

Allocation Methodology Recommendations for SUN Service System

October 18, 2007

Parameters

When the Allocation Workgroup began meeting, the County Chair and the Director of the Department of County Human Services instructed us to make allocation methodology recommendations within the following parameters:

1. Assume that allocations between the different service areas of the SUN Service System (SUN Community Schools, anti-poverty services, Parent-Child Development services, Social and Support Services for Educational Success) would stay roughly the same; and
2. Assume that the County would continue to use approximately 30% of the total SUN Service System resources to fund culturally specific services.

Allocation Principles

1. Allocate resources based primarily on poverty.
 - For School-Based services: Poverty drives the location of services
 - For School-Linked services: Poverty drives the percentage of funding allocated to a service region
2. Assure a base level of service geographically spread across the county for both school-based and school-linked services.
 - For School-Based services: Use high school catchment areas as the geographic basis for allocating programming.
 - For School-Linked services: Use the six SUN Service System regions as the geographic basis for allocating other SUN Service System resources.

I. School-Based Services

DEFINITIONS

School-based Services: Includes the SUN Community School (SUN CS) program and school-based case management services currently delivered through the Touchstone program.

High School Catchment Areas: Refers to groupings of schools in which the elementary schools feed into the middle school and the middle schools feed into the high school. For purposes of these recommendations, high school catchment areas are defined as follows:

Barlow	Centennial	Cleveland	Corbett	David Douglas
Franklin	Grant	Gresham	Jefferson	Lincoln
Madison	Marshall	Parkrose	Reynolds	Riverdale
Roosevelt	Wilson			

Alternative, charter and magnet schools are not included in the high school catchments, and the recommendations for allocation of school-based services do not apply to these school sites since they draw their attendance from across the district(s) and not through a geographically based catchment system. The county and other providers currently provide services for eligible students attending these types of schools through a variety of other programs.

Poverty Index: The Poverty Index was developed by Multnomah County to rank the relative poverty of the populations attending each school in the county. Each school has a rank that equally weights the **percentage** of students participating in the federal Free and Reduced Price Lunch Program (FRL), and the **number** of students participating in the program. The rank is derived by first separately ranking the schools by the percentage of children participating in FRL and by the number participating in FRL. These two ranks are then averaged to yield the final rank.

The Committee then divided the ranked list of schools into quartiles such that the 1st quartile includes the schools with the highest ranks for poverty and the 4th quartile includes the schools with the lowest ranks for poverty. A copy of the index that includes the rank of each school and the quartile of the index into which each school falls is attached to these recommendations for reference.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Allocate a base level of resources in all high school catchments where the high school is in the top three quartiles for poverty using the Poverty Index. Lincoln, Riverdale and Corbett catchments do not qualify to receive a base level of funding because these three high schools are in the 4th quartile of the Poverty Index.

Allocate a base of 1 SUN CS site in each of the qualifying high school catchments. Maintain the currently operating sites serving the highest poverty population in the catchment area.

Based on this principle, the following currently operating SUN CS sites would continue operating:

- Hall ES (Barlow catchment)
- Centennial MS (Centennial catchment)
- Grout ES (Cleveland catchment)
- Alice Ott MS (David Douglas catchment)
- Arleta ES (Franklin catchment)
- Sabin ES (Grant catchment)
- East Gresham ES (Gresham catchment)
- King ES (Jefferson catchment)
- Rigler ES (Madison catchment)
- Marshall HS (Marshall catchment)
- Shaver (Parkrose catchment)
- Alder (Reynolds catchment)

- James John (Roosevelt catchment)
 - Markham (Wilson catchment)
2. Minimize site changes between high poverty sites within a cluster. Based on this principle, the Committee recommends that all existing SUN CS sites that are ranked in the 1st or 2nd quartiles of the Poverty index be maintained.
3. Shift resources from currently operating sites with relatively lower poverty rankings. Based on this principle, the Committee recommends that all existing sites ranked in the 3rd and 4th quartiles of the Poverty Index in excess of the 1 “base” site **EITHER**
- (a) receive a reduced government subsidy (75% of current funding level) with saved resources moving to higher poverty sites, **OR**
 - (b) relocate to a higher poverty site, prioritizing existing sites where time limited grants are funding current services.

