pro or Con. Column B: describe the item in your own words. Do not score individual items. Then give this model ONE rank for the area, compared with the other four models: 5 = best of the five, 1 = weakest of the five. Use each number once per area. Complete the same area on all five model tabs.

01 Budget

e.g. Net recurring savings · One-time closure costs (moving, severance) · Whether the savings are enough to restore instructional days

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	Clears $1M gate.
Con	Middle of the projections for savings.

My rank for Budget (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **3**

02 Capacity

e.g. Enrollment vs. rated capacity at receiving schools · Cafeteria and gym load

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	All remaining open school sites have room to grow.

My rank for Capacity (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **4**

03 Student Impact

e.g. Academic disruption and transition stress

Pro / Con	Item

Pro	Fewest number of students relocated.

My rank for Student Impact (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **5**

04 Class Size Distribution

e.g. Average class size vs. the 24.5 target · Spread between the smallest and largest classes · Grade levels with fewer than two teachers · Blended classes

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	Small difference (and standard deviation) between largest and smallest class size.

My rank for Class Size Distribution (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **5**

05 Facilities & Closed Buildings

e.g. Cost to secure, heat, and maintain a vacant building · Liability and vandalism · Condition and deferred maintenance of buildings that stay open · Future use of a closed building · Cost to reopen if enrollment rebounds

Pro / Con	Item
Con	JA is a newer building than AC to close.
Pro	EY is the least densely utilized school site.

My rank for Facilities & Closed Buildings (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **5**

06 Community Impact & Equity

e.g. Disproportionate impact on low-income, ELL, or Title I students · Loss of a neighborhood anchor · Community groups that use the building · Trust of families and staff

Pro / Con	Item
Con	Closes a Title 1 school (though students will still be served).
Con	Closes a school across from housing development in progress.

My rank for Community Impact & Equity (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **3**

07 Transportation & Access

e.g. Longer commutes for younger students · Added bus routes and costs · Walkability and safety of new routes · Access for families without a car

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	Short distance between JA and AC so students won't need to be bused much longer.
Con	Some students will need to cross 219 on foot.

My rank for Transportation & Access (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **5**

08 Enrollment Trends

e.g. Current enrollment vs. 5-year projection · Does the model still work if enrollment keeps declining? · Reversibility of the decision

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	Each remaining school site has room to grow while not being overutilized.
Con	Closes a school across from new development.

My rank for Enrollment Trends (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **4**

09 Implementation & Transition

e.g. Realism of phasing and timeline · Boundary changes · Reduction in force and staff retention · Union contract and closure-process requirements · Short-term disruption vs. long-term benefit

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	Relocates the fewest students of any model.
Pro	Keeps the door open for potentially implementing a 5-6 school at CV and 7-8 school at MV.

My rank for Implementation & Transition (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **5**

NEWBERG-DUNDEE PUBLIC SCHOOLS: SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING MODEL RANKING

Individual Board Member Assessment · Complete independently before group discussion

Board Member:	Andy Byerley
Model Being Evaluated:	**Model G (revised): Close Ewing Young and Mountain View Middle School. Antonia Crater becomes the 6th grade center; 7-8 at Chehalem Valley.**

KEY FACTS FOR THIS MODEL (models workbook, updated October 28, 2026)

Net recurring savings	**$1,200,177**
Average elementary class size (today 25.03, target 24.5)	**24.63**
Class size spread, standard deviation (today 5.30; lower is more even)	**1.81**
Grade levels with fewer than two teachers (today 17 of 36)	**2 of 25**

HOW TO USE THIS PAGE

For each area, list the pros and cons that matter most to YOU. Column A: Pro or Con. Column B: describe the item in your own words. Do not score individual items. Then give this model ONE rank for the area, compared with the other four models: 5 = best of the five, 1 = weakest of the five. Use each number once per area. Complete the same area on all five model tabs.

01 Budget

e.g. Net recurring savings · One-time closure costs (moving, severance) · Whether the savings are enough to restore instructional days

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	Clears the $1M gate.
Pro	Saves the second highest amount of any model.

My rank for Budget (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **4**

02 Capacity

e.g. Enrollment vs. rated capacity at receiving schools · Cafeteria and gym load

Pro / Con	Item
Con	CV has 13 seats remaining at estimated enrollment.

My rank for Capacity (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **2**

03 Student Impact

e.g. Academic disruption and transition stress

Pro / Con	Item

Con	Impacts about 1,100 students, the highest of all models.

My rank for Student Impact (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **1**

04 Class Size Distribution

e.g. Average class size vs. the 24.5 target · Spread between the smallest and largest classes · Grade levels with fewer than two teachers · Blended classes

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	Only 2 grade levels below 2 teachers.
Con	Larger range between smallest and largest class sizes.

My rank for Class Size Distribution (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **3**

05 Facilities & Closed Buildings

e.g. Cost to secure, heat, and maintain a vacant building · Liability and vandalism · Condition and deferred maintenance of buildings that stay open · Future use of a closed building · Cost to reopen if enrollment rebounds

Pro / Con	Item
Con	Some improvements may be needed at AC to house 6th graders.
Con	MV is a larger building to have to maintain when closed.
Pro	EY is the least densely utilized school site.
Pro	Keeps AC + CV as a usable joint campus while creatively meeting the needs of 6th graders.

My rank for Facilities & Closed Buildings (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **1**

06 Community Impact & Equity

e.g. Disproportionate impact on low-income, ELL, or Title I students · Loss of a neighborhood anchor · Community groups that use the building · Trust of families and staff

Pro / Con	Item
Con	Many families impacted by this change.

My rank for Community Impact & Equity (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **4**

07 Transportation & Access

e.g. Longer commutes for younger students · Added bus routes and costs · Walkability and safety of new routes · Access for families without a car

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	Grade 6 routes can travel with 7 & 8 -- close drops at adjacent schools.
Pro	May be able to combine 6-8 routes with high school?
Con	May limit walking for 6th graders who would have historically gone to MV.

My rank for Transportation & Access (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **2**

08 Enrollment Trends

e.g. Current enrollment vs. 5-year projection · Does the model still work if enrollment keeps declining? · Reversibility of the decision

Pro / Con	Item
Con	CV is pushed to capacity already -- not much room for growth.

My rank for Enrollment Trends (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **2**

09 Implementation & Transition

e.g. Realism of phasing and timeline · Boundary changes · Reduction in force and staff retention · Union contract and closure-process requirements · Short-term disruption vs. long-term benefit

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	Creates a shared middle grades campus between CV and AC.
Con	Could any work needed on AC be completed soon enough to complete a move by fall 2027?

My rank for Implementation & Transition (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **2**

NEWBERG-DUNDEE PUBLIC SCHOOLS: SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING MODEL RANKING

Individual Board Member Assessment · Complete independently before group discussion

Board Member:	Andy Byerley
Model Being Evaluated:	**Model H: Close Ewing Young and Joan Austin. K-4 elementary, 5-6 at Chehalem Valley, 7-8 at Mountain View.**

KEY FACTS FOR THIS MODEL (models workbook, updated October 28, 2026)

Net recurring savings	**$1,395,026**
Average elementary class size (today 25.03, target 24.5)	**24.94**
Class size spread, standard deviation (today 5.30; lower is more even)	**1.49**
Grade levels with fewer than two teachers (today 17 of 36)	**5 of 20**

HOW TO USE THIS PAGE

For each area, list the pros and cons that matter most to YOU. Column A: Pro or Con. Column B: describe the item in your own words. Do not score individual items. Then give this model ONE rank for the area, compared with the other four models: 5 = best of the five, 1 = weakest of the five. Use each number once per area. Complete the same area on all five model tabs.

01 Budget

e.g. Net recurring savings · One-time closure costs (moving, severance) · Whether the savings are enough to restore instructional days

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	Highest savings of all models.

My rank for Budget (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **5**

02 Capacity

e.g. Enrollment vs. rated capacity at receiving schools · Cafeteria and gym load

Pro / Con	Item
Con	CV overutilized at over 98% capacity -- no buffer for any growth.
Con	3 elementaries barely over 50% capacity due to the restructure to K-4.

My rank for Capacity (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **1**

03 Student Impact

e.g. Academic disruption and transition stress

Pro / Con	Item

Pro	Brings all students together in 5th grade rather than 9th.
Con	Impacts the second highest number of students of all models.

My rank for Student Impact (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **2**

04 Class Size Distribution

e.g. Average class size vs. the 24.5 target · Spread between the smallest and largest classes · Grade levels with fewer than two teachers · Blended classes

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	Small difference (and standard deviation) between largest and smallest class size.
Pro	CV (5-6) and MV (7-8) now have buffers for class size scheduling.

My rank for Class Size Distribution (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **4**

05 Facilities & Closed Buildings

e.g. Cost to secure, heat, and maintain a vacant building · Liability and vandalism · Condition and deferred maintenance of buildings that stay open · Future use of a closed building · Cost to reopen if enrollment rebounds

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	EY is the least densely utilized school site.
Pro	Keeps CV and AC active as adjacent sites.
Con	MV could be more expensive to heat and maintain when closed as it is larger.

My rank for Facilities & Closed Buildings (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **4**

06 Community Impact & Equity

e.g. Disproportionate impact on low-income, ELL, or Title I students · Loss of a neighborhood anchor · Community groups that use the building · Trust of families and staff

Pro / Con	Item
Con	Closes a Title 1 school (though students will still be served).
Con	Closes a school across from housing development in progress.
Con	Introduces another transition in a 5-6 school.
Con	Impacts many families upfront.

My rank for Community Impact & Equity (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **1**

07 Transportation & Access

e.g. Longer commutes for younger students · Added bus routes and costs · Walkability and safety of new routes · Access for families without a car

Pro / Con	Item
Con	Introduces district-wide routes that deliver to 3 separate sites (HS, CV, MV).
Pro	Routes can still be paired CV+HS and MV+HS.
Con	More students potentially crossing major highways (99W, 219).

My rank for Transportation & Access (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **3**

08 Enrollment Trends

e.g. Current enrollment vs. 5-year projection · Does the model still work if enrollment keeps declining? · Reversibility of the decision

Pro / Con	Item
Con	CV is pushed to capacity already -- not much room for growth.
Pro	All remaining open elementary schools have plenty of room to grow.

My rank for Enrollment Trends (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **1**

09 Implementation & Transition

e.g. Realism of phasing and timeline · Boundary changes · Reduction in force and staff retention · Union contract and closure-process requirements · Short-term disruption vs. long-term benefit

Pro / Con	Item
Con	Will require a lot of planning and relocating (4 schools impacted).
	Only model that RIFs licensed staff (both Pro & Con).

My rank for Implementation & Transition (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **3**

NEWBERG-DUNDEE PUBLIC SCHOOLS: SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING MODEL RANKING

Individual Board Member Assessment · Complete independently before group discussion

Board Member:	Andy Byerley
Model Being Evaluated:	**Model J: Close Antonia Crater and Joan Austin. Ewing Young stays open. K-5 elementary and 6-8 middle schools unchanged. Added at the Board's request after October 1; student placements were estimated by grade and proximity rather than mapped by address, so class-size figures are estimates.**

KEY FACTS FOR THIS MODEL (models workbook, updated October 28, 2026)

Net recurring savings	**$800,210**
Average elementary class size (today 25.03, target 24.5)	**24.59**
Class size spread, standard deviation (today 5.30; lower is more even)	**2.02**
Grade levels with fewer than two teachers (today 17 of 36)	**7 of 24**

HOW TO USE THIS PAGE

For each area, list the pros and cons that matter most to YOU. Column A: Pro or Con. Column B: describe the item in your own words. Do not score individual items. Then give this model ONE rank for the area, compared with the other four models: 5 = best of the five, 1 = weakest of the five. Use each number once per area. Complete the same area on all five model tabs.

01 Budget

e.g. Net recurring savings · One-time closure costs (moving, severance) · Whether the savings are enough to restore instructional days

Pro / Con	Item
Con	Does not clear $1M gate.

My rank for Budget (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **1**

02 Capacity

e.g. Enrollment vs. rated capacity at receiving schools · Cafeteria and gym load

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	4 remaining schools are more efficiently utilized (all over 75%).
Con	1 very small school left open.

My rank for Capacity (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **3**

03 Student Impact

e.g. Academic disruption and transition stress

Pro / Con	Item

Con	Closes a Title 1 school which may impact families less able to adapt.
Pro	Does not impact as many students as Models G or H.

My rank for Student Impact (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **4**

04 Class Size Distribution

e.g. Average class size vs. the 24.5 target · Spread between the smallest and largest classes · Grade levels with fewer than two teachers · Blended classes

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	Lowest overall projected class size.
Con	Highest number of grade levels with fewer than 2 teachers.
Con	Large range between smallest and largest class size.

My rank for Class Size Distribution (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **1**

05 Facilities & Closed Buildings

e.g. Cost to secure, heat, and maintain a vacant building · Liability and vandalism · Condition and deferred maintenance of buildings that stay open · Future use of a closed building · Cost to reopen if enrollment rebounds

Pro / Con	Item
Con	Closes two school sites in the core of Newberg.
Con	Closes an elementary next to a middle school.

My rank for Facilities & Closed Buildings (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **2**

06 Community Impact & Equity

e.g. Disproportionate impact on low-income, ELL, or Title I students · Loss of a neighborhood anchor · Community groups that use the building · Trust of families and staff

Pro / Con	Item
Con	Closes a Title 1 school.

My rank for Community Impact & Equity (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **2**

07 Transportation & Access

e.g. Longer commutes for younger students · Added bus routes and costs · Walkability and safety of new routes · Access for families without a car

Pro / Con	Item
Con	Closing 2 schools in the more densely populated core of Newberg will require additional busing to sites further away.
Pro	Keeps EY students closer to their school.

My rank for Transportation & Access (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **1**

08 Enrollment Trends

e.g. Current enrollment vs. 5-year projection · Does the model still work if enrollment keeps declining? · Reversibility of the decision

Pro / Con	Item
Con	EY does not have room to grow like other schools.

My rank for Enrollment Trends (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **3**

09 Implementation & Transition

e.g. Realism of phasing and timeline · Boundary changes · Reduction in force and staff retention · Union contract and closure-process requirements · Short-term disruption vs. long-term benefit

Pro / Con	Item
Con	Boundaries for remaining open schools have to shift more to accomodate relocated students.

My rank for Implementation & Transition (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **1**

NEWBERG-DUNDEE PUBLIC SCHOOLS: SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING MODEL RANKING

Individual Board Member Assessment · Complete independently before group discussion

Board Member Name:	Aubrey Nichols
Date:	11/4/26

HOW TO USE THIS TOOL

1. On each model tab (C, D, G, H, and J), list the pros and cons that matter most to you in each of the nine areas. Write them in your own words. Individual items are not scored.
2. At the end of each area, give that model one rank compared with the other four: 5 = best of the five models in that area, 1 = weakest. Use each number once per area.
3. This page fills in as you go. The Check column tells you if an area is missing a rank or repeats a number.
4. Nothing here is added up. Look for the pattern: how many areas each model ranks first, how each model compares head to head, and how each model does in the areas you care about most.

MY RANKING BY AREA (5 = best of the five, 1 = weakest)

Area	Model C	Model D	Model G	Model H	Model J	Check
01 Budget	2	3	4	5	1	OK
02 Capacity	5	4	2	1	3	OK
03 Student Impact	4	5	1	2	3	OK
04 Class Size Distribution	5	4	3	2	1	OK
05 Facilities & Closed Buildings	4	5	2	3	1	OK
06 Community Impact & Equity	4	5	2	3	1	OK
07 Transportation & Access	2	3	5	4	1	OK
08 Enrollment Trends	5	4	2	3	1	OK
09 Implementation & Transition	4	5	1	2	3	OK

WHAT THE PATTERN SHOWS (counts of areas, not totals of scores)

Number of areas ranked...	Model C	Model D	Model G	Model H	Model J
best of the five (rank 5)	3	4	1	1	0
in the top two (rank 4 or 5)	7	7	2	2	0
weakest of the five (rank 1)	0	0	2	1	6

HEAD TO HEAD (areas where the model in the row ranked above the model in the column)

Row model ranked above column model in...	Model C	Model D	Model G	Model H	Model J
Model C	—	3	7	7	9
Model D	6	—	7	7	9
Model G	2	2	—	3	6
Model H	2	2	6	—	6
Model J	0	0	3	3	—

Example: a 7 in the Model D row and Model C column means Model D ranked above Model C in 7 of the 9 areas. If a model is dropped or renamed, rename its tab and the formulas follow. Ties are counted for neither model.

MY THREE MOST IMPORTANT AREAS

Pick the three areas that matter most to you. The table shows how each model ranked in those areas.

Area (pick from the list)	Model C	Model D	Model G	Model H	Model J
03 Student Impact	4	5	1	2	3
01 Budget	2	3	4	5	1
04 Class Size Distribution	5	4	3	2	1

BOARD MEMBER SUMMARY & REFLECTION

The 3 factors that most shaped my rankings:

Balanced classes and stronger teacher teams. I prioritized models that reduce uneven class sizes and give teachers colleagues at the same grade level for planning and collaboration.

Student stability and manageable transitions. I considered how many students would change schools, the loss of neighborhood connections, and whether changing grade configurations would add disruption.

Long-term sustainability. I weighed recurring savings (budget) alongside building capacity and whether each model could accommodate enrollment changes without requiring another major restructuring.

Items I need more information on:

Room-by-room capacity at receiving schools, particularly Crater under D and Chehalem Valley under G and H, including space for PE, music, intervention, and special education.

Proposed boundaries, actual bus ride times, and changes to walking access for displaced students.

Clear answer on which school (in addition to ED) could receive Title funding/staffing.

Overall reflection: what do my rankings reveal about my priorities?

My rankings reflect a preference for addressing the district's financial and staffing challenges while preserving stability for students and families. I place significant value on stronger grade-level teacher teams, balanced classes, and enough space to maintain student services. Models C and D stand out because they address those needs while retaining the current grade structure. I recognize the potential benefits of reorganizing the middle grades, but I would need greater confidence in the instructional plan, building capacity, and implementation process to support that level of change.

NEWBERG-DUNDEE PUBLIC SCHOOLS: SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING MODEL RANKING

Individual Board Member Assessment · Complete independently before group discussion

Board Member:	Aubrey Nichols
Model Being Evaluated:	**Model C: Close Ewing Young and Antonia Crater. K-5 elementary and 6-8 middle schools unchanged.**

KEY FACTS FOR THIS MODEL (models workbook, updated October 28, 2026)

Net recurring savings	**$1,081,500**
Average elementary class size (today 25.03, target 24.5)	**24.65**
Class size spread, standard deviation (today 5.30; lower is more even)	**1.85**
Grade levels with fewer than two teachers (today 17 of 36)	**2 of 24**

HOW TO USE THIS PAGE

For each area, list the pros and cons that matter most to YOU. Column A: Pro or Con. Column B: describe the item in your own words. Do not score individual items. Then give this model ONE rank for the area, compared with the other four models: 5 = best of the five, 1 = weakest of the five. Use each number once per area. Complete the same area on all five model tabs.

01 Budget

e.g. Net recurring savings · One-time closure costs (moving, severance) · Whether the savings are enough to restore instructional days

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	meets the $1 million gate

My rank for Budget (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **2**

02 Capacity

e.g. Enrollment vs. rated capacity at receiving schools · Cafeteria and gym load

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	Retains current MS model, 2 of 24 grade levels under 2 teachers
Con	Concerns about meeting PE requirements at schools to receive: MR and JA- can they handle increase?

My rank for Capacity (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **5**

03 Student Impact

e.g. Academic disruption and transition stress

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	no disruption to MS, keeps familiar K-5 structure
Con	Impact on JA students who have to move to Mabel?

My rank for Student Impact (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **4**

04 Class Size Distribution

e.g. Average class size vs. the 24.5 target · Spread between the smallest and largest classes · Grade levels with fewer than two teachers · Blended classes

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	2 of 24 is a good load spread
Con	Some classes projected at 30 students
Con	Dundee still struggling with fewer than 2 teachers at a level

My rank for Class Size Distribution (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **5**

05 Facilities & Closed Buildings

e.g. Cost to secure, heat, and maintain a vacant building · Liability and vandalism · Condition and deferred maintenance of buildings that stay open · Future use of a closed building · Cost to reopen if enrollment rebounds

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	MS buildings remain open
Con	Possibly awkward to have a closed building between CVMS and the Chehalem senior center?
Pro	JA is centrally located for AC families

My rank for Facilities & Closed Buildings (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **4**

06 Community Impact & Equity

e.g. Disproportionate impact on low-income, ELL, or Title I students · Loss of a neighborhood anchor · Community groups that use the building · Trust of families and staff

Pro / Con	Item
Con	Closing two schools on N and NW portions of the district- for EY families to go all the way to JA may feel to far
Con	Crater walking families becoming bussing families to JA

My rank for Community Impact & Equity (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **4**

07 Transportation & Access

e.g. Longer commutes for younger students · Added bus routes and costs · Walkability and safety of new routes · Access for families without a car

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	little to no impact on MS routes
Con	longer ride lengths and earlier pickup times for EY families

My rank for Transportation & Access (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **2**

08 Enrollment Trends

e.g. Current enrollment vs. 5-year projection · Does the model still work if enrollment keeps declining? · Reversibility of the decision

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	remaining schools have plenty of open seats for future growth

My rank for Enrollment Trends (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **5**

09 Implementation & Transition

e.g. Realism of phasing and timeline · Boundary changes · Reduction in force and staff retention · Union contract and closure-process requirements · Short-term disruption vs. long-term benefit

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	Only closing elementary is a fairly smooth transition- only closing and relocating- not a grade level change
Con	Two closures in a geographic area puts larger load on transportation
Con	JA families moved to Mabel

My rank for Implementation & Transition (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **4**

NEWBERG-DUNDEE PUBLIC SCHOOLS: SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING MODEL RANKING

Individual Board Member Assessment · Complete independently before group discussion

Board Member:	Aubrey Nichols
Model Being Evaluated:	**Model D: Close Ewing Young and Joan Austin. K-5 elementary and 6-8 middle schools unchanged.**

KEY FACTS FOR THIS MODEL (models workbook, updated October 28, 2026)

Net recurring savings	**$1,182,526**
Average elementary class size (today 25.03, target 24.5)	**24.79**
Class size spread, standard deviation (today 5.30; lower is more even)	**1.43**
Grade levels with fewer than two teachers (today 17 of 36)	**5 of 24**

HOW TO USE THIS PAGE

For each area, list the pros and cons that matter most to YOU. Column A: Pro or Con. Column B: describe the item in your own words. Do not score individual items. Then give this model ONE rank for the area, compared with the other four models: 5 = best of the five, 1 = weakest of the five. Use each number once per area. Complete the same area on all five model tabs.

