# Future Ready SLPS: School Portfolio Preview

**Dr. Myra Berry, Superintendent**

**June 29, 2026**

**To:** Future Ready SLPS Preview Group
**From:** Dr. Myra Berry, Superintendent
**Date:** June 29, 2026
**Subject:** Draft: Future Ready SLPS Portfolio Planning Models
**Document Status:** For Continued Review and Group Discussion

---

This draft is provided to support continued review and discussion of future school portfolio planning for Saint Louis Public Schools. It outlines preliminary models for organizing schools, programs, facilities, and feeder patterns in alignment with student access, academic pathways, enrollment, facility conditions, and long-term sustainability. **The models are for discussion purposes only and do not represent a final recommendation.**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This document presents three preliminary school portfolio planning models for Saint Louis Public Schools: **Traditional**, **Hybrid**, and **PK–8 Portfolio**. Each model is intended to help the district examine how school configurations, feeder patterns, specialized programs, facility conditions, transportation needs, and enrollment trends may be organized to support long-term sustainability.

**The models are not final recommendations.** They are planning options designed to support further review, focus group discussion, and additional analysis. Additional financial modeling, transportation analysis, staffing review, academic impact review, and community engagement will be needed before implementation decisions are brought forward.

Key themes across the models include:

- Aligning school configurations to current and projected enrollment.
- Preserving access to specialized academic pathways and districtwide programs.
- Improving clarity in feeder patterns and school transitions.
- Evaluating facility conditions, utilization, and long-term capital needs.
- Considering transportation, staffing, and operational impacts.
- Identifying potential alternative uses for buildings that may no longer house traditional schools.

## DISTRICT CONTEXT AND THE CASE FOR CHANGE

Saint Louis Public Schools is reviewing its school portfolio because the needs of students, families, neighborhoods, and the district have changed over time. Enrollment patterns, facility conditions, transportation demands, academic pathways, and operating costs all affect the district's ability to provide high-quality learning environments across all school communities.

Enrollment trends are a central factor in this work. **Historical PK–12 enrollment data show that Saint Louis Public Schools' enrollment declined from 43,284 students in 1991 to 17,981 students in 2025, a decrease of 25,303 students, or approximately 58.5%.** The most recent 2026–2027 enrollment projections show an estimated enrollment of 16,723 students, compared to 17,841 students at the end of the 2024–2025 school year, representing a decrease of 1,118 students, or approximately 6.3%, over two school years.

In addition to district enrollment trends, portfolio planning should consider the broader school-age population living in St. Louis City. U.S. Census Bureau QuickFacts estimates that 17.8% of St. Louis city residents are under age 18, with 5.4% under age 5. Based on the 2024 population estimate, this suggests approximately 34,700 residents ages 5–17. These data provide additional context for understanding district enrollment, neighborhood demand, school access, and long-term portfolio planning.

This work is not simply about closing or consolidating schools. It is about creating a stronger system of well-resourced schools where students have access to high-quality academic programming, safe learning environments, enrichment opportunities, and sustainable facilities. Portfolio planning allows the district to intentionally examine every school, program, building, and investment to determine how resources can be aligned to student success, neighborhood access, and operational sustainability.

A long-term portfolio strategy also allows the district to move away from year-to-year program and financial decision-making and toward a more intentional roadmap for the future, including periodic strategic reviews of the district portfolio.

Key areas informing this work include (see Appendix A for Links):

- Current and projected enrollment.
- School capacity and building utilization.
- Facility condition and deferred maintenance needs.
- Transportation requirements and geographic access.
- Neighborhood feeder patterns and student assignment.
- Academic pathways and specialized programming.
- Staffing and operational efficiency.
- Future capital planning and potential bond investments.

## GUIDING QUESTION

**How should Saint Louis Public Schools organize schools, programs, facilities, and feeder patterns to provide high-quality learning environments while maintaining long-term operational and financial sustainability?**

## PORTFOLIO PLANNING PRINCIPLES

**1. Create High-Efficiency Anchor Sites**
Schools with strong utilization, facility viability, enrollment stability, and strategic location should be prioritized for retention.