The following currently operating sites would **either** be relocated **or** receive 75% of the current government subsidy:

- Dexter MS (3rd quartile; Gresham catchment)
 - Beaumont MS (3rd quartile; Grant catchment)
 - Mt. Tabor MS (3rd quartile; Franklin catchment)
 - Sellwood MS (3rd quartile; Cleveland catchment)
 - Buckman ES (4th quartile; Cleveland catchment)
 - Robert Gray MS (4th quartile; Wilson catchment)
 - Jackson MS (4th quartile; Wilson catchment)
 - Fernwood MS (4th quartile; Grant catchment)
 - Clear Creek MS (3rd quartile; Gresham catchment)
 - Metropolitan Learning Center (4th quartile; Lincoln catchment)
4. Consider multiple factors when determining relocation or funding reduction for a site including funder needs and restrictions, decisions on core services, school district and school site readiness/willingness to host a site, the ability of the school population to pay fees for after-school programs, and expiration of grant funding for current sites. Add new SUN CS sites with saved or new resources using the Poverty Index, with priority to schools in the top quartile of the Index.

Based on these factors, the Committee recommends the following:

- (a) The current SUN CS site located at the Metropolitan Learning Center be relocated because this site is in the Lincoln cluster, and as noted above, Lincoln High School is in the bottom quartile of the Poverty Index. High school catchment areas in which the high school falls in the bottom quartile of the Poverty Index are not guaranteed school based services. The Committee recommends this site be relocated to Alder Elementary (highest poverty school in city/county; grant funded services expiring at end of FY 2007/2008).

- (b) The current SUN CS site at Mt. Tabor MS be relocated to Ron Russell Elementary (highest poverty site without SUN CS services).
 - (c) The current SUN CS site at Beaumont MS be relocated to Marshall High school to assure ongoing operation of the program there where a majority of grant funds will expire at the end of FY 2007/2008.
 - (d) The Committee recommends that funding for SUN CS services at the remaining sites listed in recommendation 3 above be reduced to 75% of the current government subsidy as soon as current contracts for services expire. (Dexter MS, Sellwood MS, Buckman ES, Clear Creek ES, Fernwood MS, Jackson MS, Robert Gray ES)
 - (e) The Committee recommends that savings be applied first to maintain the current SUN CS program at Davis Elementary (top quartile in poverty index; grant funded services expire at end of FY 2007/2008), and next to the highest poverty school listed in the index without a SUN CS program.
5. If any schools in which the SUN CS program is operating are closed, or if new schools are opened subsequent to the implementation of these initial recommendations, the Committee recommends that the Coordinating Council discuss the impact of school closures or openings on the SUN CS system and make recommendations for relocation of SUN CS services if necessary.
6. The county should re-compute the poverty rankings of all schools in the county after three years of the contract period for SUN CS services has ended and provide the new rankings to the Coordinating Council. The Council should review the updated rankings and recommend adjustments in per site funding or location of services if necessary.

II. School-Linked Services: Anti-Poverty Services

The county currently allocates anti-poverty program funds as follows:

- 33% of total anti-poverty funding is allocated to culturally specific services which are countywide;
- 75% of the remaining funds are allocated to serve families in poverty with related children;
- 25% of the remaining funds are allocated to serve individuals in poverty;
- The percentage of families in poverty with related children and the percentage of all people in poverty is computed for each region based on 2000 census data;
- The percentage of families in poverty with related children for any given region is then multiplied by the total funds allocated to serve families in poverty to compute the allocation for the region. The same calculation is performed to arrive at the allocation of funds to serve individuals in poverty for each region.

RECOMMENDATION

The committee recommends that the county continue to use this formula to allocate anti-poverty funds, but that the data used to compute the percentage of families in poverty with

related children and the percentage of all people in poverty for each region be updated before the county contracts for these services in FY 2008/2009. The committee recommends that the county hire a qualified consultant to project poverty trends throughout the county based on the most recent available data on the number and percent of families with related children, and individuals in poverty in each region.