01 Budget

e.g. Net recurring savings · One-time closure costs (moving, severance) · Whether the savings are enough to restore instructional days

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	clears $1 million
Pro	slightly higher transportation savings

My rank for Budget (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **3**

02 Capacity

e.g. Enrollment vs. rated capacity at receiving schools · Cafeteria and gym load

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	Keeps middle schools open
Con	Crater has smallest margin of available seats after absorbing many EY and JA

My rank for Capacity (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **4**

03 Student Impact

e.g. Academic disruption and transition stress

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	model has the smallest amount of students impacted (340)
Con	Crater would take load of students- could they handle PE, lunch etc
Pro	maintains current structure of the district
Con	Huge influx to Crater- can they handle

My rank for Student Impact (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **5**

04 Class Size Distribution

e.g. Average class size vs. the 24.5 target · Spread between the smallest and largest classes · Grade levels with fewer than two teachers · Blended classes

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	22.5 to 27.5 class size spread, fairly tight
Con	5 grade levels still have fewer than 2 teachers
Pro	Standard deviation 1.43 (lowest)
Con	Dundee has grade level groups less than 2 teachers

My rank for Class Size Distribution (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **4**

05 Facilities & Closed Buildings

e.g. Cost to secure, heat, and maintain a vacant building · Liability and vandalism · Condition and deferred maintenance of buildings that stay open · Future use of a closed building · Cost to reopen if enrollment rebounds

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	Keeps middle schools open and in use

My rank for Facilities & Closed Buildings (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **5**

06 Community Impact & Equity

e.g. Disproportionate impact on low-income, ELL, or Title I students · Loss of a neighborhood anchor · Community groups that use the building · Trust of families and staff

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	Disrupts only two elem communities
Con	Title status- Where will title qualified students land and can we redesignate a school?

My rank for Community Impact & Equity (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **5**

07 Transportation & Access

e.g. Longer commutes for younger students · Added bus routes and costs · Walkability and safety of new routes · Access for families without a car

Pro / Con	Item
Con	long ride potential for young EY students

My rank for Transportation & Access (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **3**

08 Enrollment Trends

e.g. Current enrollment vs. 5-year projection · Does the model still work if enrollment keeps declining? · Reversibility of the decision

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	closing elementary only doesn't pressure capacity at middle school
Con	Crater capacity only has 42 remaining

My rank for Enrollment Trends (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **4**

09 Implementation & Transition

e.g. Realism of phasing and timeline · Boundary changes · Reduction in force and staff retention · Union contract and closure-process requirements · Short-term disruption vs. long-term benefit

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	preserves grade spans and has fewest building moves
Con	pressure on crater capacity and boundary

My rank for Implementation & Transition (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **5**

NEWBERG-DUNDEE PUBLIC SCHOOLS: SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING MODEL RANKING

Individual Board Member Assessment · Complete independently before group discussion

Board Member:	Aubrey Nichols
Model Being Evaluated:	**Model G (revised): Close Ewing Young and Mountain View Middle School. Antonia Crater becomes the 6th grade center; 7-8 at Chehalem Valley.**

KEY FACTS FOR THIS MODEL (models workbook, updated October 28, 2026)

Net recurring savings	**$1,200,177**
Average elementary class size (today 25.03, target 24.5)	**24.63**
Class size spread, standard deviation (today 5.30; lower is more even)	**1.81**
Grade levels with fewer than two teachers (today 17 of 36)	**2 of 25**

HOW TO USE THIS PAGE

For each area, list the pros and cons that matter most to YOU. Column A: Pro or Con. Column B: describe the item in your own words. Do not score individual items. Then give this model ONE rank for the area, compared with the other four models: 5 = best of the five, 1 = weakest of the five. Use each number once per area. Complete the same area on all five model tabs.

01 Budget

e.g. Net recurring savings · One-time closure costs (moving, severance) · Whether the savings are enough to restore instructional days

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	clears 1 million, second highest savings
Pro	adds 2.2 FTE while still recurring 1.2 million in savings
Con	Possible AC expenditures with transition to sixth only

My rank for Budget (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **4**

02 Capacity

e.g. Enrollment vs. rated capacity at receiving schools · Cafeteria and gym load

Pro / Con	Item
Con	very limited seats at CVMS for 7-8

My rank for Capacity (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **2**

03 Student Impact

e.g. Academic disruption and transition stress

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	sixth grade together could be positive
Con	increase in transitions for students moving schools multiple times
Pro	all MS together could be positive

My rank for Student Impact (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **1**

04 Class Size Distribution

e.g. Average class size vs. the 24.5 target · Spread between the smallest and largest classes · Grade levels with fewer than two teachers · Blended classes

Pro / Con	Item

My rank for Class Size Distribution (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **3**

05 Facilities & Closed Buildings

e.g. Cost to secure, heat, and maintain a vacant building · Liability and vandalism · Condition and deferred maintenance of buildings that stay open · Future use of a closed building · Cost to reopen if enrollment rebounds

Pro / Con	Item
Con	Crater and CVMS are un-fenced, challenges in fencing individually while maintaining 6-8 shared environment
Con	any needed upgrades to AC are unbudgeted
Pro	creation of MS campus could be beneficial
Con	transitions/closes use of three buildings

My rank for Facilities & Closed Buildings (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **2**

06 Community Impact & Equity

e.g. Disproportionate impact on low-income, ELL, or Title I students · Loss of a neighborhood anchor · Community groups that use the building · Trust of families and staff

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	common MS campus could build relationships for ms students prior to HS
Con	massive student movemnt: all AC families, all EY families, all MVMS families
Con	7/8 students from MVMS lose quick access to HS

My rank for Community Impact & Equity (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **2**

07 Transportation & Access

e.g. Longer commutes for younger students · Added bus routes and costs · Walkability and safety of new routes · Access for families without a car

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	large transportation savings
Pro	adjacent buildings share one pickup/drop off

My rank for Transportation & Access (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **5**

08 Enrollment Trends

e.g. Current enrollment vs. 5-year projection · Does the model still work if enrollment keeps declining? · Reversibility of the decision

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	one MS campus helps weather enrollment changes
Con	CVMS capacity is too close

My rank for Enrollment Trends (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **2**

09 Implementation & Transition

e.g. Realism of phasing and timeline · Boundary changes · Reduction in force and staff retention · Union contract and closure-process requirements · Short-term disruption vs. long-term benefit

Pro / Con	Item
Con	grade level transition (6 to AC) adds time/complication to process
Pro	focus on sixth grade transition is needed in district
Con	needed summer upgrades including safety fencing

My rank for Implementation & Transition (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **1**

NEWBERG-DUNDEE PUBLIC SCHOOLS: SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING MODEL RANKING

Individual Board Member Assessment · Complete independently before group discussion

Board Member:	Aubrey Nichols
Model Being Evaluated:	**Model H: Close Ewing Young and Joan Austin. K-4 elementary, 5-6 at Chehalem Valley, 7-8 at Mountain View.**

KEY FACTS FOR THIS MODEL (models workbook, updated October 28, 2026)

Net recurring savings	**$1,395,026**
Average elementary class size (today 25.03, target 24.5)	**24.94**
Class size spread, standard deviation (today 5.30; lower is more even)	**1.49**
Grade levels with fewer than two teachers (today 17 of 36)	**5 of 20**

HOW TO USE THIS PAGE

For each area, list the pros and cons that matter most to YOU. Column A: Pro or Con. Column B: describe the item in your own words. Do not score individual items. Then give this model ONE rank for the area, compared with the other four models: 5 = best of the five, 1 = weakest of the five. Use each number once per area. Complete the same area on all five model tabs.

01 Budget

e.g. Net recurring savings · One-time closure costs (moving, severance) · Whether the savings are enough to restore instructional days

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	highest projected savings

My rank for Budget (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **5**

02 Capacity

e.g. Enrollment vs. rated capacity at receiving schools · Cafeteria and gym load

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	moving fifth creates more space at the Els
Con	extremely close capacity at CV (7 seats)

My rank for Capacity (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **1**

03 Student Impact

e.g. Academic disruption and transition stress

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	combining 5-8 in bands could help culture
Con	985 students changing buildings
Con	timeline implementation

My rank for Student Impact (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **2**

04 Class Size Distribution

e.g. Average class size vs. the 24.5 target · Spread between the smallest and largest classes · Grade levels with fewer than two teachers · Blended classes

Pro / Con	Item
Con	5/20 still under two teachers
Pro	elem sizes stay reasonable
Con	class size differences between 4 and 5-6 could be big jump

My rank for Class Size Distribution (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **2**

05 Facilities & Closed Buildings

e.g. Cost to secure, heat, and maintain a vacant building · Liability and vandalism · Condition and deferred maintenance of buildings that stay open · Future use of a closed building · Cost to reopen if enrollment rebounds

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	keeps both MS in use
Pro	older MS students have access to HS
Con	capacity issues

My rank for Facilities & Closed Buildings (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **3**

06 Community Impact & Equity

e.g. Disproportionate impact on low-income, ELL, or Title I students · Loss of a neighborhood anchor · Community groups that use the building · Trust of families and staff

Pro / Con	Item
Con	huge transitions for many students
Con	continuity of DL strand across 4 schools instead of 3
Pro	support for MS students could increase, building community before HS

My rank for Community Impact & Equity (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **3**

07 Transportation & Access

e.g. Longer commutes for younger students · Added bus routes and costs · Walkability and safety of new routes · Access for families without a car

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	strong transportaion $ savings
Con	moving many students- splitting up families across different grade level bands

My rank for Transportation & Access (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **4**

08 Enrollment Trends

e.g. Current enrollment vs. 5-year projection · Does the model still work if enrollment keeps declining? · Reversibility of the decision

Pro / Con	Item
Con	CVMS near capacity, no room for increase
Pro	leaves capacity at K-4 sites

My rank for Enrollment Trends (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **3**

09 Implementation & Transition

e.g. Realism of phasing and timeline · Boundary changes · Reduction in force and staff retention · Union contract and closure-process requirements · Short-term disruption vs. long-term benefit

Pro / Con	Item
Con	need input from teaching/learning and collaboration from educators
Pro	MS buildings are suited for the proposed grade bands

My rank for Implementation & Transition (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **2**

NEWBERG-DUNDEE PUBLIC SCHOOLS: SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING MODEL RANKING

Individual Board Member Assessment · Complete independently before group discussion

Board Member:	Aubrey Nichols
Model Being Evaluated:	**Model J: Close Antonia Crater and Joan Austin. Ewing Young stays open. K-5 elementary and 6-8 middle schools unchanged. Added at the Board's request after October 1; student placements were estimated by grade and proximity rather than mapped by address, so class-size figures are estimates.**

KEY FACTS FOR THIS MODEL (models workbook, updated October 28, 2026)

Net recurring savings	**$800,210**
Average elementary class size (today 25.03, target 24.5)	**24.59**
Class size spread, standard deviation (today 5.30; lower is more even)	**2.02**
Grade levels with fewer than two teachers (today 17 of 36)	**7 of 24**

HOW TO USE THIS PAGE

For each area, list the pros and cons that matter most to YOU. Column A: Pro or Con. Column B: describe the item in your own words. Do not score individual items. Then give this model ONE rank for the area, compared with the other four models: 5 = best of the five, 1 = weakest of the five. Use each number once per area. Complete the same area on all five model tabs.

01 Budget

e.g. Net recurring savings · One-time closure costs (moving, severance) · Whether the savings are enough to restore instructional days

Pro / Con	Item
Con	does not meet 1 million threshold

My rank for Budget (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **1**

02 Capacity

e.g. Enrollment vs. rated capacity at receiving schools · Cafeteria and gym load

Pro / Con	Item
Con	EY tight with only 20 seats left
Pro	MS unaffected

My rank for Capacity (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **3**

03 Student Impact

e.g. Academic disruption and transition stress

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	preserves rural school
Con	closes two neighborhood/close together Els
Con	JA and AC have many walkers

My rank for Student Impact (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **3**

04 Class Size Distribution

e.g. Average class size vs. the 24.5 target · Spread between the smallest and largest classes · Grade levels with fewer than two teachers · Blended classes

Pro / Con	Item
Con	7/24 grade groups 2 or fewer- mostly EY
Con	standard deviation 2.02

My rank for Class Size Distribution (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **1**

05 Facilities & Closed Buildings

e.g. Cost to secure, heat, and maintain a vacant building · Liability and vandalism · Condition and deferred maintenance of buildings that stay open · Future use of a closed building · Cost to reopen if enrollment rebounds

Pro / Con	Item
Con	closes 1000 seats
Con	closes two geographically close buildings

My rank for Facilities & Closed Buildings (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **1**

06 Community Impact & Equity

e.g. Disproportionate impact on low-income, ELL, or Title I students · Loss of a neighborhood anchor · Community groups that use the building · Trust of families and staff

Pro / Con	Item
Con	moves 459 students while keeping 129 at EY
Con	JA Title status
Con	major closure in walkable neighborhoods

My rank for Community Impact & Equity (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **1**

07 Transportation & Access

e.g. Longer commutes for younger students · Added bus routes and costs · Walkability and safety of new routes · Access for families without a car

Pro / Con	Item
Con	only model with increasing transportation costs

My rank for Transportation & Access (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **1**

08 Enrollment Trends

e.g. Current enrollment vs. 5-year projection · Does the model still work if enrollment keeps declining? · Reversibility of the decision

Pro / Con	Item
Con	closes 1000 seats in neighborhoods where building and future building exist
Con	one teacher per grade at EY (6) and DD (1) make fluctuations difficult
Con	close capacity at EY

My rank for Enrollment Trends (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **1**

09 Implementation & Transition

e.g. Realism of phasing and timeline · Boundary changes · Reduction in force and staff retention · Union contract and closure-process requirements · Short-term disruption vs. long-term benefit

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	retains current structure, no MS effects
Con	possibly complicated boundary draws
Pro	

My rank for Implementation & Transition (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **3**

NEWBERG-DUNDEE PUBLIC SCHOOLS: SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING MODEL RANKING

Individual Board Member Assessment · Complete independently before group discussion

Board Member Name:	Celeste Jones
Date:	10/30/2026

HOW TO USE THIS TOOL

1. On each model tab (C, D, G, H, and J), list the pros and cons that matter most to you in each of the nine areas. Write them in your own words. Individual items are not scored.
2. At the end of each area, give that model one rank compared with the other four: 5 = best of the five models in that area, 1 = weakest. Use each number once per area.
3. This page fills in as you go. The Check column tells you if an area is missing a rank or repeats a number.
4. Nothing here is added up. Look for the pattern: how many areas each model ranks first, how each model compares head to head, and how each model does in the areas you care about most.

MY RANKING BY AREA (5 = best of the five, 1 = weakest)

Area	Model C	Model D	Model G	Model H	Model J	Check
01 Budget	2	3	4	5	1	OK
02 Capacity	5	4	2	1	3	OK
03 Student Impact	4	5	1	2	3	OK
04 Class Size Distribution	4	5	3	4	1	OK (tie)
05 Facilities & Closed Buildings	1	5	3	5	1	OK (tie)
06 Community Impact & Equity	4	5	2	3	1	OK
07 Transportation & Access	4	5	3	1	1	OK (tie)
08 Enrollment Trends	4	5	2	3	1	OK
09 Implementation & Transition	4	5	1	2	3	OK

WHAT THE PATTERN SHOWS (counts of areas, not totals of scores)

Number of areas ranked...	Model C	Model D	Model G	Model H	Model J
best of the five (rank 5)	1	7	0	2	0
in the top two (rank 4 or 5)	7	8	1	3	0
weakest of the five (rank 1)	1	0	2	2	6

HEAD TO HEAD (areas where the model in the row ranked above the model in the column)

Row model ranked above column model in...	Model C	Model D	Model G	Model H	Model J
Model C	—	1	7	6	8
Model D	8	—	8	7	9
Model G	2	1	—	2	6
Model H	2	1	7	—	5
Model J	0	0	3	3	—

Example: a 7 in the Model D row and Model C column means Model D ranked above Model C in 7 of the 9 areas. If a model is dropped or renamed, rename its tab and the formulas follow. Ties are counted for neither model.

MY THREE MOST IMPORTANT AREAS

Pick the three areas that matter most to you. The table shows how each model ranked in those areas.

Area (pick from the list)	Model C	Model D	Model G	Model H	Model J
01 Budget	2	3	4	5	1
09 Implementation & Transition	4	5	1	2	3
04 Class Size Distribution	4	5	3	4	1

BOARD MEMBER SUMMARY & REFLECTION
The 3 factors that most shaped my rankings:
Just a note that for budget (in the "my three areas that matter most"), this was more of a cutoff item for me, over a million or under a million mattered, but savings beyond a million stopped mattering to me
Middle school restructuring seems to be an unnecessary add to an already difficult enough set of problems and changes.
The room of 77 stakeholders (DRC) and NEA opinions matter to me, very invested stakeholders who are at the forefront of wanting good education for students with an eye toward long-term sustainability.
Items I need more information on:
Please no more information, we could analyze for years to come, but at some point we have to consider the large amount of information we have analyzed and consider it good enough to move forward with. Perfection is the enemy of good.
Overall reflection: what do my rankings reveal about my priorities?
Restored school year
Long-term sustainability
Whether or not the key stakeholders and implementers (e.g. as represented by DRC, NEA) can support the change.

NEWBERG-DUNDEE PUBLIC SCHOOLS: SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING MODEL RANKING

Individual Board Member Assessment · Complete independently before group discussion

Board Member:	Celeste Jones
Model Being Evaluated:	**Model C: Close Ewing Young and Antonia Crater. K-5 elementary and 6-8 middle schools unchanged.**

KEY FACTS FOR THIS MODEL (models workbook, updated October 28, 2026)

Net recurring savings	**$1,081,500**
Average elementary class size (today 25.03, target 24.5)	**24.65**
Class size spread, standard deviation (today 5.30; lower is more even)	**1.85**
Grade levels with fewer than two teachers (today 17 of 36)	**2 of 24**

HOW TO USE THIS PAGE

For each area, list the pros and cons that matter most to YOU. Column A: Pro or Con. Column B: describe the item in your own words. Do not score individual items. Then give this model ONE rank for the area, compared with the other four models: 5 = best of the five, 1 = weakest of the five. Use each number once per area. Complete the same area on all five model tabs.

01 Budget

e.g. Net recurring savings · One-time closure costs (moving, severance) · Whether the savings are enough to restore instructional days

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	>1 million, full school year calendar

My rank for Budget (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **2**

02 Capacity

e.g. Enrollment vs. rated capacity at receiving schools · Cafeteria and gym load

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	All schools well within their capacities

My rank for Capacity (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **5**

03 Student Impact

e.g. Academic disruption and transition stress

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	Fewest number of students/families impacted
Con	CVMS and MVMS feeder schools would adjust, likely to move JA kids to CVMS
Con	This one would be tied with 5, but at DRC meetings, I asked teachers about the workplace culture differences between Crater and JA were, and heard that given recent history of leadership turnover at JA, the reputation is that it is more chaotic to work at JA, less cohesive team at JA than at Crater (I heard this from both JA and Crater teachers). I don't know if that's objective enough data on it's own, but for me it's enough to be a tie breaker in this category.