**2. Protect Districtwide Academic Pathways**
Specialized pathways such as Visual and Performing Arts, Career and Technical Education, Advanced Academics and other signature programs should be protected and clearly aligned across grade spans.

**3. Maintain Neighborhood Access Where Feasible**
Portfolio models should preserve reasonable geographic access to schools while recognizing enrollment, facilities, and transportation realities.

**4. Strengthen Feeder Pattern Clarity**
Students and families should have clearer pathways from elementary to middle to high school, especially neighborhood schools and specialized programs.

**5. Improve Long-Term Facility Sustainability**
Facility conditions, deferred maintenance, future bond planning, and redevelopment opportunities should inform decisions.

**6. Reduce Operational and Financial Inefficiencies**
Models should consider transportation, staffing, building utilization, and the cost of operating under-enrolled or high-cost facilities.

## DATA AND DECISION-MAKING FRAMEWORK

The preliminary portfolio planning models were developed using multiple data points, planning assumptions, and operational considerations. These inputs are intended to support early analysis, compare potential models, and identify areas where additional review is needed before any final recommendation is developed.

**The framework is organized around five core planning questions:**

1. **Community Impact:** How does the model reflect community needs, neighborhood context, and potential impacts on students, families, staff, and surrounding communities?
2. **Enrollment and Utilization:** Are schools appropriately sized based on current and projected enrollment, building capacity, and utilization?
3. **Facility Sustainability:** Do facility conditions, deferred maintenance needs, and capital planning assumptions support long-term investment in the site?

4. **Instructional Capacity and Student Experience:** How well does this model strengthen the district's ability to provide high-quality instruction, certified staffing, consistent core programming, enrichment opportunities, and a full student experience in every school?
5. **Operational Feasibility:** What are the transportation, staffing, cost, and implementation considerations associated with the model?

## ACADEMIC AND INSTRUCTIONAL CAPACITY

In addition to facilities and operations, the portfolio planning process should consider how school configurations affect the district's ability to provide strong academic programming in every school. A more sustainable portfolio should help SLPS better align staffing, programming, and resources so students have access to high-quality instruction and enriching learning opportunities.

**Academic and instructional considerations include:**

- Supporting the goal of placing a certified teacher in every classroom.
- Improving the district's ability to offer consistent core academic programming across schools.
- Expanding access to enhanced programming such as STEM, robotics, related arts, enrichment, and other student-centered learning opportunities.
- Strengthening middle grades programming, particularly in models that include PK–8 configurations.
- Aligning academic programs, staffing models, and facility use so schools are better positioned to provide a full and sustainable student experience.
- Under each of the portfolio models below, every school would have at minimum four (4) full-time related arts teachers, an Academic Coach, and an Assistant Principal. Exceptions would include alternative school sites and special education schools.

## SPECIALIZED PROGRAMMING AND DISTRICTWIDE PATHWAYS

The models also consider how districtwide and specialized programs may be preserved, aligned, or strengthened across grade spans. These programs are an important part of the district's academic portfolio and should be reviewed for enrollment demand, facility needs, transportation requirements, staffing capacity, and long-term sustainability.

**Specialized programming considerations include:**

- **Visual and Performing Arts:** Shaw VPA → Carr Lane VPA → Central VPA and related arts pathway planning
- **Advanced Academics:** Betty Wheeler, Mallinckrodt, McKinley Middle School (no new 9th grade enrollees 27-28), Collegiate School of Medicine and Bioscience, Metro High School, Central Visual and Performing Arts and Advanced Academics
- **Early Childhood:** Stix, Wilkinson (additional early childhood planning considerations)
- **Career and Technical Education:** Clyde C. Miller Career Academy (no new 9th grade enrollees 27-28) and Gateway (hybrid)
- **Virtual Learning:** Districtwide full-time virtual programming serving students across K-12, hybrid virtual learning options (i.e. advanced credit, original credit or credit recovery)
- **Special Education:** Public separate schools and other specialized services based on specific student needs
- **PEGS:** Future planning for PEGS programming, including 2028–2029 planning considerations at McKinley

## STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES

Portfolio planning should also consider how school configurations affect the district's ability to provide consistent student support services across all schools. A more sustainable school portfolio can support stronger service delivery by helping ensure schools have access to the staff, space, and systems needed to meet student and family needs.