III. School-Linked Services: Social and Support Services for Educational Success

The county currently allocates funds for Social and Support Services for Educational Success (SSSES) as follows:

- Approximately 15% of available funds are allocated to regional providers (the “Regional Funds”) to provide services to 13-17 year olds at risk for academic failure. Each region receives the same allocation regardless of population.
- Approximately 85% of available funds are allocated to culturally specific services for children aged 6-18 who are at risk for academic failure (the “Culturally Specific Funds”) in the following cultural groups: African-Americans (19.7% of funds), African immigrants (8.11% of funds), Asian and Pacific Islanders (20% of funds), Latinos (28.7% of funds), Native Americans (13.9% of funds) and people of Slavic origins (9.59% of funds). Contractors for culturally specific services must provide services countywide.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The committee recommends that the county use the following formula to allocate Regional Funds:

1. Cease allocating an equal and flat amount of funds to each region and instead allocate funds based on the percentage of the target population living in a region.
 - a) Using the projection data developed in connection with the recommendation for allocation of anti-poverty funds, calculate the number of poor 10-18 year olds in the county, and in each region at a given point in time. Calculate the percentage of the entire population of poor 10-18 year olds that resides in each region.
 - b) Allocate funds for each region based on percentage of the total poor 10-18 year olds in that region.
 - c) If the funding level for a region falls below a reasonable “base amount” to provide services, consider contracting with fewer providers to offer services over a larger geographic area.
2. The committee considered, but could not agree, that the county should also take into account the percentage of the target population in the region that receives culturally specific services in allocating the regional funds. Committee members were divided on whether it would be worth the effort to gather and apply this data in the formula.

3. The committee recommends that the county gather or procure better and more accurate data on the portion of the county population that each cultural group makes up, and on the total number of members of each cultural group in the county.
4. In the context of committee discussion of allocation of resources for SSSES services, some members of the committee asked that the county reconsider its division of resources between the various components of the SUN System, as well as its division of resources between culturally specific services and mainstream services. A consensus was not reached on this point, but committee members advocated strongly on both sides of the issue.

IV. School-Linked Services: Parent Child Development Services

The county currently allocates funding for Parent Child Development Services as follows:

- One half of the funding goes to culturally specific services with six providers each receiving the same amount of funding to provide countywide services to the relevant cultural group (the “Culturally Specific Funds”).
- One half of the funding is divided equally between the six regions (the “Regional Funds”).

Recommendations

The committee recommends that the funds for Parent Child Development Services be allocated as follows:

1. Cease allocating an equal and flat amount of funds to each region and instead allocate funds based on the percentage of the target population living in a region.
 - a) Using the projection data developed in connection with the recommendation for allocation of anti-poverty funds, calculate the number of poor 0-5 year olds in the county, and in each region at a given point in time. Calculate the percentage of the entire population of poor 0-5 year olds that reside in each region.
 - b) Allocate funds to each region based on the percentage of the total poor 0-5 year olds in that region.
 - c) If the funding level for a region falls below a reasonable “base amount” to provide services, consider contracting with fewer providers to offer services over a larger geographic area.

SUN Service System Coordinating Council
Allocation Methodology Workgroup
Recommendations