My rank for Student Impact (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **4**

04 Class Size Distribution

e.g. Average class size vs. the 24.5 target · Spread between the smallest and largest classes · Grade levels with fewer than two teachers · Blended classes

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	Only 2 grade levels under 2 teachers (ties for best)- this feels important
Con	4th in class size spread (standard deviation)- though the difference isn't substantial (1 student difference), and this would still be a great improvement from current

My rank for Class Size Distribution (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **4**

05 Facilities & Closed Buildings

e.g. Cost to secure, heat, and maintain a vacant building · Liability and vandalism · Condition and deferred maintenance of buildings that stay open · Future use of a closed building · Cost to reopen if enrollment rebounds

Pro / Con	Item
Con	Perhaps Veritas would be interested, unlikely to be useful for GFU or ADEC (adult ed or commercial)
Pro	Closing the two smallest schools makes for lowest costs of maintaining utilities in vacant building
Con	Likelihood of leasing two smallest and furthest buildings from town

My rank for Facilities & Closed Buildings (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **1**

06 Community Impact & Equity

e.g. Disproportionate impact on low-income, ELL, or Title I students · Loss of a neighborhood anchor · Community groups that use the building · Trust of families and staff

Pro / Con	Item

Con	Variance in support from DRC (although second fewest DRC members rated it a "1- could not support")
Con	Losing middle school collaboration opportunity with a shared campus between CV and Crater
Pro	Neither of the schools closing would be Title 1 schools
Con	Loss of two neighborhood anchors (Crater, EY)

My rank for Community Impact & Equity (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **4**

07 Transportation & Access

e.g. Longer commutes for younger students · Added bus routes and costs · Walkability and safety of new routes · Access for families without a car

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	Minimal number of students/families impacted
Con	Slightly longer commutes for EY students/families

My rank for Transportation & Access (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **4**

08 Enrollment Trends

e.g. Current enrollment vs. 5-year projection · Does the model still work if enrollment keeps declining? · Reversibility of the decision

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	Good balance in capacity modelling over both 5-10 year enrollment, and potential for growth in 20-30 years

My rank for Enrollment Trends (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **4**

09 Implementation & Transition

e.g. Realism of phasing and timeline · Boundary changes · Reduction in force and staff retention · Union contract and closure-process requirements · Short-term disruption vs. long-term benefit

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	With just two schools being absorbed into other existing schools, this is likely one of the two easiest implementation options

My rank for Implementation & Transition (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest)	4

NEWBERG-DUNDEE PUBLIC SCHOOLS: SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING MODEL RANKING

Individual Board Member Assessment · Complete independently before group discussion

Board Member:	Celeste Jones
Model Being Evaluated:	**Model D: Close Ewing Young and Joan Austin. K-5 elementary and 6-8 middle schools unchanged.**

KEY FACTS FOR THIS MODEL (models workbook, updated October 28, 2026)

Net recurring savings	**$1,182,526**
Average elementary class size (today 25.03, target 24.5)	**24.79**
Class size spread, standard deviation (today 5.30; lower is more even)	**1.43**
Grade levels with fewer than two teachers (today 17 of 36)	**5 of 24**

HOW TO USE THIS PAGE

For each area, list the pros and cons that matter most to YOU. Column A: Pro or Con. Column B: describe the item in your own words. Do not score individual items. Then give this model ONE rank for the area, compared with the other four models: 5 = best of the five, 1 = weakest of the five. Use each number once per area. Complete the same area on all five model tabs.

01 Budget

e.g. Net recurring savings · One-time closure costs (moving, severance) · Whether the savings are enough to restore instructional days

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	>1 million, full school year calendar

My rank for Budget (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **3**

02 Capacity

e.g. Enrollment vs. rated capacity at receiving schools · Cafeteria and gym load

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	All schools well within their capacities

My rank for Capacity (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **4**

03 Student Impact

e.g. Academic disruption and transition stress

Pro / Con	Item

My rank for Student Impact (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **5**

04 Class Size Distribution

e.g. Average class size vs. the 24.5 target · Spread between the smallest and largest classes · Grade levels with fewer than two teachers · Blended classes

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	Lowest class size spread (standard deviation)
Con	5/25 grade levels under 2 teachers

My rank for Class Size Distribution (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **5**

05 Facilities & Closed Buildings

e.g. Cost to secure, heat, and maintain a vacant building · Liability and vandalism · Condition and deferred maintenance of buildings that stay open · Future use of a closed building · Cost to reopen if enrollment rebounds

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	Leasability of Joan Austin

My rank for Facilities & Closed Buildings (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **5**

06 Community Impact & Equity

e.g. Disproportionate impact on low-income, ELL, or Title I students · Loss of a neighborhood anchor · Community groups that use the building · Trust of families and staff

Pro / Con	Item
Con	Disruption for JA Title I fams
Con	Loss of a neighborhood anchor (EY)
Pro	Best support from DRC

My rank for Community Impact & Equity (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **5**

07 Transportation & Access

e.g. Longer commutes for younger students · Added bus routes and costs · Walkability and safety of new routes · Access for families without a car

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	Given JA central location, minimizes the commute changes

My rank for Transportation & Access (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **5**

08 Enrollment Trends

e.g. Current enrollment vs. 5-year projection · Does the model still work if enrollment keeps declining? · Reversibility of the decision

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	Good balance in capacity modelling over both 5-10 year enrollment, and potential for growth in 20-30 years

My rank for Enrollment Trends (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **5**

09 Implementation & Transition

e.g. Realism of phasing and timeline · Boundary changes · Reduction in force and staff retention · Union contract and closure-process requirements · Short-term disruption vs. long-term benefit

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	With just two schools being absorbed into other existing schools, this is likely one of the two easiest implementation options

My rank for Implementation & Transition (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **5**

NEWBERG-DUNDEE PUBLIC SCHOOLS: SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING MODEL RANKING

Individual Board Member Assessment · Complete independently before group discussion

Board Member:	Celeste Jones
Model Being Evaluated:	**Model G (revised): Close Ewing Young and Mountain View Middle School. Antonia Crater becomes the 6th grade center; 7-8 at Chehalem Valley.**

KEY FACTS FOR THIS MODEL (models workbook, updated October 28, 2026)

Net recurring savings	**$1,200,177**
Average elementary class size (today 25.03, target 24.5)	**24.63**
Class size spread, standard deviation (today 5.30; lower is more even)	**1.81**
Grade levels with fewer than two teachers (today 17 of 36)	**2 of 25**

HOW TO USE THIS PAGE

For each area, list the pros and cons that matter most to YOU. Column A: Pro or Con. Column B: describe the item in your own words. Do not score individual items. Then give this model ONE rank for the area, compared with the other five models: 5 = best of the five, 1 = weakest of the five. Use each number once per area. Complete the same area on all five model tabs.

01 Budget

e.g. Net recurring savings · One-time closure costs (moving, severance) · Whether the savings are enough to restore instructional days

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	>1 million, full school year calendar

My rank for Budget (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **4**

02 Capacity

e.g. Enrollment vs. rated capacity at receiving schools · Cafeteria and gym load

Pro / Con	Item
Con	Only 13 open seats at 7-8 school, seems to tight and risky (deal-breaker for me)

My rank for Capacity (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **2**

03 Student Impact

e.g. Academic disruption and transition stress

Pro / Con	Item
Con	Combining middle schools at Sherwood has reportedly been difficult (less reliable/objective data, so grain of salt)
	I feel ambivalent about whether combining all the sixth graders in one building is a pro (for community unity) or a con (for everyone's sanity)
	Also ambivalent about if a middle school restructure is necessary to better support the sixth graders better, or if that can be done less disruptively with the existing structure
Con	Brings disruption to every student in the district (adding a transition)
Con	Not enough room to use a small schools or houses model (to help with connection, lower behavioral issues, boost academic achievement)
Con	Highest number of kids that change buildings

My rank for Student Impact (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **1**

04 Class Size Distribution

e.g. Average class size vs. the 24.5 target · Spread between the smallest and largest classes · Grade levels with fewer than two teachers · Blended classes

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	2/25 grade levels with <2 teachers

My rank for Class Size Distribution (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **3**

05 Facilities & Closed Buildings

e.g. Cost to secure, heat, and maintain a vacant building · Liability and vandalism · Condition and deferred maintenance of buildings that stay open · Future use of a closed building · Cost to reopen if enrollment rebounds

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	MVMS may have leasing interest

My rank for Facilities & Closed Buildings (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **3**

06 Community Impact & Equity

e.g. Disproportionate impact on low-income, ELL, or Title I students · Loss of a neighborhood anchor · Community groups that use the building · Trust of families and staff

Pro / Con	Item

Con	Disruption to every family in the district
Con	Losing close proximity campus/collaboration opportunities with Mabel Rush and NHS
Con	Loss of two neighborhood anchors (MVMS promity to MR and NHS, EY)
Con	Second least supported by DRC

My rank for Community Impact & Equity (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **2**

07 Transportation & Access

e.g. Longer commutes for younger students · Added bus routes and costs · Walkability and safety of new routes · Access for families without a car

Pro / Con	Item
Con	Longer commutes for East side middle schoolers

My rank for Transportation & Access (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **3**

08 Enrollment Trends

e.g. Current enrollment vs. 5-year projection · Does the model still work if enrollment keeps declining? · Reversibility of the decision

Pro / Con	Item
Con	This solution won't hold up for any future growth at all based on middle school capacities.

My rank for Enrollment Trends (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **2**

09 Implementation & Transition

e.g. Realism of phasing and timeline · Boundary changes · Reduction in force and staff retention · Union contract and closure-process requirements · Short-term disruption vs. long-term benefit

Pro / Con	Item
Con	The logistics of combining the middle schools have been very difficult for Sherwood. Is there enough room for a small schools or houses model?

My rank for Implementation & Transition (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest)	1

NEWBERG-DUNDEE PUBLIC SCHOOLS: SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING MODEL RANKING

Individual Board Member Assessment · Complete independently before group discussion

Board Member:	Celeste Jones
Model Being Evaluated:	**Model H: Close Ewing Young and Joan Austin. K-4 elementary, 5-6 at Chehalem Valley, 7-8 at Mountain View.**

KEY FACTS FOR THIS MODEL (models workbook, updated October 28, 2026)

Net recurring savings	**$1,395,026**
Average elementary class size (today 25.03, target 24.5)	**24.94**
Class size spread, standard deviation (today 5.30; lower is more even)	**1.49**
Grade levels with fewer than two teachers (today 17 of 36)	**5 of 20**

HOW TO USE THIS PAGE

For each area, list the pros and cons that matter most to YOU. Column A: Pro or Con. Column B: describe the item in your own words. Do not score individual items. Then give this model ONE rank for the area, compared with the other four models: 5 = best of the five, 1 = weakest of the five. Use each number once per area. Complete the same area on all five model tabs.

01 Budget

e.g. Net recurring savings · One-time closure costs (moving, severance) · Whether the savings are enough to restore instructional days

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	>1 million, full school year calendar

My rank for Budget (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **5**

02 Capacity

e.g. Enrollment vs. rated capacity at receiving schools · Cafeteria and gym load

Pro / Con	Item
Con	Only 7 open seats at 5-6 campus- seems too tight and risky (deal-breaker for me)
Con	Not enough room to use a small schools or houses model (to help with connection, lower behavioral issues, boost academic achievement)

My rank for Capacity (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **1**

03 Student Impact

e.g. Academic disruption and transition stress

Pro / Con	Item
Con	Adds an additional school transition for all kids in the district
Con	Second highest number of kids that change buildings

My rank for Student Impact (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest): 2

04 Class Size Distribution

e.g. Average class size vs. the 24.5 target · Spread between the smallest and largest classes · Grade levels with fewer than two teachers · Blended classes

Pro / Con	Item

My rank for Class Size Distribution (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest): 4

05 Facilities & Closed Buildings

e.g. Cost to secure, heat, and maintain a vacant building · Liability and vandalism · Condition and deferred maintenance of buildings that stay open · Future use of a closed building · Cost to reopen if enrollment rebounds

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	Leasability of JA

My rank for Facilities & Closed Buildings (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest): 5

06 Community Impact & Equity

e.g. Disproportionate impact on low-income, ELL, or Title I students · Loss of a neighborhood anchor · Community groups that use the building · Trust of families and staff

Pro / Con	Item
Con	Disruption for JA Title 1 fams
Con	Loss of a neighborhood anchor (EY)
Con	Least support from DRC

My rank for Community Impact & Equity (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest): 3

07 Transportation & Access

e.g. Longer commutes for younger students · Added bus routes and costs · Walkability and safety of new routes · Access for families without a car

Pro / Con	Item
Con	Families with kids divided between more different schools
Con	Long commutes for Crater to Dundee and Dundee to Crater kids (younger students)

My rank for Transportation & Access (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest)	1

Tied for 1 with H

08 Enrollment Trends

e.g. Current enrollment vs. 5-year projection · Does the model still work if enrollment keeps declining? · Reversibility of the decision

Pro / Con	Item
Con	This solution won't hold up for any future growth at all based on middle school capacities.

My rank for Enrollment Trends (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest)	3

09 Implementation & Transition

e.g. Realism of phasing and timeline · Boundary changes · Reduction in force and staff retention · Union contract and closure-process requirements · Short-term disruption vs. long-term benefit

Pro / Con	Item
Con	Is it necessary to add a middle school reconfiguration for the entire district when the savings aren't substantially more? Based on DRC support, It seems like a change of this scale might put the district beyond our change saturation level, and change fatigue has its own organizational costs.

My rank for Implementation & Transition (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest)	2

NEWBERG-DUNDEE PUBLIC SCHOOLS: SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING MODEL RANKING

Individual Board Member Assessment · Complete independently before group discussion

Board Member:	Celeste Jones
Model Being Evaluated:	**Model J: Close Antonia Crater and Joan Austin. Ewing Young stays open. K-5 elementary and 6-8 middle schools unchanged. Added at the Board's request after October 1; student placements were estimated by grade and proximity rather than mapped by address, so class-size figures are estimates.**

KEY FACTS FOR THIS MODEL (models workbook, updated October 28, 2026)

Net recurring savings	**$800,210**
Average elementary class size (today 25.03, target 24.5)	**24.59**
Class size spread, standard deviation (today 5.30; lower is more even)	**2.02**
Grade levels with fewer than two teachers (today 17 of 36)	**7 of 24**

HOW TO USE THIS PAGE

For each area, list the pros and cons that matter most to YOU. Column A: Pro or Con. Column B: describe the item in your own words. Do not score individual items. Then give this model ONE rank for the area, compared with the other four models: 5 = best of the five, 1 = weakest of the five. Use each number once per area. Complete the same area on all five model tabs.

01 Budget

e.g. Net recurring savings · One-time closure costs (moving, severance) · Whether the savings are enough to restore instructional days

Pro / Con	Item
Con	Still not a full school year (for me this is a deal breaker)

My rank for Budget (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **1**

02 Capacity

e.g. Enrollment vs. rated capacity at receiving schools · Cafeteria and gym load

Pro / Con	Item

My rank for Capacity (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **3**

03 Student Impact

e.g. Academic disruption and transition stress

Pro / Con	Item
Con	Closing both schools on the west side of town means lots of families impacted, including moving JA students from MVMS to CVMS

My rank for Student Impact (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **3**

04 Class Size Distribution

e.g. Average class size vs. the 24.5 target · Spread between the smallest and largest classes · Grade levels with fewer than two teachers · Blended classes

Pro / Con	Item
Con	7 grade levels with under 2 teachers
Con	Highest class size spread (standard deviation)

My rank for Class Size Distribution (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **1**

05 Facilities & Closed Buildings

e.g. Cost to secure, heat, and maintain a vacant building · Liability and vandalism · Condition and deferred maintenance of buildings that stay open · Future use of a closed building · Cost to reopen if enrollment rebounds

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	Leasability of JA
Con	Likelihood of finding two interested parties for leasing old school buildings?

My rank for Facilities & Closed Buildings (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **1**

06 Community Impact & Equity

e.g. Disproportionate impact on low-income, ELL, or Title I students · Loss of a neighborhood anchor · Community groups that use the building · Trust of families and staff

Pro / Con	Item
Con	Loss of a neighborhood anchor (Crater/CV campus)
Con	Closes both schools on Newberg's west side
Con	Community trust- prioritizes most affluent part of community at the cost of a Title 1 school (least affluent)

My rank for Community Impact & Equity (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **1**

07 Transportation & Access

e.g. Longer commutes for younger students · Added bus routes and costs · Walkability and safety of new routes · Access for families without a car

Pro / Con	Item
Con	Longer bus routes for the entire west side of Newberg
Pro	EY fams keep 30 min bus routes
Con	More barriers to access for Title 1 fams without a car

My rank for Transportation & Access (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest)	1

Tied for 1 with H

08 Enrollment Trends

e.g. Current enrollment vs. 5-year projection · Does the model still work if enrollment keeps declining? · Reversibility of the decision

Pro / Con	Item
Con	Problematic to close two bigger schools for 20 year longevity

My rank for Enrollment Trends (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest)	1

Tied for 1

09 Implementation & Transition

e.g. Realism of phasing and timeline · Boundary changes · Reduction in force and staff retention · Union contract and closure-process requirements · Short-term disruption vs. long-term benefit

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	With just two schools being absorbed into other existing schools, this is likely one of the easiest implementation options

My rank for Implementation & Transition (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest)	3

NEWBERG-DUNDEE PUBLIC SCHOOLS: SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING MODEL RANKING

Individual Board Member Assessment · Complete independently before group discussion

Board Member Name:	James Wolfer
Date:	11/4/2026

HOW TO USE THIS TOOL

1. On each model tab (C, D, G, H, and J), list the pros and cons that matter most to you in each of the nine areas. Write them in your own words. Individual items are not scored.
2. At the end of each area, give that model one rank compared with the other four: 5 = best of the five models in that area, 1 = weakest. Use each number once per area.
3. This page fills in as you go. The Check column tells you if an area is missing a rank or repeats a number.
4. Nothing here is added up. Look for the pattern: how many areas each model ranks first, how each model compares head to head, and how each model does in the areas you care about most.

MY RANKING BY AREA (5 = best of the five, 1 = weakest)

Area	Model C	Model D	Model G	Model H	Model J	Check
01 Budget	2	3	5	4	1	OK
02 Capacity	5	1	4	2	3	OK
03 Student Impact	4	3	5	1	2	OK
04 Class Size Distribution	4	2	5	3	1	OK
05 Facilities & Closed Buildings	2	4	5	3	1	OK
06 Community Impact & Equity	4	3	5	1	2	OK
07 Transportation & Access	4	3	5	2	1	OK
08 Enrollment Trends	3	1	5	4	2	OK
09 Implementation & Transition	4	5	3	1	2	OK

WHAT THE PATTERN SHOWS (counts of areas, not totals of scores)

Number of areas ranked...	Model C	Model D	Model G	Model H	Model J
best of the five (rank 5)	1	1	7	0	0
in the top two (rank 4 or 5)	6	2	8	2	0
weakest of the five (rank 1)	0	2	0	3	4

HEAD TO HEAD (areas where the model in the row ranked above the model in the column)

Row model ranked above column model in...	Model C	Model D	Model G	Model H	Model J
Model C	—	6	2	6	9
Model D	3	—	1	5	7
Model G	7	8	—	9	9
Model H	3	4	0	—	5
Model J	0	2	0	4	—

Example: a 7 in the Model D row and Model C column means Model D ranked above Model C in 7 of the 9 areas. If a model is dropped or renamed, rename its tab and the formulas follow. Ties are counted for neither model.

MY THREE MOST IMPORTANT AREAS

Pick the three areas that matter most to you. The table shows how each model ranked in those areas.

Area (pick from the list)	Model C	Model D	Model G	Model H	Model J
03 Student Impact	4	3	5	1	2
06 Community Impact & Equity	4	3	5	1	2
08 Enrollment Trends	3	1	5	4	2

BOARD MEMBER SUMMARY & REFLECTION
The 3 factors that most shaped my rankings:
Enrollment trends - middle school issue long term/classroom balance
Title 1 families having access
keeping walkable schools open
Items I need more information on:
Overall reflection: what do my rankings reveal about my priorities?
My priorities are long term solutions, walkability, and Title 1 schools

NEWBERG-DUNDEE PUBLIC SCHOOLS: SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING MODEL RANKING

Individual Board Member Assessment · Complete independently before group discussion

Board Member:	James Wolfer
Model Being Evaluated:	**Model C: Close Ewing Young and Antonia Crater. K-5 elementary and 6-8 middle schools unchanged.**

KEY FACTS FOR THIS MODEL (models workbook, updated October 28, 2026)

Net recurring savings	**$1,081,500**
Average elementary class size (today 25.03, target 24.5)	**24.65**
Class size spread, standard deviation (today 5.30; lower is more even)	**1.85**
Grade levels with fewer than two teachers (today 17 of 36)	**2 of 24**

HOW TO USE THIS PAGE

For each area, list the pros and cons that matter most to YOU. Column A: Pro or Con. Column B: describe the item in your own words. Do not score individual items. Then give this model ONE rank for the area, compared with the other four models: 5 = best of the five, 1 = weakest of the five. Use each number once per area. Complete the same area on all five model tabs.