**Student support considerations include:**

- Strengthening access to wraparound services that support students' academic, social, emotional, and basic needs.
- Supporting more manageable school portfolios so central office and school-based support teams can serve schools more effectively.
- Ensuring schools have access to key student support roles, including Family Support Specialists, nurses, social workers, counselors, mental health professionals, and related service providers.
- Improving the district's ability to coordinate services across schools, programs, and community partners.
- Supporting safer, more responsive school environments through more consistent staffing, service delivery, and family engagement structures.
- Under each of the portfolio models below, every school would have at minimum a full-time Social Worker, Counselor, Nurse, and a behavior support position. Exceptions would include alternative school sites and special education schools.

## TRANSPORTATION CONSIDERATIONS

Transportation assumptions are a major factor in evaluating any future portfolio model. Changes to school configurations, feeder patterns, grade spans, or specialized program locations may affect route feasibility, travel time, cost, student access, and implementation timelines. Additional transportation modeling will be needed before any final recommendation is developed.

**Transportation planning considerations include:**

- Reviewing route feasibility, travel time, and cost implications for each preliminary model.
- Evaluating how feeder pattern changes may affect neighborhood access and student transportation needs.
- Ensuring transportation assumptions are aligned to district policy, student eligibility, safety considerations, and specialized program access.
- Considering the transportation impact of protected specialized pathways, including magnet/specialized programs, Career and Technical Education, special education, and other districtwide programs.
- Reviewing how school choice within the neighborhood school portfolio may affect transportation expectations, building capacity, and program availability.

**Current access assumptions include:**

- Transportation is generally provided for students attending their neighborhood school when they live outside the applicable walk boundary or when safety conditions require transportation.
- Transportation for specialized program pathways is generally based on distance and eligibility requirements.
- Transportation is provided for eligible Career and Technical Education programming.
- Students may enroll at a neighborhood school outside of their neighborhood attendance zone if the family provides transportation; space is available at the receiving school, and the receiving school can meet the student's programming needs.

## PRELIMINARY PLANNING PORTFOLIO MODELS

The following three preliminary portfolio planning models are provided for review and discussion. Each model represents a different approach to organizing schools, grade configurations, feeder patterns, specialized programs, and districtwide support sites. The models are intended to help SLPS compare potential pathways for improving long-term sustainability while maintaining student access to high-quality learning environments.

The models should not be interpreted as final recommendations. They are planning scenarios designed to support continued analysis of enrollment, utilization, facility conditions, financial stability, transportation, academic programming, staffing, community impact, and implementation feasibility.

**Portfolio Models Overview**

| Model | Core Structure | Estimated # of Schools | Primary Planning Considerations | Estimated # of Bus Routes | *Estimated Certified Teaching Positions |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Current Portfolio** | PK-5 elementary, PK-8 schools, 6-8 middle, 9-12 high, with selected specialized pathways | 62 | | 226 | 1575 |
| **Model A:** Traditional District Portfolio | PK–5 elementary, 6–8 middle, 9–12 high school, with selected specialized pathways | 42-47 | Maintains more of the current elementary, middle, and high school structure while identifying opportunities to improve efficiency. | 210 | 1484 |
| **Model B:** PK–8 Hybrid District Portfolio | Selected PK–8 schools, selected PK–5 elementary schools, remaining 6–8 middle schools, and 9–12 high schools, with selected specialized pathways | 43-46 | Creates a phased approach by introducing selected PK–8 pathways while preserving parts of the traditional feeder structure. | 190 | 1483 |
| **Model C:** PK–8 Portfolio | Broader PK–8 school structure, fewer separate middle school configurations, and 9–12 high schools, with selected specialized pathways | 40-42 | Examines a broader PK–8 model designed to increase grade-span continuity and reduce the overall number of schools. | 150 | 1481 |

*Any reduction in the number of certified teaching positions would not impact certified teachers in the district. Reductions in positions would be represented by positions which are either currently vacant or filled by long-term substitute teachers.