Supplemental Documents

**SCP Poverty Index and Other Poverty Comparisons
Multnomah County Schools 2006-07 Data**

SUN CS in 07-08	Notes	SCHOOL	LEVEL	DISTRICT	TOT_STU 2006-2007	STU_FRL ode 2006-2007	PERC_FRL ode 2006-2007	FRL Index 2006-2007	FRL Index 2006-2007 Rank	FRL rank of inverse average	ELL rank of inverse average	ELL Quartile Rank	FRL Quartile Rank
1	21CCLC/M	Alder	ES	Reynolds	541	498	92.1	5.75	5	1	1	1	1
1		Rigler	ES	PPS	538	472	87.7	5.46	7	2	6	1	1
		Ron Russell	MS	David Douglas	784	627	80.0	5.86	4	3	14	1	1
1		King	ES	PPS	458	421	91.9	5.40	8	4	79	3	1
		Rosa Parks	ES	PPS	435	387	89.0	5.13	10	5	47	2	1
		Lincoln Park	ES	David Douglas	542	439	81.0	5.06	12	6	6	1	1
		Mill Park	ES	David Douglas	493	408	82.8	4.99	15	7	4	1	1
		Reynolds MS	MS	Reynolds	987	720	73.0	6.01	3	8	13	1	1
		Ventura Park	ES	David Douglas	481	387	80.5	4.80	22	9	20	1	1
1		Woodlawn	ES	PPS	450	372	82.7	4.82	20	9	71	2	1
		Gilbert Heights	ES	David Douglas	587	458	78.0	5.03	14	11	28	1	1
	Closed 07/08	Clarendon	ES	PPS	401	345	86.0	4.83	19	12	12	1	1
1	21CCLC/P	Vernon	ES	PPS	404	347	85.9	4.83	18	12	79	3	1
1	21CCLC/M	Marshall HS	HS	PPS	860	616	71.6	5.49	6	14	45	2	1
1		Lane MS	MS	PPS	527	411	78.0	4.82	21	15	50	2	1
1		James John	ES	PPS	459	368	80.2	4.71	24	16	20	1	1
		David Douglas HS	HS	David Douglas	2,825	1,911	67.7	11.14	1	16	25	1	1
1	21CCLC/M	Davis	ES	Reynolds	474	374	78.9	4.68	25	18	2	1	1
1		Roosevelt HS	HS	PPS	794	553	69.6	5.13	11	19	53	2	1
		Hartley	ES	Reynolds	439	351	80.0	4.62	29	20	8	1	1
1		HB Lee MS	MS	Reynolds	771	536	69.5	5.05	13	21	33	1	1
1	21CCLC/P	Clark	ES	PPS	508	389	76.6	4.66	27	22	11	1	1
		Floyd Light MS	MS	David Douglas	760	518	68.2	4.92	17	23	26	1	1
1		Binnsmead MS	MS	PPS	484	373	77.1	4.61	30	24	23	1	1
1	21CCLC/M	Glenfair	ES	Reynolds	491	374	76.2	4.58	32	25	3	1	1
1		George MS	MS	PPS	383	322	84.1	4.65	28	25	49	2	1
1		Jefferson HS	HS	PPS	566	410	72.4	4.59	31	27	84	3	1
1	21CCLC/P	Boise Eliot	ES	PPS	415	333	80.2	4.55	33	27	101	3	1
1		Madison HS	HS	PPS	936	624	66.7	5.33	9	29	57	2	1
1		Kelly	ES	PPS	439	345	78.6	4.54	35	30	30	1	1
		West Powellhurst	ES	David Douglas	470	361	76.8	4.54	34	30	35	1	1
		Scott	ES	PPS	440	345	78.4	4.53	36	32	55	2	1
1		Alice Ott MS	MS	David Douglas	713	482	67.6	4.73	23	33	32	1	1
1	CHIF	Whitman	ES	PPS	384	312	81.3	4.50	38	33	33	1	1
1		Woodmere	ES	PPS	422	333	78.9	4.50	37	35	10	1	1
		Benson	HS	PPS	1,294	665	51.4	4.93	16	36	126	4	1
1		Lent	ES	PPS	400	316	79.0	4.43	41	37	28	1	1
1		Shaver	ES	Parkrose	375	298	79.5	4.37	42	38	40	2	1