01 Budget

e.g. Net recurring savings · One-time closure costs (moving, severance) · Whether the savings are enough to restore instructional days

Pro / Con	Item
Con	Saves just over $1Million, one of the lowest cost savings

My rank for Budget (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **2**

02 Capacity

e.g. Enrollment vs. rated capacity at receiving schools · Cafeteria and gym load

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	All elementary schools are below max capacity

My rank for Capacity (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **5**

03 Student Impact

e.g. Academic disruption and transition stress

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	only closes two schools
Con	closes one school within the Crater/CV campus

My rank for Student Impact (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **4**

04 Class Size Distribution

e.g. Average class size vs. the 24.5 target · Spread between the smallest and largest classes · Grade levels with fewer than two teachers · Blended classes

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	only 2 grade levels with less than 2 teachers and one of the lowest average class sizes

My rank for Class Size Distribution (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **4**

05 Facilities & Closed Buildings

e.g. Cost to secure, heat, and maintain a vacant building · Liability and vandalism · Condition and deferred maintenance of buildings that stay open · Future use of a closed building · Cost to reopen if enrollment rebounds

Pro / Con	Item
Con	Closes Crater, one of our newer buildings (30 years old)
Con	closes Crater which is part of larger Crater/CV campus

My rank for Facilities & Closed Buildings (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **2**

06 Community Impact & Equity

e.g. Disproportionate impact on low-income, ELL, or Title I students · Loss of a neighborhood anchor · Community groups that use the building · Trust of families and staff

Pro / Con	Item
Con	Loss of school with a lot of walkability to surrounding neighborhoods
Con	loss of anchor school within neighborhood with a ton of housing built around it in last few decades

My rank for Community Impact & Equity (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **4**

07 Transportation & Access

e.g. Longer commutes for younger students · Added bus routes and costs · Walkability and safety of new routes · Access for families without a car

Pro / Con	Item
Con	closes walkable school

My rank for Transportation & Access (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **4**

08 Enrollment Trends

e.g. Current enrollment vs. 5-year projection · Does the model still work if enrollment keeps declining? · Reversibility of the decision

Pro / Con	Item
Con	does not solve middle school problem
Con	based on trends, will likely need to close a middle school in near future

My rank for Enrollment Trends (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **3**

09 Implementation & Transition

e.g. Realism of phasing and timeline · Boundary changes · Reduction in force and staff retention · Union contract and closure-process requirements · Short-term disruption vs. long-term benefit

Pro / Con	Item
Con	closes two westside schools/two feeder schools to CV
Con	requires large boundary redraws

My rank for Implementation & Transition (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **4**

NEWBERG-DUNDEE PUBLIC SCHOOLS: SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING MODEL RANKING

Individual Board Member Assessment · Complete independently before group discussion

Board Member:	James Wolfer
Model Being Evaluated:	**Model D: Close Ewing Young and Joan Austin. K-5 elementary and 6-8 middle schools unchanged.**

KEY FACTS FOR THIS MODEL (models workbook, updated October 28, 2026)

Net recurring savings	**$1,182,526**
Average elementary class size (today 25.03, target 24.5)	**24.79**
Class size spread, standard deviation (today 5.30; lower is more even)	**1.43**
Grade levels with fewer than two teachers (today 17 of 36)	**5 of 24**

HOW TO USE THIS PAGE

For each area, list the pros and cons that matter most to YOU. Column A: Pro or Con. Column B: describe the item in your own words. Do not score individual items. Then give this model ONE rank for the area, compared with the other four models: 5 = best of the five, 1 = weakest of the five. Use each number once per area. Complete the same area on all five model tabs.

01 Budget

e.g. Net recurring savings · One-time closure costs (moving, severance) · Whether the savings are enough to restore instructional days

Pro / Con	Item
Con	third worst savings - closes two neighborhood schools for just over $1M

My rank for Budget (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **3**

02 Capacity

e.g. Enrollment vs. rated capacity at receiving schools · Cafeteria and gym load

Pro / Con	Item
Con	Crater fully at capacity, with new homes being built no room for those students

My rank for Capacity (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **1**

03 Student Impact

e.g. Academic disruption and transition stress

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	only affects 2 schools
Con	Disproportionally affects low income students
Con	students in new housing across from JA will have to be bussed or walk across a highway

My rank for Student Impact (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **3**

04 Class Size Distribution

e.g. Average class size vs. the 24.5 target · Spread between the smallest and largest classes · Grade levels with fewer than two teachers · Blended classes

Pro / Con	Item
Con	lower ranked model in grade levels - leaves 5 with under 2 teachers versus 2 in other models
Con	higher average class size than other models

My rank for Class Size Distribution (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **2**

05 Facilities & Closed Buildings

e.g. Cost to secure, heat, and maintain a vacant building · Liability and vandalism · Condition and deferred maintenance of buildings that stay open · Future use of a closed building · Cost to reopen if enrollment rebounds

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	JA would likley be leased by NWCC, GFU or ADEC
Con	closes second newest building in district

My rank for Facilities & Closed Buildings (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **4**

06 Community Impact & Equity

e.g. Disproportionate impact on low-income, ELL, or Title I students · Loss of a neighborhood anchor · Community groups that use the building · Trust of families and staff

Pro / Con	Item
Con	Title 1 school is closed.
Con	Zone (after school care) will likely not follow all lower income families - after school costs to some families will be inequitable
Con	homes across from JA will be less desirable with closed school to families, hurting an already declined enrollment

My rank for Community Impact & Equity (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **3**

07 Transportation & Access

e.g. Longer commutes for younger students · Added bus routes and costs · Walkability and safety of new routes · Access for families without a car

Pro / Con	Item
Con	lower income students will have to walk farther, access to after school activities weakened, etc
Con	families without cars will be unable to go to after school activities if not walkable

My rank for Transportation & Access (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **3**

08 Enrollment Trends

e.g. Current enrollment vs. 5-year projection · Does the model still work if enrollment keeps declining? · Reversibility of the decision

Pro / Con	Item
Con	does not solve middle school issue
Con	based on trends, will need to close middle school in near future
Con	Crater at capacity

My rank for Enrollment Trends (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **1**

09 Implementation & Transition

e.g. Realism of phasing and timeline · Boundary changes · Reduction in force and staff retention · Union contract and closure-process requirements · Short-term disruption vs. long-term benefit

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	central location so easier to split student body among other schools

My rank for Implementation & Transition (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **5**

NEWBERG-DUNDEE PUBLIC SCHOOLS: SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING MODEL RANKING

Individual Board Member Assessment · Complete independently before group discussion

Board Member:	James Wolfer
Model Being Evaluated:	**Model G (revised): Close Ewing Young and Mountain View Middle School. Antonia Crater becomes the 6th grade center; 7-8 at Chehalem Valley.**

KEY FACTS FOR THIS MODEL (models workbook, updated October 28, 2026)

Net recurring savings	**$1,200,177**
Average elementary class size (today 25.03, target 24.5)	**24.63**
Class size spread, standard deviation (today 5.30; lower is more even)	**1.81**
Grade levels with fewer than two teachers (today 17 of 36)	**2 of 25**

HOW TO USE THIS PAGE

For each area, list the pros and cons that matter most to YOU. Column A: Pro or Con. Column B: describe the item in your own words. Do not score individual items. Then give this model ONE rank for the area, compared with the other four models: 5 = best of the five, 1 = weakest of the five. Use each number once per area. Complete the same area on all five model tabs.

01 Budget

e.g. Net recurring savings · One-time closure costs (moving, severance) · Whether the savings are enough to restore instructional days

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	Second highest saving of remaining models
Pro	saves more than $1M goal, extra savings can go to building reserves back
Pro	saves on long-term costs on maintaining older buildings

My rank for Budget (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **5**

02 Capacity

e.g. Enrollment vs. rated capacity at receiving schools · Cafeteria and gym load

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	Solves middle school capacity issues before they arise related to declining enrollment
Con	CV is 98% capacity
Pro	Crater can absorb CV capacity overage with more equitable campus model

My rank for Capacity (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **4**

03 Student Impact

e.g. Academic disruption and transition stress

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	Separates 6th graders from 7th and 8th but keeps on campus model to have interaction
Pro	1 middle school, removes disparity between 2 middle schools and brings community back together earlier
Pro	Cohorts stay together for 7 years versus 4

My rank for Student Impact (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **5**

04 Class Size Distribution

e.g. Average class size vs. the 24.5 target · Spread between the smallest and largest classes · Grade levels with fewer than two teachers · Blended classes

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	Tied with Model C for best grade level teacher distribution
Pro	Best standard deviation coupled with grade level distribution

My rank for Class Size Distribution (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **5**

05 Facilities & Closed Buildings

e.g. Cost to secure, heat, and maintain a vacant building · Liability and vandalism · Condition and deferred maintenance of buildings that stay open · Future use of a closed building · Cost to reopen if enrollment rebounds

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	MV is close to Adec and GFU, may have interest in leasing
Pro	Keeps newer schools open and closes 2 oldest schools
Pro	Private schools or daycare could be interested in EY due to rural area and small size
Pro	closes two of the oldest buildings versus newest (EY and MV)

My rank for Facilities & Closed Buildings (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **5**

06 Community Impact & Equity

e.g. Disproportionate impact on low-income, ELL, or Title I students · Loss of a neighborhood anchor · Community groups that use the building · Trust of families and staff

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	Campus model is less impact on families than other models
Pro	"Closes" two elementary schools but maintains Crater identity
Pro	More equitable to have one middle school campus vs. two with MV being older

Pro	Affects all grade levels K-8
Pro	Keeps Title I at JA where need is greatest

My rank for Community Impact & Equity (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **5**

07 Transportation & Access

e.g. Longer commutes for younger students · Added bus routes and costs · Walkability and safety of new routes · Access for families without a car

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	Centralizes middle school grades on one campus, less bussing
Pro	Keeps walkable schools open

My rank for Transportation & Access (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **5**

08 Enrollment Trends

e.g. Current enrollment vs. 5-year projection · Does the model still work if enrollment keeps declining? · Reversibility of the decision

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	Resolves declining enrollment for middle school before it happens
Pro	Right sizes across all grade levels
Pro	Keeps JA open with new 700 home development across the street

My rank for Enrollment Trends (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **5**

09 Implementation & Transition

e.g. Realism of phasing and timeline · Boundary changes · Reduction in force and staff retention · Union contract and closure-process requirements · Short-term disruption vs. long-term benefit

Pro / Con	Item
Con	Merging two middle schools coupled with re-drawing boundaries will require more work

My rank for Implementation & Transition (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **3**

NEWBERG-DUNDEE PUBLIC SCHOOLS: SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING MODEL RANKING

Individual Board Member Assessment · Complete independently before group discussion

Board Member:	James Wolfer
Model Being Evaluated:	**Model H: Close Ewing Young and Joan Austin. K-4 elementary, 5-6 at Chehalem Valley, 7-8 at Mountain View.**

KEY FACTS FOR THIS MODEL (models workbook, updated October 28, 2026)

Net recurring savings	**$1,395,026**
Average elementary class size (today 25.03, target 24.5)	**24.94**
Class size spread, standard deviation (today 5.30; lower is more even)	**1.49**
Grade levels with fewer than two teachers (today 17 of 36)	**5 of 20**

HOW TO USE THIS PAGE

For each area, list the pros and cons that matter most to YOU. Column A: Pro or Con. Column B: describe the item in your own words. Do not score individual items. Then give this model ONE rank for the area, compared with the other four models: 5 = best of the five, 1 = weakest of the five. Use each number once per area. Complete the same area on all five model tabs.

01 Budget

e.g. Net recurring savings · One-time closure costs (moving, severance) · Whether the savings are enough to restore instructional days

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	Saves district the most money
Con	Increased transition costs

My rank for Budget (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **4**

02 Capacity

e.g. Enrollment vs. rated capacity at receiving schools · Cafeteria and gym load

Pro / Con	Item
Con	CV at capacity, no ability to use Crater for overflow

My rank for Capacity (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **2**

03 Student Impact

e.g. Academic disruption and transition stress

Pro / Con	Item
Con	Adds one more school transition (4 vs 3)
Con	Siblings split between up to 4 schools

My rank for Student Impact (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **1**

04 Class Size Distribution

e.g. Average class size vs. the 24.5 target · Spread between the smallest and largest classes · Grade levels with fewer than two teachers · Blended classes

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	Tied for second best ranking for grade levels under 2 teachers

My rank for Class Size Distribution (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **3**

05 Facilities & Closed Buildings

e.g. Cost to secure, heat, and maintain a vacant building · Liability and vandalism · Condition and deferred maintenance of buildings that stay open · Future use of a closed building · Cost to reopen if enrollment rebounds

Pro / Con	Item
Con	Closes newer school (JA) and keeps open older school (MV)

My rank for Facilities & Closed Buildings (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **3**

06 Community Impact & Equity

e.g. Disproportionate impact on low-income, ELL, or Title I students · Loss of a neighborhood anchor · Community groups that use the building · Trust of families and staff

Pro / Con	Item
Con	Difficult for parents to get involved with this many different schools
Con	largest community disruption

My rank for Community Impact & Equity (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **1**

07 Transportation & Access

e.g. Longer commutes for younger students · Added bus routes and costs · Walkability and safety of new routes · Access for families without a car

Pro / Con	Item
Con	Too difficult for parents to participate in 4 school pickups / dropoffs
Con	More bussing needed

My rank for Transportation & Access (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **2**

08 Enrollment Trends

e.g. Current enrollment vs. 5-year projection · Does the model still work if enrollment keeps declining? · Reversibility of the decision

Pro / Con	Item
Con	CV constantly at capacity with 5/6 grades

My rank for Enrollment Trends (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **4**

09 Implementation & Transition

e.g. Realism of phasing and timeline · Boundary changes · Reduction in force and staff retention · Union contract and closure-process requirements · Short-term disruption vs. long-term benefit

Pro / Con	Item
Con	Curriculum not built for 5/6 paired
Con	A ton of transitioning for not much more money

My rank for Implementation & Transition (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **1**

NEWBERG-DUNDEE PUBLIC SCHOOLS: SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING MODEL RANKING

Individual Board Member Assessment · Complete independently before group discussion

Board Member:	James Wolfer
Model Being Evaluated:	**Model J: Close Antonia Crater and Joan Austin. Ewing Young stays open. K-5 elementary and 6-8 middle schools unchanged. Added at the Board's request after October 1; student placements were estimated by grade and proximity rather than mapped by address, so class-size figures are estimates.**

KEY FACTS FOR THIS MODEL (models workbook, updated October 28, 2026)

Net recurring savings	**$800,210**
Average elementary class size (today 25.03, target 24.5)	**24.59**
Class size spread, standard deviation (today 5.30; lower is more even)	**2.02**
Grade levels with fewer than two teachers (today 17 of 36)	**7 of 24**

HOW TO USE THIS PAGE

For each area, list the pros and cons that matter most to YOU. Column A: Pro or Con. Column B: describe the item in your own words. Do not score individual items. Then give this model ONE rank for the area, compared with the other four models: 5 = best of the five, 1 = weakest of the five. Use each number once per area. Complete the same area on all five model tabs.

01 Budget

e.g. Net recurring savings · One-time closure costs (moving, severance) · Whether the savings are enough to restore instructional days

Pro / Con	Item
Con	is under $1M savings while closing two elementaries - not worth the disruption it causes

My rank for Budget (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **1**

02 Capacity

e.g. Enrollment vs. rated capacity at receiving schools · Cafeteria and gym load

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	elementaries aren't over capacity

My rank for Capacity (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **3**

03 Student Impact

e.g. Academic disruption and transition stress

Pro / Con	Item
Con	trading two walkable, neighborhood schools for rural school with no walking routes, no nearby facilities
Con	neighborhood kids will now be bussed to rural school instead of walkable neighborhood school

My rank for Student Impact (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **2**

04 Class Size Distribution

e.g. Average class size vs. the 24.5 target · Spread between the smallest and largest classes · Grade levels with fewer than two teachers · Blended classes

Pro / Con	Item
Con	weakest of models for grade level (7 of 24)
Con	worst standard deviation of all remaining models

My rank for Class Size Distribution (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **1**

05 Facilities & Closed Buildings

e.g. Cost to secure, heat, and maintain a vacant building · Liability and vandalism · Condition and deferred maintenance of buildings that stay open · Future use of a closed building · Cost to reopen if enrollment rebounds

Pro / Con	Item
Con	keeps oldest building while closing 2 of the newest buildings
Con	closes crater which is part of a campus
Con	costs of older building is higher for maintanence versus newer

My rank for Facilities & Closed Buildings (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **1**

06 Community Impact & Equity

e.g. Disproportionate impact on low-income, ELL, or Title I students · Loss of a neighborhood anchor · Community groups that use the building · Trust of families and staff

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	keeps rural school open for those families
Con	Disproprotionaly affects westside students
Con	Major displacement for lower income students and families with closing JA and Crater - no safe walking routes

Con	closes 2 walkable schools to keep a non-walkable school open
Con	new development across JA and newer neighborhoods near Crater will be less attractive for families and hasten decline

My rank for Community Impact & Equity (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **2**

07 Transportation & Access

e.g. Longer commutes for younger students · Added bus routes and costs · Walkability and safety of new routes · Access for families without a car

Pro / Con	Item
Con	students bussing versus walking - increased bussing costs
Con	increase bus commute times for multiple neighborhoods previously able to walk to school
Con	no way for families to drop off/pick up kids without a car - title 1 folks after school activities

My rank for Transportation & Access (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **1**

08 Enrollment Trends

e.g. Current enrollment vs. 5-year projection · Does the model still work if enrollment keeps declining? · Reversibility of the decision

Pro / Con	Item
Con	EY has lowest capacity
Con	does not solve middle school issue
Con	based on trends, will need to close middle school in near future

My rank for Enrollment Trends (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **2**

09 Implementation & Transition

e.g. Realism of phasing and timeline · Boundary changes · Reduction in force and staff retention · Union contract and closure-process requirements · Short-term disruption vs. long-term benefit

Pro / Con	Item
Con	Will require massive boundary line adjustments to close two westside schools and keep EY open

My rank for Implementation & Transition (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **2**

NEWBERG-DUNDEE PUBLIC SCHOOLS: SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING MODEL RANKING

Individual Board Member Assessment · Complete independently before group discussion

Board Member Name:	Jeremy Hayden
Date:	11/6/2026

HOW TO USE THIS TOOL

1. On each model tab (C, D, G, H, and J), list the pros and cons that matter most to you in each of the nine areas. Write them in your own words. Individual items are not scored.
2. At the end of each area, give that model one rank compared with the other four: 5 = best of the five models in that area, 1 = weakest. Use each number once per area.
3. This page fills in as you go. The Check column tells you if an area is missing a rank or repeats a number.
4. Nothing here is added up. Look for the pattern: how many areas each model ranks first, how each model compares head to head, and how each model does in the areas you care about most.

MY RANKING BY AREA (5 = best of the five, 1 = weakest)

Area	Model C	Model D	Model G	Model H	Model J	Check
01 Budget	2	3	4	5	1	OK
02 Capacity	4	5	1	3	2	OK
03 Student Impact	4	5	2	1	3	OK
04 Class Size Distribution	2	5	3	4	1	OK
05 Facilities & Closed Buildings	4	5	2	5	1	OK (tie)
06 Community Impact & Equity	2	5	4	3	1	OK
07 Transportation & Access	4	5	3	2	1	OK
08 Enrollment Trends	4	5	3	1	2	OK
09 Implementation & Transition	4	5	2	1	3	OK

WHAT THE PATTERN SHOWS (counts of areas, not totals of scores)

Number of areas ranked...	Model C	Model D	Model G	Model H	Model J
best of the five (rank 5)	0	8	0	2	0
in the top two (rank 4 or 5)	6	8	2	3	0
weakest of the five (rank 1)	0	0	1	3	5

HEAD TO HEAD (areas where the model in the row ranked above the model in the column)

Row model ranked above column model in...	Model C	Model D	Model G	Model H	Model J
Model C	—	0	6	5	9
Model D	9	—	8	7	9
Model G	3	1	—	5	6
Model H	4	1	4	—	6
Model J	0	0	3	3	—

Example: a 7 in the Model D row and Model C column means Model D ranked above Model C in 7 of the 9 areas. If a model is dropped or renamed, rename its tab and the formulas follow. Ties are counted for neither model.

MY THREE MOST IMPORTANT AREAS

Pick the three areas that matter most to you. The table shows how each model ranked in those areas.

Area (pick from the list)	Model C	Model D	Model G	Model H	Model J
01 Budget	2	3	4	5	1
08 Enrollment Trends	4	5	3	1	2
03 Student Impact	4	5	2	1	3

BOARD MEMBER SUMMARY & REFLECTION
The 3 factors that most shaped my rankings:
Keeping schools that have capacity to have more classes, and also cover the wideth swath of Newberg/Dundee neighborhoods
We need to be financially stable - what allows us to get to a normal school year and help us build a reserve
Items I need more information on:
Projected costs of upkeep of these buildings in the coming years
Overall reflection: what do my rankings reveal about my priorities?
I love model H, it meets finance and class size goals. It also unifies the students at 5th grade. But not sure if it is the right move to take right now. I do not want this community have to make another change within the next 10 years. Also - there are capacity issues for the several years until enrollment trends bottom out
I think JA will be most desired for sale or lease due to proximity of the school to the town.

NEWBERG-DUNDEE PUBLIC SCHOOLS: SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING MODEL RANKING

Individual Board Member Assessment · Complete independently before group discussion

Pro	19
Con	15

Board Member:	Jeremy Hayden
Model Being Evaluated:	**Model C: Close Ewing Young and Antonia Crater. K-5 elementary and 6-8 middle schools unchanged.**

KEY FACTS FOR THIS MODEL (models workbook, updated October 28, 2026)

Net recurring savings	**$1,081,500**
Average elementary class size (today 25.03, target 24.5)	**24.65**
Class size spread, standard deviation (today 5.30; lower is more even)	**1.85**
Grade levels with fewer than two teachers (today 17 of 36)	**2 of 24**

HOW TO USE THIS PAGE

For each area, list the pros and cons that matter most to YOU. Column A: Pro or Con. Column B: describe the item in your own words. Do not score individual items. Then give this model ONE rank for the area, compared with the other four models: 5 = best of the five, 1 = weakest of the five. Use each number once per area. Complete the same area on all five model tabs.

01 Budget

e.g. Net recurring savings · One-time closure costs (moving, severance) · Whether the savings are enough to restore instructional days

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	Saves $1,081,500 per year
Pro	Adding only 1.0 FTE to hold class sizes near 24.5 keeps instructional cost increases minimal compared to other models.
Con	This is the lowest net savings of the five models. If the budget gap is larger than this model covers, we could find ourselves back at this table sooner than we'd like.
Con	(Short term): One-time transition costs — moving, and setting up closed buildings for maintenance mode — will that dip into year-one savings?