## MODEL A: TRADITIONAL SCHOOL/DISTRICT PORTFOLIO

**Estimated Number of Schools:** 42-47 (includes neighborhood, specialized pathways, and future planning)

### Model Overview

Model A maintains the district's most traditional grade-span structure, with PK–5 elementary schools, 6–8 middle schools, and 9–12 high schools. This model preserves more of the current feeder pattern structure while identifying opportunities to improve efficiency, clarify pathways, and align school capacity with enrollment.

Model A represents the lowest-disruption option among the three preliminary portfolio planning models. It limits the number of schools requiring full grade-span reconfiguration and maintains more existing school identities, neighborhood feeder relationships, and traditional elementary-to-middle-to-high school transitions.

**Core Configuration:** PK–5 elementary schools, 6–8 middle schools, and 9–12 high schools, with selected specialized pathways and districtwide support sites.

### Key Features

- Maintains more separate elementary and middle school configurations.
- Limits the number of schools requiring grade-span reconfiguration.
- Maintains specialized programming and districtwide support sites.
- Provides the clearest comparison to the district's current school portfolio.

### Planning Considerations

- Represents the lowest-disruption model for families, staff, and school communities.
- Preserves more existing school identities and feeder patterns.
- May require fewer immediate facility conversions.
- Maintains more buildings and may leave some underutilization unresolved.
- May require continued transportation complexity.
- Requires additional analysis of capacity, utilization, staffing, facility condition, and projected enrollment before any implementation decision is made.

**Model A – Traditional Portfolio: Neighborhood Feeder Pathways**

| Elementary Schools (PK-5) | Middle Schools (6-8) | High School (9-12) |
|---|---|---|
| Gateway<br>Pamoja<br>Dunbar (2028) | Gateway Middle | Vashon |
| Herzog<br>Hickey/Lexington<br>Nance<br>Turner Branch (2030)<br>Walnut Park (2030) | Yeatman Middle<br>Turner Middle (2030) | Sumner |
| Dewey<br>Washington<br>Mitchell (2027, rebuild by 2030) | Compton Drew Middle | Soldan |
| Buder<br>Mason | Busch | Gateway |
| Mann | Long Middle | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Mullanphy<br>Oak Hill | | |
| Woerner<br>Woodward | Long Middle | Roosevelt |
| Froebel<br>Hodgen<br>Sigel | Carnahan Middle | |

## MODEL B: PK–8 HYBRID DISTRICT PORTFOLIO

**Estimated Number of Schools:** 43-46 (includes neighborhood, specialized pathways, and future planning)

**Model Overview**

Model B introduces a hybrid portfolio structure by converting selected schools to PK–8 while maintaining some PK–5 elementary schools, 6–8 middle schools, and 9–12 high schools. This model creates a phased approach between the traditional district structure and a broader PK–8 model.

Model B represents a moderate-change option. It may improve continuity for students and families in selected feeder clusters while preserving parts of the current elementary-to-middle-to-high school structure. Because school configurations would vary by area, this model would require clear communication, careful implementation planning, and additional review of transportation, staffing, capacity, and PK-8 programming.

**Core Configuration:** Selected PK–8 schools, selected PK–5 elementary schools, remaining 6–8 middle school structures, and 9–12 high schools.

**Key Features**

- Converts selected schools to PK–8 while maintaining some traditional feeder structures.
- Reduces the total number of schools compared to Model A.
- Creates a phased approach between the current structure and a broader PK–8 model.
- Maintains specialized programming and districtwide support sites.
- Allows the district to test PK–8 continuity in selected areas without moving fully to a districtwide PK–8 structure.

**Planning Considerations**

- Provides a moderate-disruption model with potential for phased implementation.
- May improve continuity for students and families in selected feeder clusters.
- Could reduce some operational inefficiencies while preserving parts of the current structure.
- May be more difficult to explain because school configurations would vary by area.
- Requires careful analysis of staffing, transportation, capacity, utilization, and middle grades programming.
- Requires additional review of projected enrollment by grade level to determine whether each proposed PK–8 site can support the full grade span.