**SCP Poverty Index and Other Poverty Comparisons
Multnomah County Schools 2006-07 Data**

SUN CS in 07-08	Notes	SCHOOL	LEVEL	DISTRICT	TOT_STU 2006-2007	STU_FRL 2006-2007	PERC_FRL 2006-2007	FRL Index 2006-2007	FRL Index 2006-2007 Rank	FRL rank of inverse average	ELL rank of inverse average	ELL Quartile Rank	FRL Quartile Rank
		Parkrose MS	MS	Parkrose	815	488	59.9	4.46	40	39	30	1	2
1		Ockley Green MS	MS	PPS	442	333	75.3	4.36	43	39	88	3	2
		Salish Ponds	ES	Reynolds	510	351	68.8	4.19	46	41	16	1	2
		Reynolds HS	HS	Reynolds	2,837	1,246	43.9	7.24	2	41	41	2	2
		Humboldt	ES	PPS	240	226	95.8	4.67	26	41	92	3	2
		Cherry Park	ES	David Douglas	460	334	72.6	4.26	45	44	41	2	2
1		Gilbert Park	ES	David Douglas	626	393	62.8	4.15	50	45	36	1	2
		Franklin HS	HS	PPS	1,283	601	46.8	4.46	39	45	79	3	2
1		Centennial MS	MS	Centennial	1,006	495	49.2	4.08	55	47	51	2	2
1		Parkrose HS	HS	Parkrose	1,121	529	47.2	4.16	49	47	68	2	2
		Peninsula	ES	PPS	299	242	80.9	4.17	48	47	74	2	2
1		Earl Boyles	ES	David Douglas	451	324	71.8	4.19	47	50	66	2	2
1		Portsmouth MS	MS	PPS	286	232	81.1	4.13	52	50	73	2	2
1		Marysville	ES	PPS	368	279	75.8	4.14	51	52	41	2	2
		Menlo Park	ES	David Douglas	462	323	69.9	4.11	53	53	45	2	2
		Wilkes	ES	Reynolds	512	344	67.2	4.10	54	54	5	1	2
		Prescott	ES	Parkrose	380	276	72.6	4.00	59	55	36	1	2
1	21CCLC/M	Harold Oliver Primary	ES	Centennial	506	339	67.0	4.07	56	56	8	1	2
		Centennial HS	HS	Centennial	1,848	655	35.4	4.27	44	57	61	2	2
		Lee	ES	PPS	354	264	74.6	4.02	57	58	54	2	2
1		Sitton	ES	PPS	285	225	78.9	4.02	58	59	70	2	2
1		Lynch View	ES	Centennial	475	319	67.2	3.99	60	60	15	1	2
1		East Gresham	ES	Gresham-Barl	502	326	64.9	3.93	61	61	38	1	2
1		Faubion	ES	PPS	332	242	72.9	3.86	63	62	94	3	2
1		Harold Oliver Intermedia	ES	Centennial	402	273	67.9	3.81	66	63	52	2	2
1	21CCLC/M	Lynch Wood	ES	Centennial	597	338	56.6	3.66	69	63	58	2	2
1		Arlita	ES	PPS	370	260	70.3	3.84	64	65	69	2	2
		Scott	ES	Reynolds	193	331	58.3	3.70	68	66	23	1	2
1		Gregory Heights MS	MS	PPS	471	303	64.3	3.80	67	67	64	2	2
	Closed 07/	Tubman MS	MS	PPS	131	114	87.0	3.83	65	68	85	3	2
		Gresham HS	HS	Gresham-Barl	1,784	495	27.8	3.26	78	69	74	2	2
		Centennial Learning	MS	Centennial	78	73	93.6	3.90	62	70	145	4	2
		Beach	ES	PPS	412	264	64.1	3.62	70	71	44	2	2
1		Hall	ES	Gresham-Barl	481	273	56.8	3.38	76	72	65	2	2
		Vestal	ES	PPS	343	232	67.6	3.61	71	73	78	3	2
		Lynch Meadows	ES	Centennial	522	271	51.9	3.18	79	74	27	1	2
		Woodland	ES	Reynolds	545	274	50.3	3.13	80	75	18	1	2
		Sacramento	ES	Parkrose	405	252	62.2	3.49	74	75	72	2	2