My rank for Budget (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **2**

02 Capacity

e.g. Enrollment vs. rated capacity at receiving schools · Cafeteria and gym load

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	(Long term): Closes 700 seats and leaves 1,058 open seats in the remaining buildings — plenty of cushion to absorb continued enrollment influx
Pro	(Short term): No single receiving school ends up dangerously close to its building limit. Dundee at 262/350, Joan Austin at 363/500, Edwards at 446/700, Mabel Rush at 468/625
Con	(Long term): If the enrollment decline accelerates beyond projections, four buildings with 1,058 open seats still may not be enough of a reduction. This model preserves more square footage than enrollment may ultimately need.

My rank for Capacity (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **4**

03 Student Impact

e.g. Academic disruption and transition stress

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	Students landing in receiving schools benefit from more stable class sizes and better-resourced buildings, without the program fragility that comes with under-enrolled schools.
Pro	Eliminating the two smallest enrollment schools removes the grade levels most likely to be under 2 teachers, which limits program depth and flexibility for the kids in those classrooms.
Con	(Short term): About 500 students change buildings. For elementary-age kids, that's a real disruption — new teachers, new routines, new peer groups.

Con	(Short term): Antonia Crater has 26 students attending from the Ewing Young boundary area who chose Crater specifically. Those families will need to be re-accommodated and communicated with clearly.

My rank for Student Impact (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **4**

04 Class Size Distribution

e.g. Average class size vs. the 24.5 target · Spread between the smallest and largest classes · Grade levels with fewer than two teachers · Blended classes

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	(Long term): Standard deviation drops from 5.30 to 1.85. Class sizes become dramatically more consistent district-wide. No more 14-student sections sitting next to 37-student sections.
Pro	The largest class in this model is 30 (Dundee grade 3) — still manageable, and nothing like the 37-student outliers we're dealing with today.
Pro	Only 2 of 24 grade levels fall under the 2-teacher threshold, compared to 17 of 36 today. That's a dramatic improvement in instructional support at the grade level.
Con	Dundee grade 3 at 30.00 is the ceiling in this model and it sits in the smallest receiving school with limited room to adjust.

My rank for Class Size Distribution (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **2**

05 Facilities & Closed Buildings

e.g. Cost to secure, heat, and maintain a vacant building · Liability and vandalism · Condition and deferred maintenance of buildings that stay open · Future use of a closed building · Cost to reopen if enrollment rebounds

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	(Short term): Retaining 0.5 custodial FTE at each closed site keeps things from deteriorating in the transition period.
Pro	Consolidating into fewer, well-utilized buildings is more cost-effective long-term than spreading staff and resources across underused square footage.
Con	Two buildings sit empty with ongoing utility and maintenance costs — even at 50%, that's money out the door. The district needs a real plan for these assets, whether that's lease, sale, or repurpose.
Con	Antonia Crater is a relatively newer facility. Closing a newer building while keeping older ones draws questions

My rank for Facilities & Closed Buildings (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **4**

06 Community Impact & Equity

e.g. Disproportionate impact on low-income, ELL, or Title I students · Loss of a neighborhood anchor · Community groups that use the building · Trust of families and staff

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	Directing resources toward fewer schools can improve program equity — more students at each school means more room for support staff, specialists, and enrichment opportunities that small schools can't sustain.
Con	Antonia Crater serves a distinct geographic community. Closing it displaces families who may have specifically chosen that school for proximity, culture, or program fit.
Con	Ewing Young has a high proportion of cross-boundary student; 33 (27.3%) of 121 students
Con	Community trust can take years to rebuild after a school closure. Closing two schools in a single cycle is a heavy lift, even when it's the right structural decision.

My rank for Community Impact & Equity (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **2**

07 Transportation & Access

e.g. Longer commutes for younger students · Added bus routes and costs · Walkability and safety of new routes · Access for families without a car

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	(Short term): Only 3 new transportation routes needed — the smallest route increase of any model and a relatively low ongoing cost built into the savings.
Pro	(Long term): Fewer routes means lower ongoing transportation costs, which contributes to the net savings figure year after year.
Con	Out of the current 6 routes to EY and if they stay the same and changing to new destination school, 3 routes (6, 9, 10) will be extending times

Pro	Out of the current 6 routes to EY and if they stay the same and changing to new destination school, 2 routes (7, 11) will reduce times While Route 8 would most likely be the same or faster, since they don't have to backtrack to EY

My rank for Transportation & Access (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **4**

08 Enrollment Trends

e.g. Current enrollment vs. 5-year projection · Does the model still work if enrollment keeps declining? · Reversibility of the decision

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	(Long term): District-wide enrollment has fallen from 5,174 in 2009-10 to a projected 3,628 in fall 2026 — roughly a 30% drop in 17 years. Closing two schools aligns the physical footprint to where enrollment actually is, not where it was.
Pro	(Short term): The 1,058 open seats across remaining buildings provide a reasonable buffer for the next several years without requiring further restructuring immediately.
Con	(Long term): At the current pace of decline even four buildings may need revisiting within 7-10 years.
Con	(Short term): May be a mass exodus that drops enrollment between this year and next year

My rank for Enrollment Trends (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **4**

09 Implementation & Transition

e.g. Realism of phasing and timeline · Boundary changes · Reduction in force and staff retention · Union contract and closure-process requirements · Short-term disruption vs. long-term benefit

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	With about 500 students changing buildings, this is a more manageable transition than Models G, H, or J in terms of communication, boundary work, and family notifications.
Pro	Grade span stays K-5 at all remaining schools. No new structures for families to understand — it's a school change, not a system change.
Con	Non-instructional positions at the two closed buildings MAY BE eliminated.

My rank for Implementation & Transition (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **4**

NEWBERG-DUNDEE PUBLIC SCHOOLS: SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING MODEL RANKING

Individual Board Member Assessment · Complete independently before group discussion

Pro	19
Con	15

Board Member:	Jeremy Hayden
Model Being Evaluated:	**Model D: Close Ewing Young and Joan Austin. K-5 elementary and 6-8 middle schools unchanged.**

KEY FACTS FOR THIS MODEL (models workbook, updated October 28, 2026)

Net recurring savings	**$1,182,526**
Average elementary class size (today 25.03, target 24.5)	**24.79**
Class size spread, standard deviation (today 5.30; lower is more even)	**1.43**
Grade levels with fewer than two teachers (today 17 of 36)	**5 of 24**

HOW TO USE THIS PAGE

For each area, list the pros and cons that matter most to YOU. Column A: Pro or Con. Column B: describe the item in your own words. Do not score individual items. Then give this model ONE rank for the area, compared with the other four models: 5 = best of the five, 1 = weakest of the five. Use each number once per area. Complete the same area on all five model tabs.

01 Budget

e.g. Net recurring savings · One-time closure costs (moving, severance) · Whether the savings are enough to restore instructional days

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	$1,182,526 per year in recurring savings — a meaningful step up from Model C with the same number of closures.
Pro	Only 0.5 added FTE needed to manage class sizes — the lowest instructional cost increase of any of the five models.
Pro	Four transportation routes at $150,000/year are built into the net savings figure, and the bottom line is still strong.
Con	(Short term): One-time transition costs — moving, and setting up closed buildings for maintenance mode — will that dip into year-one savings?

My rank for Budget (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **3**

02 Capacity

e.g. Enrollment vs. rated capacity at receiving schools · Cafeteria and gym load

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	Three of the four receiving schools — Dundee (116 seats remaining), Edwards (262), and Mabel Rush (216), have comfortable headroom, creating flexibility for future redistribution if needed.
Pro	(Long term): Closes 700 seats and leaves 1,058 open seats in the remaining buildings — plenty of cushion to absorb continued enrollment influx
Con	(Short term): Antonia Crater ends at 458 students in a 500-seat building — only 42 seats of headroom. That is the tightest any elementary building gets in any model that keeps Crater open.
Con	(Long term): If even modest enrollment shifts push more students toward Crater, or if boundary decisions have to be revisited, there is very little room to absorb it. This building is essentially at its operational ceiling.

My rank for Capacity (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **5**

03 Student Impact

e.g. Academic disruption and transition stress

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	Only about 340 students change buildings — the least disruption of any of the five models. That matters enormously to families and to public trust in the process.
Pro	Students benefit from the most even class size distribution of any model (std dev 1.43), which means more consistent instructional experiences across schools for years to come.
Con	(Short term): Joan Austin has significant cross-boundary enrollment — 36 students from the Antonia Crater boundary area attend Joan Austin. Redirecting those families requires careful communication and clear boundary decisions.
Con	(Short term): Antonia Crater's tightness will create boundary enforcement pressure.

My rank for Student Impact (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **5**

04 Class Size Distribution

e.g. Average class size vs. the 24.5 target · Spread between the smallest and largest classes · Grade levels with fewer than two teachers · Blended classes

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	Standard deviation of 1.43 is the best of all five models. Class sizes run from 22.50 to 27.33
Pro	5 of 24 grade levels fall under 2 teachers, down from 17 of 36 today
Con	With Antonia Crater so full, there's limited flexibility to respond to grade-level enrollment swings without bumping against the class-size ceiling. If a cohort comes in heavier than expected, there's no easy safety valve.

My rank for Class Size Distribution (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **5**

05 Facilities & Closed Buildings

e.g. Cost to secure, heat, and maintain a vacant building · Liability and vandalism · Condition and deferred maintenance of buildings that stay open · Future use of a closed building · Cost to reopen if enrollment rebounds

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	Consolidating into fewer, well-utilized buildings is more cost-effective long-term than spreading staff and resources across underused square footage.
Pro	(Short term): Retaining 0.5 custodial FTE at each closed site keeps things from deteriorating in the transition period.
Con	Two buildings sit empty with ongoing utility and maintenance costs — even at 50%, that's money out the door. The district needs a real plan for these assets, whether that's lease, sale, or repurpose.

My rank for Facilities & Closed Buildings (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **5**

06 Community Impact & Equity

e.g. Disproportionate impact on low-income, ELL, or Title I students · Loss of a neighborhood anchor · Community groups that use the building · Trust of families and staff

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	Fewest students displaced of any model — about 340. Lower disruption means less community friction in the short run and a more manageable public engagement process.
Pro	Fully enrolling Antonia Crater gives the district's more geographically central elementary a stable, full enrollment that strengthens program offerings and staffing depth.
Con	Joan Austin's closure affects a specific neighborhood community. Those families may feel disproportionately impacted, especially if that area has fewer transportation options or less access to other nearby schools.
Con	Antonia Crater's near-capacity state may effectively limit access over time for families who want or need that school, creating an informal equity issue as the building fills. Cross-boundary transfers will be difficult to accommodate.

My rank for Community Impact & Equity (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **5**

07 Transportation & Access

e.g. Longer commutes for younger students · Added bus routes and costs · Walkability and safety of new routes · Access for families without a car

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	Even with more transportation cost, the operational efficiency is better than Model C on a net basis — $1,182,526 vs. $1,081,500.
Con	Four new bus routes at $150,000/year — higher than Model C, though still built into the net savings
Con	Out of the current 6 routes to EY and if they stay the same and changing to new destination school, 3 routes (6, 9, 10) will be extending times
Pro	Out of the current 6 routes to EY and if they stay the same and changing to new destination school, 2 routes (7, 11) will reduce times While Route 8 would most likely be the same or faster, since they don't have to backtrack to EY

My rank for Transportation & Access (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **5**

08 Enrollment Trends

e.g. Current enrollment vs. 5-year projection · Does the model still work if enrollment keeps declining? · Reversibility of the decision

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	(Long term): District-wide enrollment has fallen from 5,174 in 2009-10 to a projected 3,628 in fall 2026 — roughly a 30% drop in 17 years. Closing two schools aligns the physical footprint to where enrollment actually is, not where it was.
Pro	(Short term): The 1,058 open seats across remaining buildings provide a reasonable buffer for the next several years without requiring further restructuring immediately.
Con	(Long term): Antonia Crater's tightness gives this model the least cushion for redistribution if enrollment has a large positive influx, or down the road needing to close another school
Con	(Long term): At the current pace of decline even four buildings may need revisiting within 7-10 years.

My rank for Enrollment Trends (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **5**

09 Implementation & Transition

e.g. Realism of phasing and timeline · Boundary changes · Reduction in force and staff retention · Union contract and closure-process requirements · Short-term disruption vs. long-term benefit

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	(Short term): About 340 students changing buildings is the most operationally manageable transition of the five. Fewer families to notify, fewer boundary decisions, fewer staffing reassignments.
Pro	Grade span stays K-5 at all remaining schools. No new structures for families to understand — it's a school change, not a system change.
Con	(Short term): Antonia Crater's near-capacity landing creates a first-year enrollment management challenge. Boundaries will need to be drawn precisely to avoid overloading Crater in year one, and the margin for error is thin.
Con	Non-instructional positions at the two closed buildings MAY BE eliminated.

My rank for Implementation & Transition (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **5**

NEWBERG-DUNDEE PUBLIC SCHOOLS: SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING MODEL RANKING

Individual Board Member Assessment · Complete independently before group discussion

Board Member:	Jeremy Hayden
Model Being Evaluated:	**Model G (revised): Close Ewing Young and Mountain View Middle School. Antonia Crater becomes the 6th grade center; 7-8 at Chehalem Valley.**

Pro 14

Con 21

KEY FACTS FOR THIS MODEL (models workbook, updated October 28, 2026)

Net recurring savings	**$1,200,177**
Average elementary class size (today 25.03, target 24.5)	**24.63**
Class size spread, standard deviation (today 5.30; lower is more even)	**1.81**
Grade levels with fewer than two teachers (today 17 of 36)	**2 of 25**

HOW TO USE THIS PAGE

For each area, list the pros and cons that matter most to YOU. Column A: Pro or Con. Column B: describe the item in your own words. Do not score individual items. Then give this model ONE rank for the area, compared with the other four models: 5 = best of the five, 1 = weakest of the five. Use each number once per area. Complete the same area on all five model tabs.

01 Budget

e.g. Net recurring savings · One-time closure costs (moving, severance) · Whether the savings are enough to restore instructional days

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	$1,200,177 in annual recurring savings — mid-pack, but achieved through a structural change that also rationalizes the middle school configuration.
Pro	(Long term): If the 6th grade center model proves effective and sustainable, the structural efficiency it creates could position the district well for future enrollment-related decisions.
Con	Requires 2.2 net additional FTE, costing $277,778/year in instructional staff — the highest instructional offset of any model.
Con	Six new transportation routes at $225,000/year — the highest transportation cost of any model. That's a recurring cost baked into operations going forward.

My rank for Budget (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **4**

02 Capacity

e.g. Enrollment vs. rated capacity at receiving schools · Cafeteria and gym load

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	900 seats closed — the most of any model — which most directly right-sizes the district's physical footprint to current enrollment.
Con	(Short term): Chehalem Valley ends at 582 students in a 595-seat building — 13 seats of headroom. That is an operationally concerning level of tightness for a school taking every 7th and 8th grader in the district.
Con	(Long term): Any unexpected bump in grades 7-8 — in-migration, boundary pressure, program consolidation — and Chehalem Valley is immediately over capacity with no relief valve available.
Con	(Long term): The 6th grade center at Crater has 291 students in a 500-seat building, leaving 209 seats unused. That's a significant underutilization for a single-grade operation.

My rank for Capacity (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **1**

03 Student Impact

e.g. Academic disruption and transition stress

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	(Long term): If the 6th grade center works as intended, 6th graders benefit from a focused transition environment — not 'top dogs' in an elementary, not 'new kids' in a full middle school. That developmental logic is sound.
Con	(Short term): About 1,100 students change buildings — by far the most disruptive model. This touches nearly every family in the district in some way.

Con	(Short term): Every single 6th grader in the district changes where they go to school. Families with kids currently in elementary school face a pathway that looks different than what they expected when they enrolled.
Con	(Short term): Current 6th and 7th graders at Chehalem Valley lose their peer group structure as the school shifts from 6-8 to 7-8. That transition mid-career is disruptive for those cohorts.

My rank for Student Impact (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **2**

04 Class Size Distribution

e.g. Average class size vs. the 24.5 target · Spread between the smallest and largest classes · Grade levels with fewer than two teachers · Blended classes

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	Standard deviation of 1.81 — a dramatic improvement over today's 5.30. The range tightens from 14.00–37.00 to 21.50–30.00.
Pro	Only 2 of 25 grade levels fall under the 2-teacher threshold — tied for the best performance on that metric.
Con	Dundee grade 3 remains the ceiling at 30.00 — same as Model C, since the K-5 configuration in both models is identical.
Con	The 6th grade center introduces a new class-size calculation layer. The district needs to establish a consistent staffing standard for that configuration and communicate it clearly.

My rank for Class Size Distribution (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **3**

05 Facilities & Closed Buildings

e.g. Cost to secure, heat, and maintain a vacant building · Liability and vandalism · Condition and deferred maintenance of buildings that stay open · Future use of a closed building · Cost to reopen if enrollment rebounds

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	Mountain View is a 700-seat building. Its closure frees up significant square footage with potentially stronger lease or sale value than a small elementary school.
Pro	Crater keeps its full office and custodial staff as an operating school. 0.5 custodial FTE is retained at Ewing Young.
Con	With Mountain View closed, Chehalem Valley is the only 7-8 building in the district, running at nearly full capacity. If Chehalem Valley ever needs significant maintenance or faces a disruption, there's no backup facility.
Con	Antonia Crater transitions from a full K-5 school to a single-grade center. That's a significant operational change for a building designed as a traditional elementary, and it may not be an efficient use of a 500-seat facility for 291 students.

My rank for Facilities & Closed Buildings (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **2**

06 Community Impact & Equity

e.g. Disproportionate impact on low-income, ELL, or Title I students · Loss of a neighborhood anchor · Community groups that use the building · Trust of families and staff

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	The 6th grade center, if well-implemented, creates a genuine equity improvement — every 6th grader in the district gets the same transition experience regardless of which elementary they came from. That's a compelling equity story.
Con	About 1,100 students change buildings, but the disruption is concentrated. Families at Edwards, Mabel Rush, Dundee, and Joan Austin with kids in K-5 are largely untouched. The heaviest burden falls on Ewing Young, Mountain View, and every current 6th grader.
Con	Mountain View Middle School has its own culture, staff, and community identity. Closing it will generate strong emotional responses that go beyond logistics.
Con	Families of current 5th graders get one year of warning before their child goes to a brand-new type of school. That's a short runway for trust-building around a significant change.
Pro	All students in district start assimilating at 6th grade and go through rest of the grades together. No more us vs them

My rank for Community Impact & Equity (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **4**

07 Transportation & Access

e.g. Longer commutes for younger students · Added bus routes and costs · Walkability and safety of new routes · Access for families without a car

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	The 6th grade center and Chehalem Valley share a campus, so no additional route is needed to serve those two buildings. That's a geographic efficiency worth noting.
Con	Bus routes moving kids to other schools, including all middle school ages
Con	Routing for a single-grade center that draws from the whole district is more complex to manage and adjust annually than neighborhood-based elementary routes.

My rank for Transportation & Access (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest)	3

08 Enrollment Trends

e.g. Current enrollment vs. 5-year projection · Does the model still work if enrollment keeps declining? · Reversibility of the decision

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	Closing 900 rated seats most directly aligns the district's footprint to its enrollment trajectory.
Pro	(Long term): The 6th grade center model creates flexibility. If enrollment in grades 7-8 continues declining, Chehalem Valley can absorb that internally without requiring another closure conversation.
Con	(Short term): Chehalem Valley at 13 seats of headroom in year one is a vulnerability. Unsure what will happen long term, but with projected declining enrollment rates it should be fine long term
Con	(Long term): This model restructures grade spans in a way that is hard to undo. If the 6th grade center doesn't work operationally or the community rejects it, reversing the structure is expensive and disruptive all over again.

My rank for Enrollment Trends (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest)	3

09 Implementation & Transition

e.g. Realism of phasing and timeline · Boundary changes · Reduction in force and staff retention · Union contract and closure-process requirements · Short-term disruption vs. long-term benefit

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	Ewing Young's 79 in-boundary students represent the smallest elementary closure burden. Much of that school's enrollment was already cross-boundary, which simplifies the reassignment process.
Con	(Short term): This is one of the most complex implementation of any model. Closing an elementary and a middle school while converting a third building to a new grade configuration requires parallel workstreams, new curriculum alignment, facilities prep, and extensive community engagement — all simultaneously.
Con	(Short term): About 1,100 students in transition means every principal, counselor, and family liaison in the district is managing change at the same time. Staff capacity to execute this well is a real consideration.

My rank for Implementation & Transition (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest)	2

NEWBERG-DUNDEE PUBLIC SCHOOLS: SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING MODEL RANKING

Individual Board Member Assessment · Complete independently before group discussion

Pro	16
Con	16

Board Member:	Jeremy Hayden
Model Being Evaluated:	**Model H: Close Ewing Young and Joan Austin. K-4 elementary, 5-6 at Chehalem Valley, 7-8 at Mountain View.**

KEY FACTS FOR THIS MODEL (models workbook, updated October 28, 2026)

Net recurring savings	**$1,395,026**
Average elementary class size (today 25.03, target 24.5)	**24.94**
Class size spread, standard deviation (today 5.30; lower is more even)	**1.49**
Grade levels with fewer than two teachers (today 17 of 36)	**5 of 20**

HOW TO USE THIS PAGE

For each area, list the pros and cons that matter most to YOU. Column A: Pro or Con. Column B: describe the item in your own words. Do not score individual items. Then give this model ONE rank for the area, compared with the other four models: 5 = best of the five, 1 = weakest of the five. Use each number once per area. Complete the same area on all five model tabs.