**Model B - PK–8 Hybrid: Neighborhood Feeder Pathways**

| Elementary Schools (PK-5) | Middle Schools (6-8) | High School (9-12) |
|---|---|---|
| Dunbar PK-5/PK-8 (2028) | Pamoja Middle | Vashon |
| Gateway Complex PK-8 | | |
| Hickey/Lexington<br>Herzog<br>Nance<br>Walnut Park (2030) | Yeatman Middle | Sumner |
| Turner Branch PK-8 (2030) | | |
| Dewey<br>Washington | Compton Drew Middle | Soldan |
| Mitchell PK-8 | | |
| Mason<br>Buder | Busch Middle | Gateway |
| Mann<br>Mullanphy<br>Oak Hill | Long Middle | |
| Sigel PK-8 | | |
| Woerner<br>Woodward | Carnahan Middle | Roosevelt |
| Hodgen | Long Middle | |
| Froebel PK-8 | | |

## MODEL C: PK–8 PORTFOLIO

**Estimated Number of Schools:** 40-42 (includes neighborhood, specialized pathways, and future planning)

**Model Overview**
Model C represents the broadest shift toward a PK–8 portfolio, converting neighborhood elementary and middle school pathways into PK–8 configurations while maintaining 9–12 high schools. This model may create clearer continuity for students and families from early grades through 8th grade and reduce the total number of schools, but it would require the most extensive planning for academics, staffing, facilities, transportation, community engagement, and implementation.

**Core Configuration:** Broader PK–8 school structure, fewer separate middle school configurations, and 9–12 high schools.

**Key Features**
- Converts neighborhood elementary and middle school pathways to PK–8 configurations.
- Reduces the total number of schools compared to Models A and B.
- Creates longer grade-span continuity for students and families.
- Reduces reliance on separate middle school structures.
- Maintains specialized programming and districtwide support sites, unless otherwise noted.

**Planning Considerations**

- Represents the highest-disruption model and would require the most extensive transition planning.
- May create clearer school continuity from early grades through 8th grade.
- Could improve facility utilization and long-term operational efficiency.
- Requires significant academic, staffing, facility, and transportation planning.
- Requires careful review of PK–8 programming, including middle grades coursework, electives, related arts, extracurricular access, student supports, and staffing models.
- Requires additional review of projected enrollment by grade level to determine whether each proposed PK–8 site can support the full grade span.

**Model C - PK–8 Portfolio: Neighborhood Feeder Pathways**

| PK-8 | | High School |
|---|---|---|
| Gateway<br>Pamoja | Dunbar (2028) | Vashon |
| Herzog<br>Hickey/Lexington | Nance<br>Yeatman | Sumner |
| Compton Drew<br>Dewey<br>Washington | Mitchell (2027) rebuild by 2030 | Soldan |
| Carnahan<br>Froebel<br>Hodgen | L'Ouverture<br>Woodward<br>Woerner | Roosevelt |
| Mason<br>Sigel<br>Mullanphy | Long<br>Busch<br>Oak Hill | Gateway |

## SPECIALIZED PROGRAMMING PATHWAYS AND DISTRICTWIDE PROGRAMS

Across all preliminary portfolio planning models, specialized academic pathways and districtwide programs will provide students with access to advanced coursework, arts programming, career and technical education, early childhood services, special education services, virtual learning, and other targeted supports. These programs will be reviewed for alignment across grade spans, facility needs, enrollment demand, transportation requirements, and long-term sustainability.