**SCP Poverty Index and Other Poverty Comparisons
Multnomah County Schools 2006-07 Data**

SUN CS in 07-08	Notes	SCHOOL	LEVEL	DISTRICT	TOT_STU 2006-2007	STU FRL 2006-2007	PERC_FRL 2006-2007	FRL Index 2006-2007	FRL Index 2006-2007 Rank	FRL rank of inverse average	ELL rank of inverse average	ELL Quartile Rank	FRL Quartile Rank
		Fairview	ES	Reynolds	407	249	61.2	3.44	75	77	22	1	3
		Creston Elementary	ES	PPS	309	211	68.3	3.54	73	77	77	3	3
1		Grout	ES	PPS	333	223	67.0	3.55	72	79	48	2	3
		Barlow HS	HS	Gresham-Barlow	1,891	425	22.5	2.74	85	80	17	1	3
		Grant HS	HS	PPS	1,691	392	23.2	2.62	92	81	125	4	3
		Kellogg MS	MS	PPS	269	181	67.3	3.37	77	82	82	3	3
		Bridger	ES	PPS	421	227	53.9	3.06	81	83	91	3	3
		Highland	ES	Gresham-Barlow	570	259	45.4	2.88	83	84	39	2	3
		G Russell MS	MS	Gresham-Barlow	774	290	37.5	2.71	87	85	76	2	3
		Cleveland HS	HS	PPS	1,472	349	23.7	2.44	100	85	99	3	3
1		Sabin	ES	PPS	432	219	50.7	2.90	82	87	104	3	3
1		Dexter MS	MS	Gresham-Barlow	657	263	40.0	2.69	90	88	95	3	3
1		Clear Creek MS	MS	Gresham-Barlow	710	267	37.6	2.61	93	89	59	2	3
		North Gresham	ES	Gresham-Barlow	533	233	43.7	2.69	89	90	66	2	3
		Walt Morey MS	MS	Reynolds	736	269	36.5	2.58	97	90	102	3	3
		Atkinson	ES	PPS	549	234	42.6	2.66	91	92	19	1	3
		Russell Academy	ES	Parkrose	434	212	48.9	2.80	84	93	59	2	3
		Chief Joseph	ES	PPS	359	182	50.7	2.74	86	94	103	3	3
1		Beaumont MS	MS	PPS	500	217	43.4	2.61	94	95	122	4	3
1		Markham	ES	PPS	359	180	50.1	2.70	88	96	63	2	3
		Hosford MS	MS	PPS	476	209	43.9	2.59	95	96	87	3	3
		Hogan Cedars Elementary	ES	Gresham-Barlow	545	219	40.2	2.50	99	98	82	3	3
		Troutdale	ES	Reynolds	494	214	43.3	2.59	96	98	89	3	3
		Astor	ES	PPS	331	162	48.9	2.58	98	100	111	3	3
		Irvington	ES	PPS	473	193	40.8	2.40	101	101	130	4	3
		Butler Creek	ES	Centennial	532	201	38.0	2.33	102	102	55	2	3
		Powell Valley	ES	Gresham-Barlow	523	198	37.9	2.31	103	103	85	3	3
		Kelly Creek	ES	Gresham-Barlow	517	181	35.0	2.13	104	104	93	3	3
		Hollydale	ES	Gresham-Barlow	474	165	34.8	2.05	105	105	97	3	3
		Pleasant Valley	ES	Centennial	516	164	31.8	1.93	107	106	62	2	3
		Rose City Park	ES	PPS	406	134	33.0	1.84	108	107	89	3	3
		Lewis	ES	PPS	293	113	38.6	1.96	106	107	108	3	3
		Wilson HS	HS	PPS	1,556	239	15.4	1.63	114	109	107	3	3
		Sweet Briar	ES	Reynolds	477	136	28.5	1.67	111	110	106	3	3
		West Gresham	ES	Gresham-Barlow	357	114	31.9	1.71	109	111	97	3	3
		Da Vinci	MS	PPS	444	129	29.1	1.66	112	111	147	4	3
		Chapman	ES	PPS	478	132	27.6	1.62	116	113	105	3	3
1	PPR only	Mt Tabor MS	MS	PPS	633	155	24.5	1.60	117	113	117	4	3
1	CHIF	Sellwood MS	MS	PPS	515	131	25.4	1.53	119	115	115	3	3