01 Budget

e.g. Net recurring savings · One-time closure costs (moving, severance) · Whether the savings are enough to restore instructional days

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	$1,395,026 per year — the highest recurring savings of any of the five models.
Pro	This is the only model where net FTE actually decreases (-0.9). Instead of adding cost to hold class sizes, the restructuring creates enough efficiency to reduce headcount slightly.
Pro	Even with five added transportation routes at $187,500/year, the savings are robust enough to absorb the cost.
Con	(Short term): One-time implementation costs will be significant given the breadth of the change. Every school restructures simultaneously, which drives up transition expenses.

My rank for Budget (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **5**

02 Capacity

e.g. Enrollment vs. rated capacity at receiving schools · Cafeteria and gym load

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	The four K-4 elementary buildings all have healthy headroom — Antonia Crater (138), Edwards (339), Mabel Rush (301), Dundee (161). The elementary side of this model is well-sized for current and projected enrollment.
Pro	Mountain View (7-8) ends at 563/700 — 137 seats of headroom. That building is appropriately utilized for its purpose.
Con	Chehalem Valley (5-6) ends at 588 students in a 595-seat building — just 7 seats of headroom. That is effectively full on day one. Any unexpected enrollment shift in grades 5-6 and there's no room to absorb it.
Con	Chehalem Valley's near-zero headroom is a structural risk. If grades 5-6 enrollment grows or shifts due to boundary changes, the district has no option but to redistrict or add portables.

My rank for Capacity (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **3**

03 Student Impact

e.g. Academic disruption and transition stress

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	(Long term): Separating grades 5-6 to Chehalem Valley gives upper elementary students a more intentional transition environment before full middle school. The developmental logic for that progression is well-supported.
Con	About 990-1000 students change buildings — the second-highest disruption of any model. Almost every family with a 5th-grade thru 8th-grade student is affected.
Con	Every 5th grader in the district changes schools — not just those at the closed buildings. 5th grade is no longer the 'top of elementary' experience, which is a cultural and identity shift for kids and families alike.

My rank for Student Impact (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest)	**1**

04 Class Size Distribution

e.g. Average class size vs. the 24.5 target · Spread between the smallest and largest classes · Grade levels with fewer than two teachers · Blended classes

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	Standard deviation of 1.49 — second-best of the five models after D. Class sizes run from 22.50 to 27.50, a tight and equitable range.
Pro	The model eliminates all extreme class sizes. Nothing under 18, nothing over 28 — the committee identified this as a goal and this model achieves it.
Pro	No grade level in any school is significantly out of line with the target. The distribution is clean across the board.
Con	With K-4 as the new elementary span, teachers and curriculum coordinators need to adapt to a slightly younger population across every elementary building. That's a professional development and program alignment effort.
My rank for Class Size Distribution (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest)	**4**

05 Facilities & Closed Buildings

e.g. Cost to secure, heat, and maintain a vacant building · Liability and vandalism · Condition and deferred maintenance of buildings that stay open · Future use of a closed building · Cost to reopen if enrollment rebounds

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	Mountain View stays open as a 7-8 building at 563/700
Pro	(Long term): Four K-4 elementary buildings at reasonable utilization is a sustainable footprint for the district's current and projected enrollment trajectory.
Con	Two buildings sit empty with ongoing utility and maintenance costs — even at 50%, that's money out the door. The district needs a real plan for these assets, whether that's lease, sale, or repurpose.
Con	(Long term): Converting Chehalem Valley from 6-8 to 5-6 requires operational changes inside a building that's already nearly full. Any deferred maintenance at Chehalem Valley becomes an urgent issue, not a deferrable one.
My rank for Facilities & Closed Buildings (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest)	**5**

06 Community Impact & Equity

e.g. Disproportionate impact on low-income, ELL, or Title I students · Loss of a neighborhood anchor · Community groups that use the building · Trust of families and staff

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	Every 5th and 6th grader in the district transitions through Chehalem Valley together, regardless of which elementary they came from. That creates a more equitable on-ramp to middle school.
Con	Shifting from K-5 to K-4 elementary changes every parent's expectation of what elementary school looks like. That's a cultural shift, not just a logistical one, and it requires sustained community engagement to get right.
Con	While fewer students physically change buildings than in Model G (~985 vs. ~1,100), Model H is arguably the broader community disruption. The grade restructuring means every family with a child in grades 5 through 8 is affected — new school, new grade-span structure, or both — regardless of whether their current school closes. That touches closer to 1,500 students when you count all of grades 5-8 district-wide. This isn't a targeted closure. It's a system-wide structural shift that every middle-grades family has to navigate.
Con	(Long term): Community buy-in if the communication is lacking, the district risks lasting community distrust that outlasts the transition.
My rank for Community Impact & Equity (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest)	**3**

07 Transportation & Access

e.g. Longer commutes for younger students · Added bus routes and costs · Walkability and safety of new routes · Access for families without a car

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	Even with higher transportation cost, savings net out at $1,395,026 — the strongest financial case of any model. The cost is worth noting but doesn't undermine the fiscal argument.
Con	Five new routes at $187,500/year. The grade restructuring creates transportation complexity that doesn't exist in a traditional K-5 model
Con	(Long term): Managing transportation for a K-4/5-6/7-8 structure is permanently more complex than neighborhood-based K-5. Any year-to-year enrollment fluctuation requires route adjustments.

My rank for Transportation & Access (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest)	**2**

08 Enrollment Trends

e.g. Current enrollment vs. 5-year projection · Does the model still work if enrollment keeps declining? · Reversibility of the decision

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	(Long term): The grade restructuring creates flexibility. If elementary enrollment continues declining, the K-4 model can absorb that without immediately requiring more closures.
Con	(Long term): Chehalem Valley at 7 seats of headroom in year one is an immediate problem if enrollment doesn't track exactly as modeled.
Pro	(Long Term) The 9/1 vs. 5/1 enrollment comparison shows the district consistently loses students from the prior year to the new year. The current headroom at CV is critical, but in a few years will not be as critical
My rank for Enrollment Trends (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest)	**1**

09 Implementation & Transition

e.g. Realism of phasing and timeline · Boundary changes · Reduction in force and staff retention · Union contract and closure-process requirements · Short-term disruption vs. long-term benefit

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	(Long term): If the transition is managed well, the resulting structure is in some ways simpler — fewer extreme class sizes, clearer grade-span logic — and potentially more sustainable for the district's long-term enrollment profile.
Con	(Short term): This is the most complex operational implementation of the five. Every school changes grade span, two schools close, and entirely new transportation and scheduling systems are needed simultaneously.
Con	(Short term): Staff across the entire district face role changes. Even teachers who stay in their building may be teaching a different grade span than before. That's a real morale and professional development challenge.
My rank for Implementation & Transition (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest)	**1**

NEWBERG-DUNDEE PUBLIC SCHOOLS: SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING MODEL RANKING

Individual Board Member Assessment · Complete independently before group discussion

Pro	6
Con	24

Board Member:	Jeremy Hayden
Model Being Evaluated:	**Model J: Close Antonia Crater and Joan Austin. Ewing Young stays open. K-5 elementary and 6-8 middle schools unchanged. Added at the Board's request after October 1; student placements were estimated by grade and proximity rather than mapped by address, so class-size figures are estimates.**

KEY FACTS FOR THIS MODEL (models workbook, updated October 28, 2026)

Net recurring savings	**$800,210**
Average elementary class size (today 25.03, target 24.5)	**24.59**
Class size spread, standard deviation (today 5.30; lower is more even)	**2.02**
Grade levels with fewer than two teachers (today 17 of 36)	**7 of 24**

HOW TO USE THIS PAGE

For each area, list the pros and cons that matter most to YOU. Column A: Pro or Con. Column B: describe the item in your own words. Do not score individual items. Then give this model ONE rank for the area, compared with the other four models: 5 = best of the five, 1 = weakest of the five. Use each number once per area. Complete the same area on all five model tabs.

01 Budget

e.g. Net recurring savings · One-time closure costs (moving, severance) · Whether the savings are enough to restore instructional days

Pro / Con	Item
Con	$800,210 per year — the lowest recurring savings of any of the five models. For the same number of closures as every other model, this delivers the weakest fiscal return.
Con	Transportation - Five routes are added and zero are removed at $187,500/year
Con	(Long term): If the district's budget gap requires more than $800K in annual recurring relief, this model doesn't get there. A second restructuring conversation may come sooner than expected.

My rank for Budget (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **1**

02 Capacity

e.g. Enrollment vs. rated capacity at receiving schools · Cafeteria and gym load

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	Keeping Ewing Young open at one teacher per grade is a simple, clean operational structure as long as enrollment holds steady.
Con	758 open seats across remaining buildings — the smallest capacity buffer of any model.
Con	(Short term): Ewing Young stays open at 180/200 — just 20 seats of room. That school is essentially full. Unsure of teachers needed and what class sizes would be
Con	(Long term): Edwards lands at 582/700 and Mabel Rush at 504/625. Both are manageable, but Edwards carries a heavy load relative to its receiving peers and has limited room to flex.

My rank for Capacity (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **2**

03 Student Impact

e.g. Academic disruption and transition stress

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	(Short term): Students in the Ewing Young boundary keep their school and their community. For those families, that matters a great deal.
Con	(Short term): About 460 students change buildings — moderate disruption, more than Model D, less than G or H. Still a significant transition for elementary-age kids.
Con	(Short term): Student placement was estimated by proximity rather than mapped by address (GIS was not available for this model). Families won't know their assignments with the same precision or confidence as other models, and actual placements may differ from estimates.

Con	(Long term): 7 of 24 grade levels fall under the 2-teacher threshold — the worst performance of any model on this metric. Ewing Young accounts for 6 of those 7. With one teacher per grade, students have no same-grade peer teachers to collaborate with or be regrouped across. That limits instructional flexibility.

My rank for Student Impact (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **3**

04 Class Size Distribution

e.g. Average class size vs. the 24.5 target · Spread between the smallest and largest classes · Grade levels with fewer than two teachers · Blended classes

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	The average class size of 24.59 still hits close to the 24.5 target.
Con	Standard deviation of 2.02 — the highest of all five models. Class sizes range from 20.67 to 29.00, the widest spread of any option on the table.
Con	Concerned with right-size classes at EY
Con	I am not sure how adding 50 students only equals 1 additional FTE needed. I think it needs 2

My rank for Class Size Distribution (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **1**

05 Facilities & Closed Buildings

e.g. Cost to secure, heat, and maintain a vacant building · Liability and vandalism · Condition and deferred maintenance of buildings that stay open · Future use of a closed building · Cost to reopen if enrollment rebounds

Pro / Con	Item
Con	Antonia Crater is a relatively modern facility. Closing a newer building while keeping the older Ewing Young (200 seats) open is a counterintuitive facilities decision that the community and future boards will question.
Con	Two buildings sit empty with ongoing utility and maintenance costs — even at 50%, that's money out the door. The district needs a real plan for these assets, whether that's lease, sale, or repurpose.

My rank for Facilities & Closed Buildings (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **1**

06 Community Impact & Equity

e.g. Disproportionate impact on low-income, ELL, or Title I students · Loss of a neighborhood anchor · Community groups that use the building · Trust of families and staff

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	Ewing Young's community keeps its school. For families who have advocated for that school's continuation, this outcome has real meaning.
Con	Closing Antonia Crater displaces 198 in-boundary students
Con	Student placement estimates are rougher than other models because GIS data wasn't available. Families won't know their assignments with as much precision or confidence in the process, which can feel inequitable even when the intent isn't.
Con	The lack of GIS-based modeling means boundary decisions will need to be made after a vote, extending the implementation timeline and creating uncertainty for families longer than necessary.

My rank for Community Impact & Equity (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **1**

07 Transportation & Access

e.g. Longer commutes for younger students · Added bus routes and costs · Walkability and safety of new routes · Access for families without a car

Pro / Con	Item
Con	This is the only model where transportation is a net cost — five routes added, zero removed. The district is spending more on busing after the closure than before it.
Con	The added transportation routes reflect the geographic reality that Ewing Young is not centrally located relative to where displaced Crater and Joan Austin students live. The routing cost is a symptom of a geographic inefficiency built into this model.
Con	$187,500 per year in added transportation reduces an already-low savings figure to $800,210 — the weakest fiscal case of the five, and the transportation dynamic is a recurring drag, not a one-time cost.

My rank for Transportation & Access (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest)	**1**

08 Enrollment Trends

e.g. Current enrollment vs. 5-year projection · Does the model still work if enrollment keeps declining? · Reversibility of the decision

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	With students redistributed from the closed Crater and JA buildings, EY is projected at approximately 180 students — 90% of its 200-seat capacity. That removes the near-term underfill concern and gives EY a healthier operating enrollment.
Con	(Long term): 758 open seats across remaining buildings is the smallest buffer of any model. If enrollment grows even modestly in certain areas, the district could face capacity pressure sooner than expected.
My rank for Enrollment Trends (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest)	**2**

09 Implementation & Transition

e.g. Realism of phasing and timeline · Boundary changes · Reduction in force and staff retention · Union contract and closure-process requirements · Short-term disruption vs. long-term benefit

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	All schools stay K-5 and no grade spans change. The communication burden for structure is minimal — it's a school change, not a system change.
Con	The lack of GIS mapping means boundary decisions for this model must happen after a vote rather than before it. That extends the implementation timeline and leaves families without clear answers for longer.
Con	This model was added at the board's request after the committee's October 1 meeting and was not reviewed at a full committee table.
Con	(Long term): If the board later determines that Ewing Young needs to close anyway — which the enrollment trends suggest is likely within a few years — the district will have gone through two closure cycles in rapid succession. That compounds community disruption and erodes trust in the planning process.
My rank for Implementation & Transition (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest)	**3**

NEWBERG-DUNDEE PUBLIC SCHOOLS: SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING MODEL RANKING

Individual Board Member Assessment · Complete independently before group discussion

Board Member Name:	Sarah King
Date:	

HOW TO USE THIS TOOL

1. On each model tab (C, D, G, H, and J), list the pros and cons that matter most to you in each of the nine areas. Write them in your own words. Individual items are not scored.
2. At the end of each area, give that model one rank compared with the other four: 5 = best of the five models in that area, 1 = weakest. Use each number once per area.
3. This page fills in as you go. The Check column tells you if an area is missing a rank or repeats a number.
4. Nothing here is added up. Look for the pattern: how many areas each model ranks first, how each model compares head to head, and how each model does in the areas you care about most.

MY RANKING BY AREA (5 = best of the five, 1 = weakest)

Area	Model C	Model D	Model G	Model H	Model J	Check
01 Budget	3	5	2	4	1	OK
02 Capacity	4	3	1	2	5	OK
03 Student Impact	4	5	2	1	3	OK
04 Class Size Distribution	4	3	5	2	1	OK
05 Facilities & Closed Buildings	2	3	1	4	5	OK
06 Community Impact & Equity	2	5	3	4	1	OK
07 Transportation & Access	3	5	1	2	4	OK
08 Enrollment Trends	3	2	1	4	5	OK
09 Implementation & Transition	5	4	1	2	3	OK

WHAT THE PATTERN SHOWS (counts of areas, not totals of scores)

Number of areas ranked...	Model C	Model D	Model G	Model H	Model J
best of the five (rank 5)	1	4	1	0	3
in the top two (rank 4 or 5)	4	5	1	4	4
weakest of the five (rank 1)	0	0	5	1	3

HEAD TO HEAD (areas where the model in the row ranked above the model in the column)

Row model ranked above column model in...	Model C	Model D	Model G	Model H	Model J
Model C	—	4	7	5	5
Model D	5	—	8	7	6
Model G	2	1	—	2	3
Model H	4	2	7	—	3
Model J	4	3	6	6	—

Example: a 7 in the Model D row and Model C column means Model D ranked above Model C in 7 of the 9 areas. If a model is dropped or renamed, rename its tab and the formulas follow. Ties are counted for neither model.

MY THREE MOST IMPORTANT AREAS

Pick the three areas that matter most to you. The table shows how each model ranked in those areas.

Area (pick from the list)	Model C	Model D	Model G	Model H	Model J
03 Student Impact	4	5	2	1	3
01 Budget	3	5	2	4	1
04 Class Size Distribution	4	3	5	2	1

BOARD MEMBER SUMMARY & REFLECTION

The 3 factors that most shaped my rankings:

Class size and spread as well as targeting grade levels under 2 teachers really matters to me. Consistent experience for students with teachers who have a balanced load and team

Where can we find enough savings to ensure we have school days restored

Access and equity for students- can our students get to and from school from their communities well and what are the impacts to our students where school is a safe place and provides essential services

Items I need more information on:

Can we adjust start times for elementary to accomodate route changes and longer transportion times? If we do that do we also then consider early release vs. late start?

I would really like to hear from our own staff and DO team what they consider to be the best option. They are the experts and in the classroom every day living this.

Overall reflection: what do my rankings reveal about my priorities?

I think that my rankings still highlight my priority for our student class size and distribution even when that means closing my zone's own school (and the school my kids went to).

My priorities contine to show that budget is important knowing that we have to restore classroom days.

It also shows that at this time I don't believe that the reshaping for our middle school experience in the options presented makes a meaningful enough impact to justify it either from a student experience perspective or from the process of implementing such a change

NEWBERG-DUNDEE PUBLIC SCHOOLS: SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING MODEL RANKING

Individual Board Member Assessment · Complete independently before group discussion

Board Member:	Sarah King
Model Being Evaluated:	**Model C: Close Ewing Young and Antonia Crater. K-5 elementary and 6-8 middle schools unchanged.**

KEY FACTS FOR THIS MODEL (models workbook, updated October 28, 2026)

Net recurring savings	**$1,081,500**
Average elementary class size (today 25.03, target 24.5)	**24.65**
Class size spread, standard deviation (today 5.30; lower is more even)	**1.85**
Grade levels with fewer than two teachers (today 17 of 36)	**2 of 24**

HOW TO USE THIS PAGE

For each area, list the pros and cons that matter most to YOU. Column A: Pro or Con. Column B: describe the item in your own words. Do not score individual items. Then give this model ONE rank for the area, compared with the other five models: 5 = best of the five, 1 = weakest of the five. Use each number once per area. Complete the same area on all five model tabs.

01 Budget

e.g. Net recurring savings · One-time closure costs (moving, severance) · Whether the savings are enough to restore instructional days

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	Gets enough saving to restore instructional days but just barely. This could change with transportation realities
Con	Difficutlies finding leasors for the rural campus or the Crater campus with it's close proximity to other school and the attached senior center

My rank for Budget (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **3**

02 Capacity

e.g. Enrollment vs. rated capacity at receiving schools · Cafeteria and gym load

Pro / Con	Item
Con	The three larger buildings still have significant capacity available, maybe to much to be sustainable
Pro	Dundee capacity is at an appropriate level

My rank for Capacity (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **4**

03 Student Impact

e.g. Academic disruption and transition stress

Pro / Con	Item
Con	Siginficant transition for students coming from EY as they join much larger schools
Pro	

My rank for Student Impact (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **4**

04 Class Size Distribution

e.g. Average class size vs. the 24.5 target · Spread between the smallest and largest classes · Grade levels with fewer than two teachers · Blended classes

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	Brings class size distribution near right to target and spread within balance
Pro	Grade levels under 2 teachers is at it's lowest

My rank for Class Size Distribution (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **4**

05 Facilities & Closed Buildings

e.g. Cost to secure, heat, and maintain a vacant building · Liability and vandalism · Condition and deferred maintenance of buildings that stay open · Future use of a closed building · Cost to reopen if enrollment rebounds

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	Crater is within the complex of CV and sports complex, reducing risk of vandalism perhaps
Pro	Maybe Crater has a lease option that aligns with the sports complex or senior center for additional revenue?
Con	EY could be difficult to find a lease for
Con	

My rank for Facilities & Closed Buildings (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **2**

06 Community Impact & Equity

e.g. Disproportionate impact on low-income, ELL, or Title I students · Loss of a neighborhood anchor · Community groups that use the building · Trust of families and staff

Pro / Con	Item
Con	Big community impact for EY families with loss of rural school and anchor
Con	Losing two elementary schools on the west side of town

My rank for Community Impact & Equity (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **2**

07 Transportation & Access

e.g. Longer commutes for younger students · Added bus routes and costs · Walkability and safety of new routes · Access for families without a car

Pro / Con	Item
Con	Longer commute for EY students especially with paired with the JA closure

My rank for Transportation & Access (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **3**

08 Enrollment Trends

e.g. Current enrollment vs. 5-year projection · Does the model still work if enrollment keeps declining? · Reversibility of the decision

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	There continues to be room if there is an increase in enrollment
Con	If there is a continued decrease, concerned that there is yet again to much open capacity in one of the three larger schools

My rank for Enrollment Trends (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **3**

09 Implementation & Transition

e.g. Realism of phasing and timeline · Boundary changes · Reduction in force and staff retention · Union contract and closure-process requirements · Short-term disruption vs. long-term benefit

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	Logistics ability to move excess equipment to CV perhaps - this is a long shot pro
	My top choice becuase boundaries for Crater and EY can be considerd together, potential for greater routing efficiencies in transport

My rank for Implementation & Transition (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **5**

NEWBERG-DUNDEE PUBLIC SCHOOLS: SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING MODEL RANKING

Individual Board Member Assessment · Complete independently before group discussion

Board Member:	Sarah King
Model Being Evaluated:	**Model D: Close Ewing Young and Joan Austin. K-5 elementary and 6-8 middle schools unchanged.**

KEY FACTS FOR THIS MODEL (models workbook, updated October 28, 2026)

Net recurring savings	**$1,182,526**
Average elementary class size (today 25.03, target 24.5)	**24.79**
Class size spread, standard deviation (today 5.30; lower is more even)	**1.43**
Grade levels with fewer than two teachers (today 17 of 36)	**5 of 24**

HOW TO USE THIS PAGE

For each area, list the pros and cons that matter most to YOU. Column A: Pro or Con. Column B: describe the item in your own words. Do not score individual items. Then give this model ONE rank for the area, compared with the other four models: 5 = best of the five, 1 = weakest of the five. Use each number once per area. Complete the same area on all five model tabs.