**SCP Poverty Index and Other Poverty Comparisons
Multnomah County Schools 2006-07 Data**

SUN CS in 07-08	Notes	SCHOOL	LEVEL	DISTRICT	TOT_STU 2006-2007	STU_FRL 2006-2007	PERC_FRL 2006-2007	FRL Index 2006-2007	FRL Index 2006-2007 Rank	FRL rank of inverse average	ELL rank of inverse average	ELL Quartile Rank	FRL Quartile Rank
		Capitol Hill	ES	PPS	341	106	31.1	1.64	113	116	96	3	4
		Hayhurst	ES	PPS	345	106	30.7	1.62	115	117	100	3	4
		Woodstock	ES	PPS	384	108	28.1	1.53	118	118	116	4	4
		Corbett HS	HS	Corbett	140	54	38.6	1.69	110	118	148	4	4
1		Buckman	ES	PPS	506	119	23.5	1.40	120	120	128	4	4
		Glencoe	ES	PPS	498	117	23.5	1.39	122	121	114	3	4
1		Robert Gray MS	MS	PPS	457	109	23.9	1.37	123	122	122	4	4
		Sunnyside	ES	PPS	501	115	23.0	1.37	124	123	127	4	4
		Llewellyn	ES	PPS	309	81	26.2	1.34	125	124	132	4	4
1	CHIF	Jackson MS	MS	PPS	688	123	17.9	1.21	130	125	113	3	4
		Corbett ES	ES	Corbett	314	80	25.5	1.31	126	126	148	4	4
1	CHIF	Fernwood MS	MS	PPS	347	83	23.9	1.26	127	127	135	4	4
		Springwater Trail High S	HS	Gresham-Barl	163	51	31.3	1.40	121	128	131	4	4
		Lincoln HS	HS	PPS	1,498	143	9.5	0.97	131	128	137	4	4
1	PPR only	Met Learning Center	K-12	PPS	439	97	22.1	1.25	128	130	146	4	4
		East Orient	ES	Gresham-Barl	444	97	21.9	1.24	129	131	119	4	4
		Deep Creek	ES	Gresham-Barl	322	61	18.9	0.97	132	132	108	3	4
		West Orient MS	MS	Gresham-Barl	423	71	16.8	0.93	133	133	112	3	4
		Maplewood	ES	PPS	307	56	18.2	0.92	134	134	119	4	4
		Winterhaven	K-8	PPS	344	54	15.7	0.81	135	135	140	4	4
		Duniway	ES	PPS	446	61	13.7	0.77	137	135	143	4	4
		Laurelhurst	ES	PPS	561	66	11.8	0.71	141	137	118	4	4
		Damascus	MS	Gresham-Barl	356	54	15.2	0.79	136	138	121	4	4
		West Sylvan MS	MS	PPS	896	72	8.0	0.59	143	138	128	4	4
		Bridlemile	ES	PPS	458	60	13.1	0.74	139	140	108	3	4
		Skyline	ES	PPS	233	38	16.3	0.76	138	140	133	4	4
		Abernethy	ES	PPS	357	85	23.8	0.37	145	140	136	4	4
		Alameda	ES	PPS	678	61	9.0	0.58	144	140	139	4	4
		Richmond	ES	PPS	360	50	13.9	0.72	140	144	124	4	4
		Corbett MS	MS	Corbett	177	25	14.1	0.62	142	145	148	4	4
		Rieke	ES	PPS	280	17	6.1	0.27	146	146	138	4	4
		Stephenson	ES	PPS	310	17	5.5	0.25	147	147	134	4	4
		Ainsworth	ES	PPS	509	22	4.3	0.23	148	148	144	4	4
		Hollyrood	ES	PPS	210	11	5.2	0.21	149	149	148	4	4
		Forest Park	ES	PPS	508	3	0.6	0.00	152	149	149	4	4
		Riverdale ES	ES	Riverdale	322	6	1.9	0.06	151	150	148	4	4
		Riverdale HS	HS	Riverdale	221	5	2.3	0.07	150	150	153	4	4
		Reynolds Learning Acad	HS	Reynolds	172						141	4	4
A number of PPS schools are transitioning to a K-8 structure, The "level" does not reflect the new structure.													

High School Catchment Areas
Existing SUN Community School Sites (FY 2007/2008)

Barlow

Hall (2)*

Centennial

Centennial MS (2)
Harold Oliver Primary(2)
Lynch View (2)
Harold Oliver Intermed (2)
Lynch Wood (2)

Cleveland

Grout (3)
Sellwood (3)
Buckman (4)

David Douglas

Alice Ott MS (1)
Gilbert Park (2)
Earl Boyles (2)

Franklin

Arleta (2)
Mt. Tabor MS (3)

Grant

Sabin (3)
Beaumont MS (3)
Fernwood MS (4)

Gresham

E. Gresham (2)
Dexter MS (3)
Clear Creek (3)

Jefferson

King (1)
Woodlawn (1)
Vernon (1)
Boise Eliot (1)
Jefferson HS (1)
Ockley Green MS (2)
Faubion (2)

Lincoln

MLC (4)

Madison

Rigler (1)
Binnsmead (1)
Madison HS (1)
Gregory Heights (2)

Marshall

Marshall HS (1)
Lane MS (1)
Clark (1)
Kelly (1)
Whitman (1)
Woodmere (1)
Lent (1)
Marysville (1)

Parkrose

Shaver (1)
Parkrose HS (2)

Reynolds

Alder (1)
Davis (1)
HB Lee MS (1)
Glenfair (1)

Roosevelt

James John (1)
Roosevelt HS (1)
George MS (1)
Portsmouth MS (2)
Sitton (2)

Wilson

Markham (3)
Robert Gray (4)
Jackson MS (4)

* Numbers in parenthesis refer to the quartile of the poverty index which the school falls into. The poverty index ranks school sites by poverty using a formula that includes the percentage of children participating in the federal free and reduced price lunch program in 2007 and the number children participating in the program. Schools in the top quartile (1) of the index are the highest poverty; schools in the bottom quartile (4) are the lowest poverty. Each list of schools in the catchment areas listed above are in descending order with the highest poverty schools at the top of the list and the lowest poverty schools at the bottom.