01 Budget

e.g. Net recurring savings · One-time closure costs (moving, severance) · Whether the savings are enough to restore instructional days

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	Clears the savings requirement to restore instructional days
Con	Closes a Title I school and reduces funding
Pro	Does not require significant retrofit of any building to implement

My rank for Budget (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **5**

02 Capacity

e.g. Enrollment vs. rated capacity at receiving schools · Cafeteria and gym load

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	Brings capacity in remaining open builds up to appropriate thresholds
Con	This one requires a careful look at boundary maps- Crater recieving the majority push capacity almost to the max

My rank for Capacity (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **3**

03 Student Impact

e.g. Academic disruption and transition stress

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	JA and Crater are close proximty to each other, could lessen the impact of transition
Con	Still siginficant transition for EY rural families

My rank for Student Impact (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **5**

04 Class Size Distribution

e.g. Average class size vs. the 24.5 target · Spread between the smallest and largest classes · Grade levels with fewer than two teachers · Blended classes

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	Brings class size nearly to target
Pro	Class size spread also significantly balances out
Con	Does not solve the grade levels under 2 teachers in Dundee problem

My rank for Class Size Distribution (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **3**

05 Facilities & Closed Buildings

e.g. Cost to secure, heat, and maintain a vacant building · Liability and vandalism · Condition and deferred maintenance of buildings that stay open · Future use of a closed building · Cost to reopen if enrollment rebounds

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	JA lease potential given it's location and it's not tied to another building or complex
Con	EY lease potential with rural location and size/building age

My rank for Facilities & Closed Buildings (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **3**

06 Community Impact & Equity

e.g. Disproportionate impact on low-income, ELL, or Title I students · Loss of a neighborhood anchor · Community groups that use the building · Trust of families and staff

Pro / Con	Item
Con	Loss of rural school at EY

My rank for Community Impact & Equity (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **5**

07 Transportation & Access

e.g. Longer commutes for younger students · Added bus routes and costs · Walkability and safety of new routes · Access for families without a car

Pro / Con	Item
Con	EY transportation is already really long for bussing, hence the long pick up and drop off lines. Need to optimize this
Pro	Keeps a west side school open and the EY student commute as short as possible
Pro	Continues to serve the walking community adjacent the school

My rank for Transportation & Access (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **5**

08 Enrollment Trends

e.g. Current enrollment vs. 5-year projection · Does the model still work if enrollment keeps declining? · Reversibility of the decision

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	If we eventually see an increase in enrollment, reopening an elementary without redoing MS is much simpler perhaps

My rank for Enrollment Trends (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **2**

09 Implementation & Transition

e.g. Realism of phasing and timeline · Boundary changes · Reduction in force and staff retention · Union contract and closure-process requirements · Short-term disruption vs. long-term benefit

Pro / Con	Item

My rank for Implementation & Transition (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **4**

NEWBERG-DUNDEE PUBLIC SCHOOLS: SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING MODEL RANKING

Individual Board Member Assessment · Complete independently before group discussion

Board Member:	Sarah King
Model Being Evaluated:	**Model G (revised): Close Ewing Young and Mountain View Middle School. Antonia Crater becomes the 6th grade center; 7-8 at Chehalem Valley.**

KEY FACTS FOR THIS MODEL (models workbook, updated October 28, 2026)

Net recurring savings	**$1,200,177**
Average elementary class size (today 25.03, target 24.5)	**24.63**
Class size spread, standard deviation (today 5.30; lower is more even)	**1.81**
Grade levels with fewer than two teachers (today 17 of 36)	**2 of 25**

HOW TO USE THIS PAGE

For each area, list the pros and cons that matter most to YOU. Column A: Pro or Con. Column B: describe the item in your own words. Do not score individual items. Then give this model ONE rank for the area, compared with the other four models: 5 = best of the five, 1 = weakest of the five. Use each number once per area. Complete the same area on all five model tabs.

01 Budget

e.g. Net recurring savings · One-time closure costs (moving, severance) · Whether the savings are enough to restore instructional days

Pro / Con	Item
Con	Savings are largely based on transporation savings which could vary with reality.
Con	Adds the largest number of licensed staff and only at one grade level and in one building (no cross utilization)
Con	Significant infastructure upgrades for Crater to prep for 6th grade - hard to justify with MV

My rank for Budget (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **2**

02 Capacity

e.g. Enrollment vs. rated capacity at receiving schools · Cafeteria and gym load

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	Utilizes K-5 building space well at current enrollment with future return to growth
Pro	Ample room at Crater to absorb all 6 grade students through wondering if the buidling will be under utilized with decline
Con	CV capacity leaves little room at current enrollment with no room for future return to growth

My rank for Capacity (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **1**

03 Student Impact

e.g. Academic disruption and transition stress

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	Brings all middle grade students together beginning at 6th grade
Con	6th grade is isolated from everyone else - what social/emotional implications for this to transtion into 7/8?
Con	Still requires 3 schools within a three year span, sigificant transitions between builidings and staff teams

My rank for Student Impact (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **2**

04 Class Size Distribution

e.g. Average class size vs. the 24.5 target · Spread between the smallest and largest classes · Grade levels with fewer than two teachers · Blended classes

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	Supports the target class size for elementary
Pro	Also supports one of the smaller deviations though still presents outliers for Dundee

My rank for Class Size Distribution (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **5**

05 Facilities & Closed Buildings

e.g. Cost to secure, heat, and maintain a vacant building · Liability and vandalism · Condition and deferred maintenance of buildings that stay open · Future use of a closed building · Cost to reopen if enrollment rebounds

Pro / Con	Item
Con	
Con	Mountain view location, parking and proximity other schools - does this create lease potential challenges?

My rank for Facilities & Closed Buildings (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **1**

06 Community Impact & Equity

e.g. Disproportionate impact on low-income, ELL, or Title I students · Loss of a neighborhood anchor · Community groups that use the building · Trust of families and staff

Pro / Con	Item
Con	MV community anchor for middle grades in east Newberg? Is there a gap then between MR and HS that's significant?

My rank for Community Impact & Equity (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **3**

07 Transportation & Access

e.g. Longer commutes for younger students · Added bus routes and costs · Walkability and safety of new routes · Access for families without a car

Pro / Con	Item
Con	Middle school campus requires significant bussing from all parts of town.
Con	EY closed increases bussing needs farther into town for K-5
Con	Increased traffice to the middle school campus neighborhood with all 6-8 students there and with same start/end times

My rank for Transportation & Access (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **1**

08 Enrollment Trends

e.g. Current enrollment vs. 5-year projection · Does the model still work if enrollment keeps declining? · Reversibility of the decision

Pro / Con	Item
Con	Crater reversibility expensive to convert back to K-5 depending on upgrades (bathrooms, locker rooms, etc...)
Con	CV can only sustain building capacity with current enrollment rates or decline, not increase over time

My rank for Enrollment Trends (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **1**

09 Implementation & Transition

e.g. Realism of phasing and timeline · Boundary changes · Reduction in force and staff retention · Union contract and closure-process requirements · Short-term disruption vs. long-term benefit

Pro / Con	Item
Con	Transitioning Crater to MS could be a lot of infastucture cost - bathrooms, locker rooms for PE, etc..
Con	Transitioning MS teams amidst elementary teams with over lap at Crater is alot

My rank for Implementation & Transition (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **1**

NEWBERG-DUNDEE PUBLIC SCHOOLS: SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING MODEL RANKING

Individual Board Member Assessment · Complete independently before group discussion

Board Member:	Sarah King
Model Being Evaluated:	**Model H: Close Ewing Young and Joan Austin. K-4 elementary, 5-6 at Chehalem Valley, 7-8 at Mountain View.**

KEY FACTS FOR THIS MODEL (models workbook, updated October 28, 2026)

Net recurring savings	**$1,395,026**
Average elementary class size (today 25.03, target 24.5)	**24.94**
Class size spread, standard deviation (today 5.30; lower is more even)	**1.49**
Grade levels with fewer than two teachers (today 17 of 36)	**5 of 20**

HOW TO USE THIS PAGE

For each area, list the pros and cons that matter most to YOU. Column A: Pro or Con. Column B: describe the item in your own words. Do not score individual items. Then give this model ONE rank for the area, compared with the other four models: 5 = best of the five, 1 = weakest of the five. Use each number once per area. Complete the same area on all five model tabs.

01 Budget

e.g. Net recurring savings · One-time closure costs (moving, severance) · Whether the savings are enough to restore instructional days

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	Largest of the reoccuring budget savings annually
Con	Transportation is the second largest line item of savings which seems like the largest potential to change
Con	Closes a Title I school and reducing funding

My rank for Budget (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **4**

02 Capacity

e.g. Enrollment vs. rated capacity at receiving schools · Cafeteria and gym load

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	Elementary shift to K-14 keeps building capacity with plenty of room
Con	5-6, capacity is nearly max with no room to spare for at least 2-3 years until enrollment comes down
Con	

My rank for Capacity (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **2**

03 Student Impact

e.g. Academic disruption and transition stress

Pro / Con	Item
Con	Most significant distruption of grade levels, splitting into three separate school levels
Con	Cross town logistics for families bridging students across both 5-6 and 7-8 levels, if not more with early elementary and HS
Con	Still does not support schools with 2 or more classrooms at same grade in Dundee
Pro	DOES bring together 5-6 into one unit earlier
Pro	Does bring together 7-8 student groups across the community before entering high school

My rank for Student Impact (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **1**

04 Class Size Distribution

e.g. Average class size vs. the 24.5 target · Spread between the smallest and largest classes · Grade levels with fewer than two teachers · Blended classes

Pro / Con	Item
Con	Does not significantly improve the class size average for elementary.
Pro	It does bring the standard deviation down in compared to today, supporting continuity with staffing needs

My rank for Class Size Distribution (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **2**

05 Facilities & Closed Buildings

e.g. Cost to secure, heat, and maintain a vacant building · Liability and vandalism · Condition and deferred maintenance of buildings that stay open · Future use of a closed building · Cost to reopen if enrollment rebounds

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	EY is one of the smallest of the buildings to maintain/heat if closed
Pro	JA lease potential for nearby organizations
Con	EY greater potential for liability/vandalism due to rural setting?

My rank for Facilities & Closed Buildings (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **4**

06 Community Impact & Equity

e.g. Disproportionate impact on low-income, ELL, or Title I students · Loss of a neighborhood anchor · Community groups that use the building · Trust of families and staff

Pro / Con	Item
Con	Losing JA loses Title I school
Con	Losing EY loses only rural and farthest west school - cuts off rural community members
Pro	Brings together middle grades across community sooner to support inclusivity and community development of cohort

Pro	Brings togeher staff teams across middle grades within centralized buildings to support grade level learning objectives

My rank for Community Impact & Equity (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **4**

07 Transportation & Access

e.g. Longer commutes for younger students · Added bus routes and costs · Walkability and safety of new routes · Access for families without a car

Pro / Con	Item
Con	Significant increase in transport for famlies from rural EY areas
Con	Cross town logistics for 5-6, 7-8 grade splits into two different schools
Pro	Does create ability for 8th grade students to have easier access to high school for advanced programing

My rank for Transportation & Access (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **2**

08 Enrollment Trends

e.g. Current enrollment vs. 5-year projection · Does the model still work if enrollment keeps declining? · Reversibility of the decision

Pro / Con	Item
Con	If enrollment keeps declining the early elementary feels like building capacity is under utilized at only ~50%
Con	The first few years of the middle grade models will be very tight in buildings until enrollment declines, little room for regrowth over time

My rank for Enrollment Trends (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **4**

09 Implementation & Transition

e.g. Realism of phasing and timeline · Boundary changes · Reduction in force and staff retention · Union contract and closure-process requirements · Short-term disruption vs. long-term benefit

Pro / Con	Item
Con	Significant phasing for staff transition and planning ar the middle grade level in particular
Con	Transportation planning and phasing
Con	Boundary changes for the two closed elementary schools

My rank for Implementation & Transition (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **2**

NEWBERG-DUNDEE PUBLIC SCHOOLS: SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING MODEL RANKING

Individual Board Member Assessment · Complete independently before group discussion

Board Member:	Sarah King
Model Being Evaluated:	**Model J: Close Antonia Crater and Joan Austin. Ewing Young stays open. K-5 elementary and 6-8 middle schools unchanged. Added at the Board's request after October 1; student placements were estimated by grade and proximity rather than mapped by address, so class-size figures are estimates**

KEY FACTS FOR THIS MODEL (models workbook, updated October 28, 2026)

Net recurring savings	**$800,210**
Average elementary class size (today 25.03, target 24.5)	**24.59**
Class size spread, standard deviation (today 5.30; lower is more even)	**2.02**
Grade levels with fewer than two teachers (today 17 of 36)	**7 of 24**

HOW TO USE THIS PAGE

For each area, list the pros and cons that matter most to YOU. Column A: Pro or Con. Column B: describe the item in your own words. Do not score individual items. Then give this model ONE rank for the area, compared with the other four models: 5 = best of the five, 1 = weakest of the five. Use each number once per area. Complete the same area on all five model tabs.

01 Budget

e.g. Net recurring savings · One-time closure costs (moving, severance) · Whether the savings are enough to restore instructional days

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	Both Crater and JA may have greater lease potential the EY from a revenue recapture perspective
Con	Closes a Title I School and loss of funding
Con	Does not get us enough savings to restore the school year

My rank for Budget (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **1**

02 Capacity

e.g. Enrollment vs. rated capacity at receiving schools · Cafeteria and gym load

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	It does bring remaining buildings up to higher end of capacity with room to space but also ability to shrink and be comfrotable
Con	EY capacity could be pushing the envelope for a couple of years for PE space

My rank for Capacity (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **5**

03 Student Impact

e.g. Academic disruption and transition stress

Pro / Con	Item
Con	Would disperse two elementary schools where students can walk to school currently and would need transport

My rank for Student Impact (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **3**

04 Class Size Distribution

e.g. Average class size vs. the 24.5 target · Spread between the smallest and largest classes · Grade levels with fewer than two teachers · Blended classes

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	Meets the class size target ratio
Con	Still maintains all single grade classes at EY because of capacity

My rank for Class Size Distribution (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **1**

05 Facilities & Closed Buildings

e.g. Cost to secure, heat, and maintain a vacant building · Liability and vandalism · Condition and deferred maintenance of buildings that stay open · Future use of a closed building · Cost to reopen if enrollment rebounds

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	JA and Crater are newer schools and could be easier to lease
Con	Not sure what lease potential is for Crater with Senior Center also incorporated?

My rank for Facilities & Closed Buildings (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **5**

06 Community Impact & Equity

e.g. Disproportionate impact on low-income, ELL, or Title I students · Loss of a neighborhood anchor · Community groups that use the building · Trust of families and staff

Pro / Con	Item
Con	Loss if Title I school
Pro	Maintains rural school
Con	Losing two elementary schools in a large population concentration on the west side of town

My rank for Community Impact & Equity (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **1**

07 Transportation & Access

e.g. Longer commutes for younger students · Added bus routes and costs · Walkability and safety of new routes · Access for families without a car

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	Prevents longer transport for rural students by maintaining EY
Con	Removes two walkable schools from the community in town

My rank for Transportation & Access (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **4**

08 Enrollment Trends

e.g. Current enrollment vs. 5-year projection · Does the model still work if enrollment keeps declining? · Reversibility of the decision

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	The model does work with continued enrollment decline
Pro	If reversibilty becomes option have two close options to pick from that doesn't require signficant transport disruption perhaps

My rank for Enrollment Trends (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **5**

09 Implementation & Transition

e.g. Realism of phasing and timeline · Boundary changes · Reduction in force and staff retention · Union contract and closure-process requirements · Short-term disruption vs. long-term benefit

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	Boundary changes t

My rank for Implementation & Transition (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **3**

NEWBERG-DUNDEE PUBLIC SCHOOLS: SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING MODEL RANKING

Individual Board Member Assessment · Complete independently before group discussion

Board Member Name:	Sol Allen
Date:	11/5/2026

HOW TO USE THIS TOOL

1. On each model tab (C, D, G, H, and J), list the pros and cons that matter most to you in each of the nine areas. Write them in your own words. Individual items are not scored.
2. At the end of each area, give that model one rank compared with the other four: 5 = best of the five models in that area, 1 = weakest. Use each number once per area.
3. This page fills in as you go. The Check column tells you if an area is missing a rank or repeats a number.
4. Nothing here is added up. Look for the pattern: how many areas each model ranks first, how each model compares head to head, and how each model does in the areas you care about most.

MY RANKING BY AREA (5 = best of the five, 1 = weakest)

Area	Model C	Model D	Model G	Model H	Model J	Check
01 Budget	3	4	2	5	1	OK
02 Capacity	4	3	1	5	2	OK
03 Student Impact	3	4	1	5	2	OK
04 Class Size Distribution	3	5	2	4	1	OK
05 Facilities & Closed Buildings	3	4	1	5	2	OK
06 Community Impact & Equity	4	3	2	5	1	OK
07 Transportation & Access	2	3	5	4	1	OK
08 Enrollment Trends	5	3	1	4	2	OK
09 Implementation & Transition	3	5	1	4	2	OK

WHAT THE PATTERN SHOWS (counts of areas, not totals of scores)

Number of areas ranked...	Model C	Model D	Model G	Model H	Model J
best of the five (rank 5)	1	2	1	5	0
in the top two (rank 4 or 5)	3	5	1	9	0
weakest of the five (rank 1)	0	0	5	0	4

HEAD TO HEAD (areas where the model in the row ranked above the model in the column)

Row model ranked above column model in...	Model C	Model D	Model G	Model H	Model J
Model C	—	3	8	1	9
Model D	6	—	8	2	9
Model G	1	1	—	1	4
Model H	8	7	8	—	9
Model J	0	0	5	0	—

Example: a 7 in the Model D row and Model C column means Model D ranked above Model C in 7 of the 9 areas. If a model is dropped or renamed, rename its tab and the formulas follow. Ties are counted for neither model.

MY THREE MOST IMPORTANT AREAS

Pick the three areas that matter most to you. The table shows how each model ranked in those areas.

Area (pick from the list)	Model C	Model D	Model G	Model H	Model J
06 Community Impact & Equity	4	3	2	5	1
03 Student Impact	3	4	1	5	2
09 Implementation & Transition	3	5	1	4	2

BOARD MEMBER SUMMARY & REFLECTION

The 3 factors that most shaped my rankings:

I think that with a chance to rethink our school communities, the idea of getting all studets together before 9th grade is a great idea. I have heard a lot of positive remarks about this.

I found it important to take the buildings out of the equation, trying to focus more so on the volume of students knowing that lower income families will be effected regardless of keeping any specific school open due to boundary changes for schools that may not even close.

Conversartions I have been having with people from a variety of schools. Their input and understanding that hard decisions that will be un-popular no matter what are needed. I believe there is an understanding that through this process and the work done to get us here, clearly thought out and transparetnt decisions would alleviate the frustration that will come from any of a number of areas

Items I need more information on:

Is the process of setting curicculum for a 5-6, 7-8 middle school setting feasable?

How do any potential savings change when calculating in potential loss of tax-exempt status from buildings? / How likely are we to lose that exemption?

What is the expectation of the schools that would be title 1 based on student population shifts due to boundary changes?

Overall reflection: what do my rankings reveal about my priorities?

I believe a shift in our structural model is an opportunity that we should take.

While I have pride in my neighborhood school, I recognize the reality of the situation. I dont believe the buildings matter, I believe that our teachers, our students, and our families that matter. All of those should transition, in these models

I want to reduce the overall volume of impact of the transition on our elementary school students, knowing that many groups will feel unfairly overlooked.

NEWBERG-DUNDEE PUBLIC SCHOOLS: SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING MODEL RANKING

Individual Board Member Assessment · Complete independently before group discussion

Board Member:	Sol Allen
Model Being Evaluated:	**Model C: Close Ewing Young and Antonia Crater. K-5 elementary and 6-8 middle schools unchanged.**

KEY FACTS FOR THIS MODEL (models workbook, updated October 28, 2026)

Net recurring savings	**$1,081,500**
Average elementary class size (today 25.03, target 24.5)	**24.65**
Class size spread, standard deviation (today 5.30; lower is more even)	**1.85**
Grade levels with fewer than two teachers (today 17 of 36)	**2 of 24**

HOW TO USE THIS PAGE

For each area, list the pros and cons that matter most to YOU. Column A: Pro or Con. Column B: describe the item in your own words. Do not score individual items. Then give this model ONE rank for the area, compared with the other four models: 5 = best of the five, 1 = weakest of the five. Use each number once per area. Complete the same area on all five model tabs.

01 Budget

e.g. Net recurring savings · One-time closure costs (moving, severance) · Whether the savings are enough to restore instructional days

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	Hits the $1 Million number
Con	Lowest savings among those that hit $1 million

My rank for Budget (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **3**

02 Capacity

e.g. Enrollment vs. rated capacity at receiving schools · Cafeteria and gym load

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	Current projections of where impacted students will go does not put strain on actual capacity numbers
Con	Concerns were noted about space for PE and SpeD

My rank for Capacity (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **4**

03 Student Impact

e.g. Academic disruption and transition stress

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	No impact on Middle Schools
Con	Impacts the most K-5, almost 500 kids.
Con	Seperates cohorts from 3 schools instead of 2

My rank for Student Impact (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **3**

04 Class Size Distribution

e.g. Average class size vs. the 24.5 target · Spread between the smallest and largest classes · Grade levels with fewer than two teachers · Blended classes

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	Only 2 grade levels under 2 teachers
Con	High spread of class size
Con	Highest deviation

My rank for Class Size Distribution (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **3**

05 Facilities & Closed Buildings

e.g. Cost to secure, heat, and maintain a vacant building · Liability and vandalism · Condition and deferred maintenance of buildings that stay open · Future use of a closed building · Cost to reopen if enrollment rebounds

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	Crater could be used as some kind of overflow/reimagined space for CHehalem Valley/potential community use
Pro	Keeps one of our newer schools with a fenced in playground.
Con	Ewying Yong being vacant without a new use may have issues due to its location.

My rank for Facilities & Closed Buildings (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **3**

06 Community Impact & Equity

e.g. Disproportionate impact on low-income, ELL, or Title I students · Loss of a neighborhood anchor · Community groups that use the building · Trust of families and staff

Pro / Con	Item
Con	Toughest on Far northwest and rural families
Con	Displaces students at 3 elementaries.
Con	This will still displace title 1 students to other schools in the district.

Pro	arguably the best model for our title 1 school and those families
Pro	Keeps our familiar school structure in place

My rank for Community Impact & Equity (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **4**

07 Transportation & Access

e.g. Longer commutes for younger students · Added bus routes and costs · Walkability and safety of new routes · Access for families without a car

Pro / Con	Item
Con	longer commutes for our rural families
Con	removes an important walkable neighborhood school at Crater
Con	lowest bus route reduction (outside of model J)
Pro	Keeps access to a walkable neighborhood school in JA.
Con	The walkability for families that might utilize afterschool activities or community events will be more of a struggle.

My rank for Transportation & Access (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **2**

08 Enrollment Trends

e.g. Current enrollment vs. 5-year projection · Does the model still work if enrollment keeps declining? · Reversibility of the decision

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	Should be sustainable with current trends
Pro	Insulated Long term if/when population growth increases
Pro	Would be easier to reverse changes with Crater as it is so connected to CV.

My rank for Enrollment Trends (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **5**

09 Implementation & Transition

e.g. Realism of phasing and timeline · Boundary changes · Reduction in force and staff retention · Union contract and closure-process requirements · Short-term disruption vs. long-term benefit

Pro / Con	Item
Con	Impacting districting for 3 school boundaries
Pro	No changes needed at middle school
Con	Keeps students from becoming a single cohort until 9th grade

My rank for Implementation & Transition (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **3**

NEWBERG-DUNDEE PUBLIC SCHOOLS: SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING MODEL RANKING

Individual Board Member Assessment · Complete independently before group discussion

Board Member:	Sol Allen
Model Being Evaluated:	**Model D: Close Ewing Young and Joan Austin. K-5 elementary and 6-8 middle schools unchanged.**

KEY FACTS FOR THIS MODEL (models workbook, updated October 28, 2026)

Net recurring savings	**$1,182,526**
Average elementary class size (today 25.03, target 24.5)	**24.79**
Class size spread, standard deviation (today 5.30; lower is more even)	**1.43**
Grade levels with fewer than two teachers (today 17 of 36)	**5 of 24**

HOW TO USE THIS PAGE

For each area, list the pros and cons that matter most to YOU. Column A: Pro or Con. Column B: describe the item in your own words. Do not score individual items. Then give this model ONE rank for the area, compared with the other four models: 5 = best of the five, 1 = weakest of the five. Use each number once per area. Complete the same area on all five model tabs.

01 Budget

e.g. Net recurring savings · One-time closure costs (moving, severance) · Whether the savings are enough to restore instructional days

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	Hits $1 million mark
Pro	Closing JA allows for best chance at leasing building

My rank for Budget (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **4**

02 Capacity

e.g. Enrollment vs. rated capacity at receiving schools · Cafeteria and gym load

Pro / Con	Item
Con	Puts strain on Crater with 200 students coming in.
Pro	Mable rush is only other school taking in substantial students but it is less than half of Crater
Con	Unsure of impact of Cafeteria/PE/Sped on these 2 schools taking in students

My rank for Capacity (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **3**

03 Student Impact

e.g. Academic disruption and transition stress

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	Only 2 school communities impacted
Pro	Most of EY students would stay together at Crater
Con	JA community gets split between 3 schools.

My rank for Student Impact (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **4**

04 Class Size Distribution

e.g. Average class size vs. the 24.5 target · Spread between the smallest and largest classes · Grade levels with fewer than two teachers · Blended classes

Pro / Con	Item
Con	5 grade levels with less than 2 teachers
Pro	lowest spread
Pro	Lowest deviation

My rank for Class Size Distribution (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **5**

05 Facilities & Closed Buildings

e.g. Cost to secure, heat, and maintain a vacant building · Liability and vandalism · Condition and deferred maintenance of buildings that stay open · Future use of a closed building · Cost to reopen if enrollment rebounds

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	JA has best chance of being leased and thus not worrying about vandalistm
Con	JA is one of the newest schools and should have the least future maintenance costs associated
Con	If leased and retrofitted for other things, the cost to refit the building to classrooms could be expensive.
Con	Ewying Yong being vacant without a new use may have issues due to its location.

My rank for Facilities & Closed Buildings (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **4**

06 Community Impact & Equity

e.g. Disproportionate impact on low-income, ELL, or Title I students · Loss of a neighborhood anchor · Community groups that use the building · Trust of families and staff

Pro / Con	Item
Con	removing a title 1 school and negatively impacting the lower Socioeconomic groups in our community
Pro	The changes would be less extreme for JA students as they are relatively dead center of Newberg making their new schools relatively close
Con	Worries of potential impacts with Austin family.

Con	Impact on rural families
Pro	Keeps our familiar school structure in place

My rank for Community Impact & Equity (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **3**

07 Transportation & Access

e.g. Longer commutes for younger students · Added bus routes and costs · Walkability and safety of new routes · Access for families without a car

Pro / Con	Item
Con	Impacts rural families, but not as much as Model C
Pro	One more bus route saved than Model C (Still less than H & G)
Pro	JA students wouldnt have long bus routes to their new schools
Con	The walkability for families that might utilize afterschool activities or community events will be more of a struggle.

My rank for Transportation & Access (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **3**

08 Enrollment Trends

e.g. Current enrollment vs. 5-year projection · Does the model still work if enrollment keeps declining? · Reversibility of the decision

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	Should be sustainable with current trends
Con	Crater being close to capacity could be a problem in the Long term if trends start in increase student enrollment.
Con	If JA is leased, the contract could cause problems for reversability

My rank for Enrollment Trends (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **3**

09 Implementation & Transition

e.g. Realism of phasing and timeline · Boundary changes · Reduction in force and staff retention · Union contract and closure-process requirements · Short-term disruption vs. long-term benefit

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	With only 2 school communities being displaced it would be the easiest for phasing
Pro	Least boundary changes
Pro	No impact on middle school
Con	Keeps students from becoming a single cohort until 9th grade

My rank for Implementation & Transition (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **5**

NEWBERG-DUNDEE PUBLIC SCHOOLS: SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING MODEL RANKING

Individual Board Member Assessment · Complete independently before group discussion

Board Member:	Sol Allen
Model Being Evaluated:	**Model G (revised): Close Ewing Young and Mountain View Middle School. Antonia Crater becomes the 6th grade center; 7-8 at Chehalem Valley.**

KEY FACTS FOR THIS MODEL (models workbook, updated October 28, 2026)

Net recurring savings	**$1,200,177**
Average elementary class size (today 25.03, target 24.5)	**24.63**
Class size spread, standard deviation (today 5.30; lower is more even)	**1.81**
Grade levels with fewer than two teachers (today 17 of 36)	**2 of 25**

HOW TO USE THIS PAGE

For each area, list the pros and cons that matter most to YOU. Column A: Pro or Con. Column B: describe the item in your own words. Do not score individual items. Then give this model ONE rank for the area, compared with the other four models: 5 = best of the five, 1 = weakest of the five. Use each number once per area. Complete the same area on all five model tabs.

01 Budget

e.g. Net recurring savings · One-time closure costs (moving, severance) · Whether the savings are enough to restore instructional days

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	Hits $1 million mark
Con	Adds the most licensed FTE
Pro	Saves the most on bus routes

My rank for Budget (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **2**

02 Capacity

e.g. Enrollment vs. rated capacity at receiving schools · Cafeteria and gym load

Pro / Con	Item
Con	Closes our largest Middle School
Con	Puts Chehalem valley at near capacity with no other buildings to expand to if needed.
Pro	No added strain on elemen

My rank for Capacity (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **1**

03 Student Impact

e.g. Academic disruption and transition stress

Pro / Con	Item
Con	Displaces 4 schools (1 middle, 3 elementary)
Con	Long term middle schoolers will not get as many chances to interact at the highschool from being on the other side of town
Pro	Gets all students in the district together by the 6th grade
Con	Impacts the most K-5, almost 500 kids.

My rank for Student Impact (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **1**

04 Class Size Distribution

e.g. Average class size vs. the 24.5 target · Spread between the smallest and largest classes · Grade levels with fewer than two teachers · Blended classes

Pro / Con	Item
Con	One of the largest spreads
Pro	reduces grade levels under 2 teachers to 2.
Con	2nd highest standard devation.
Con	This could cause strain on middle school class sizes
Pro	OR this could help with the spread and standard deviation with just 1 building.

My rank for Class Size Distribution (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **2**

05 Facilities & Closed Buildings

e.g. Cost to secure, heat, and maintain a vacant building · Liability and vandalism · Condition and deferred maintenance of buildings that stay open · Future use of a closed building · Cost to reopen if enrollment rebounds

Pro / Con	Item
Con	Closing Mountain View removes our largest middle school
Con	Removes a school within the highschool complex
Con	Mountain view and Ewying Young seem the most like to deal with liability problems due to their locations.
Con	Not sure what, if any, potentals for Mountain view are.
Pro	Could work to incorporate Mountain view buildign for highschool utilization

My rank for Facilities & Closed Buildings (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **1**

06 Community Impact & Equity

e.g. Disproportionate impact on low-income, ELL, or Title I students · Loss of a neighborhood anchor · Community groups that use the building · Trust of families and staff

Pro / Con	Item
Con	Loss of a neighborhood middleschool for the East side of town
Con	Missing map of JA students being moved to other elementary, but it would appear it would be lower income areas.
Con	This will still displace title 1 students to other schools in the district.

Pro	Builds community among families and students by getting students together by 5th grade
Con	Impact on rural families

My rank for Community Impact & Equity (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **2**

07 Transportation & Access

e.g. Longer commutes for younger students · Added bus routes and costs · Walkability and safety of new routes · Access for families without a car

Pro / Con	Item
Con	East side middle school families will have a strain for 3 years.
Con	Parking is already an issue at Crater/CV, this would increase the student count at the complex from 650 to 870
Pro	Best busing solution in regards to routes

My rank for Transportation & Access (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **5**

08 Enrollment Trends

e.g. Current enrollment vs. 5-year projection · Does the model still work if enrollment keeps declining? · Reversibility of the decision

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	If trends stay level we will utilize middle schools and elementary
Con	No Growth potential with CV being at capacity (unless Crater and CV combine to a sprawling 6--8)

My rank for Enrollment Trends (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **1**

09 Implementation & Transition

e.g. Realism of phasing and timeline · Boundary changes · Reduction in force and staff retention · Union contract and closure-process requirements · Short-term disruption vs. long-term benefit

Pro / Con	Item
Con	All current 6th-7th graders at mountain view transition further from the highschool after being used to and more ready to transition to highschool
Con	Trying to reconfigure 3 elementary schools will be a strain
Pro	Getting cohorts together earlier (6th grade) is a long term benefit that I believe the community would like

My rank for Implementation & Transition (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **1**

NEWBERG-DUNDEE PUBLIC SCHOOLS: SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING MODEL RANKING

Individual Board Member Assessment · Complete independently before group discussion

Board Member:	Sol Allen
Model Being Evaluated:	**Model H: Close Ewing Young and Joan Austin. K-4 elementary, 5-6 at Chehalem Valley, 7-8 at Mountain View.**

KEY FACTS FOR THIS MODEL (models workbook, updated October 28, 2026)

Net recurring savings	**$1,395,026**
Average elementary class size (today 25.03, target 24.5)	**24.94**
Class size spread, standard deviation (today 5.30; lower is more even)	**1.49**
Grade levels with fewer than two teachers (today 17 of 36)	**5 of 20**

HOW TO USE THIS PAGE

For each area, list the pros and cons that matter most to YOU. Column A: Pro or Con. Column B: describe the item in your own words. Do not score individual items. Then give this model ONE rank for the area, compared with the other four models: 5 = best of the five, 1 = weakest of the five. Use each number once per area. Complete the same area on all five model tabs.

01 Budget

e.g. Net recurring savings · One-time closure costs (moving, severance) · Whether the savings are enough to restore instructional days

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	Hits the $1 millon mark
Pro	Highest savings
Pro	Joan Austin has best chance at being leased.

My rank for Budget (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **5**

02 Capacity

e.g. Enrollment vs. rated capacity at receiving schools · Cafeteria and gym load

Pro / Con	Item
Con	Puts CV at capacity
Pro	Elementeries are clear
Pro	Worries of Crater numbers from model D not an issue with 5th grade moving to middle school building
Pro	Better utilizes Mountainview

My rank for Capacity (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **5**

03 Student Impact

e.g. Academic disruption and transition stress

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	Only 2 elementary school communities impacted
Con	All current 4th graders would make a move a year earlier than they expected
Pro	All current 4th and 5th graders would be together relieving some of the first year change anxiety of adjusting to older kids
Con	Current 6th and 7th graders at CV would be moved to Mountainview as a tranisition change
Pro	Current 6th and 7th graders at CV would be moved to Mountainview TOGETHER and helping with that stress.
Pro	addressing the age spread of 6th and 8th graders and problems that have been associated with that

My rank for Student Impact (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **5**

04 Class Size Distribution

e.g. Average class size vs. the 24.5 target · Spread between the smallest and largest classes · Grade levels with fewer than two teachers · Blended classes

Pro / Con	Item
Con	5 of the grade levels would have less than 2 teachers.
Pro	Spread is one of the better ones
Con	unsure of the class size changes at middle schools

My rank for Class Size Distribution (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **4**

05 Facilities & Closed Buildings

e.g. Cost to secure, heat, and maintain a vacant building · Liability and vandalism · Condition and deferred maintenance of buildings that stay open · Future use of a closed building · Cost to reopen if enrollment rebounds

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	JA has best chance of being leased.
Con	JA is one of the newest schools and should have the least future maintenance costs associated
Con	If leased and retrofitted for other things, the cost to refit the building to classrooms could be expensive.
Con	Ewying Yong being vacant without a new use may have issues due to its location.

My rank for Facilities & Closed Buildings (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **5**

06 Community Impact & Equity

e.g. Disproportionate impact on low-income, ELL, or Title I students · Loss of a neighborhood anchor · Community groups that use the building · Trust of families and staff

Pro / Con	Item
Con	Impact on rural families
Con	removing a title 1 school and negatively impacting the lower Socioeconomic groups in our community

Pro	The changes would be less extreme for JA students as they are relatively dead center of Newberg making their new schools relatively close
Con	Worries of potential impacts with Austin family.
Pro	Having all 7th and 8th grades right next to the highschool may help with the transition and overall culture.
Pro	Builds community among families and students by getting students together by 5th grade

My rank for Community Impact & Equity (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **5**

07 Transportation & Access

e.g. Longer commutes for younger students · Added bus routes and costs · Walkability and safety of new routes · Access for families without a car

Pro / Con	Item
Con	Impacts rural families, but not as much as Model C
Pro	More Bus routes saved than C or D
Pro	Spreads the issue of walkability and access across new middle school grades rather than just one side of town (arguably a con as well)
Pro	JA students wouldnt have long bus routes to their new schools
Con	The walkability for families that might utilize afterschool activities or community events will be more of a struggle.

My rank for Transportation & Access (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **4**

08 Enrollment Trends

e.g. Current enrollment vs. 5-year projection · Does the model still work if enrollment keeps declining? · Reversibility of the decision

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	If trends stay level we will utilize middle schools and elementary
Con	If trends were to rise, it could cause a strain on Chehalem valley as capacity is close to the top.
Con	If JA is leased, the contract could cause problems for reversability

My rank for Enrollment Trends (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **4**

09 Implementation & Transition

e.g. Realism of phasing and timeline · Boundary changes · Reduction in force and staff retention · Union contract and closure-process requirements · Short-term disruption vs. long-term benefit

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	Getting cohorts together by 5th grade is a long term benefit that families are excited about and would bolster our educational communities
Con	Figuring out what a 5-6 early middle school model looks like will be a challenge
Con	Potential issues with teachers moving to which shcools
Pro	Least boundary changes
Pro	Only 2 school communities being displaced.

My rank for Implementation & Transition (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **4**

NEWBERG-DUNDEE PUBLIC SCHOOLS: SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING MODEL RANKING

Individual Board Member Assessment · Complete independently before group discussion

Board Member:	Sol Allen
Model Being Evaluated:	**Model J: Close Antonia Crater and Joan Austin. Ewing Young stays open. K-5 elementary and 6-8 middle schools unchanged. Added at the Board's request after October 1; student placements were estimated by grade and proximity rather than mapped by address, so class-size figures are estimates.**

KEY FACTS FOR THIS MODEL (models workbook, updated October 28, 2026)

Net recurring savings	**$800,210**
Average elementary class size (today 25.03, target 24.5)	**24.59**
Class size spread, standard deviation (today 5.30; lower is more even)	**2.02**
Grade levels with fewer than two teachers (today 17 of 36)	**7 of 24**

HOW TO USE THIS PAGE

For each area, list the pros and cons that matter most to YOU. Column A: Pro or Con. Column B: describe the item in your own words. Do not score individual items. Then give this model ONE rank for the area, compared with the other four models: 5 = best of the five, 1 = weakest of the five. Use each number once per area. Complete the same area on all five model tabs.

01 Budget

e.g. Net recurring savings · One-time closure costs (moving, severance) · Whether the savings are enough to restore instructional days

Pro / Con	Item
Con	Does not hit the $1 million dollar mark
Con	Lowest projected savings

My rank for Budget (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **1**

02 Capacity

e.g. Enrollment vs. rated capacity at receiving schools · Cafeteria and gym load

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	Utilizes elementary buildings the best
Con	Allows the lowest growth potential due to closing 2 schools with 500 student capacity
Con	I would assume this puts a greater strain on PE, SpeD and cafeterias with a surge of kids into every building

My rank for Capacity (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **2**

03 Student Impact

e.g. Academic disruption and transition stress

Pro / Con	Item
Con	Closes 2 schools but impacts 3 school communities
Con	2nd most students impacted

My rank for Student Impact (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **2**

04 Class Size Distribution

e.g. Average class size vs. the 24.5 target · Spread between the smallest and largest classes · Grade levels with fewer than two teachers · Blended classes

Pro / Con	Item
Con	Leaves aproximately 7 grade levels with only 1 teacher per grade within buildings
Con	Spread of 21.33 to 29

My rank for Class Size Distribution (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **1**

05 Facilities & Closed Buildings

e.g. Cost to secure, heat, and maintain a vacant building · Liability and vandalism · Condition and deferred maintenance of buildings that stay open · Future use of a closed building · Cost to reopen if enrollment rebounds

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	Joan Austin has best chance of being leased
Pro	Crater could be used as some kind of overflow/reimagined space for CHehalem Valley/potential community use
Con	keeping 2 of the larger elementaries maintained is a strain

My rank for Facilities & Closed Buildings (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **2**

06 Community Impact & Equity

e.g. Disproportionate impact on low-income, ELL, or Title I students · Loss of a neighborhood anchor · Community groups that use the building · Trust of families and staff

Pro / Con	Item
Con	This benefits our smallest school with arguably the highest socioeconomics at the expense of a .
Con	Ignores the issues of the larger impact to our low income families with the lowest financial return
Pro	Keeps rural families happy

Con	Closes 2 schools on the northwest side of town, both important to their communities

My rank for Community Impact & Equity (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **1**

07 Transportation & Access

e.g. Longer commutes for younger students · Added bus routes and costs · Walkability and safety of new routes · Access for families without a car

Pro / Con	Item
Pro	Does not add to the already long bus rides for rural students
Con	Creates longer bus routes for students in town
Con	The walkability for families that might utilize afterschool activities or community events will be more of a struggle.
Con	Adds bus routes and raises transportation cost

My rank for Transportation & Access (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **1**

08 Enrollment Trends

e.g. Current enrollment vs. 5-year projection · Does the model still work if enrollment keeps declining? · Reversibility of the decision

Pro / Con	Item
Con	If enrollment declines in our rural areas, this will be for naught.
Con	Looking at a longer 20-50 year time frame, if enrollment begins to increase there will be a strain on elementary school capacity
Pro	If trends hold, we are best utilizing building potential of those elementaries that are open.

My rank for Enrollment Trends (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **2**

09 Implementation & Transition

e.g. Realism of phasing and timeline · Boundary changes · Reduction in force and staff retention · Union contract and closure-process requirements · Short-term disruption vs. long-term benefit

Pro / Con	Item
Con	WIth a high short term disruption without a long term benefit, or a short term finicial benefit like the others it is a struggle
Con	The transition for students and families to lose 2 schools in such a large chunk of our city will be a problem.
Pro	Only 2 school communities being displaced.

My rank for Implementation & Transition (5 = best of the five models, 1 = weakest) **2**