**Specialized Programming Pathways**

| Pathway | Elementary School(s) | Middle School(s) | High School Options |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Advanced Academics** | Betty Wheeler (Gifted)<br>Mallinckrodt (Gifted) | McKinley Middle School (Gifted) | Collegiate SMB<br>Metro, Central VPA* |
| **Visual & Performing Arts (VPA)** | Shaw VPA | Carr Lane VPA | Central VPA |

**Districtwide Specialized Programming: Early Childhood, SPED, CTE**

| Site | Grade Span | Function | Feeder Method |
|---|---|---|---|
| Stix | P3 – 2nd | Early Childhood Center | Zip code, Choice |
| Wilkinson | P3 – 2nd | Early Childhood Center | Zip code, Choice |
| Des Peres (2028) | P3 - 2nd | Early Childhood Center | Zip code, choice |
| Gateway Michael | KG – 8th | SPED - Public Separate | IEP dependent |
| Madison | KG – 8th | SPED - Public Separate | IEP dependent |
| Nottingham CJA | 9th – 12th | SPED - Public Separate | IEP dependent |
| Clyde C. Miller | 11th – 12th | CTE Center | n/a |
| Gateway High School | 11th – 12th | Hybrid CTE Center | n/a |
| Peabody | Birth - 3 yr | Childcare for Staff Families | n/a |
| PEGS (28-29) | KG-12 | Exceptionally Gifted 99$^{th}$ Percentile | PEGS |

**Note:** Grade spans, access methods, and program locations should be reviewed as part of the next phase of analysis, particularly where early childhood, special education, CTE, or specialized academic pathways may be affected by facility or feeder pattern changes.

## DEVELOPMENT AND ALTERNATIVE USE OPPORTUNITIES

As SLPS reviews future portfolio planning models, some buildings may require further evaluation for reuse, redevelopment, or disposition. This section identifies opportunities for facilities that may no longer be needed for traditional school use or may be better aligned to another district or community purpose.

Alternative use planning should be guided by the district's long-term academic, operational, facility, and financial priorities. Potential uses may include early childhood expansion, staff or community housing, community hubs, health clinics or wraparound services, administrative or office use, public-private partnerships, future bond planning, or potential sale/redevelopment.

These concepts are preliminary and do not represent final property decisions. Any future recommendation regarding facility reuse, redevelopment, sale, or partnership would require additional analysis, community input, legal review, financial review, and Board consideration. The District will provide a recommendation to the Board regarding putting out an RFQ for future uses/redevelopments of buildings.

**Potential Alternative Use Categories**

- Housing / Teacher Housing
- Community Hub or Community-Based Facility
- Health Clinic / Wraparound Services
- Office or Administrative Use
- Early Childhood / Birth-to-Three Programming
- Public-Private Partnership
- Potential Sale or Redevelopment
- Future Bond or Capital Planning Priority

## PRELIMINARY REUSE AND REDEVELOPMENT CONCEPTS

| Site | Potential Use Category | Preliminary Notes/Planning Considerations |
|---|---|---|
| Shenandoah | Housing / Teacher Housing | Potential teacher and community housing |
| Columbia | Housing / Student Support | Potential support site for students in transition |
| Monroe | Housing / Redevelopment | Potential apartment housing |
| Humboldt | Housing / Redevelopment | Potential apartment housing |
| Adams | Teacher Housing | Potential teacher housing |
| Hamilton | Teacher Housing | Potential teacher housing |
| Lyon@ Blow | Community Hub | Potential community-serving facility |
| Bryan Hill | Community Hub | Potential community-serving facility |
| Walbridge | Community Hub | Potential community-serving facility |
| Ashland | Community Hub/Student Support | Potential community-serving facility; facility condition should be reviewed in light of storm impact, Potential support site for students in transition |
| Henry | Community Hub / Housing | Potential community-serving facility or housing opportunity |
| Jefferson | Community Hub | Potential community-serving facility |
| Beaumont | Community Hub / Cultural Use | Potential museum or community-serving use |
| AESM@ L'Ouverture | Partnership / Community Use | Potential partnership opportunity; possible interest noted for further review |
| Laclede | Potential health clinic or wraparound services site | Potential health clinic or wraparound services site |
| Ames | Potential health clinic or wraparound services site | Potential health clinic or wraparound services site |

## FUTURE CAPITAL PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT CONCEPTS

| Site | Preliminary Planning Concept | Potential Funding /Planning Consideration |
|---|---|---|
| Mitchell | New build; house students during construction | Bond planning |
| Walnut Park | Full rehabilitation | Public-private partnership |
| Northwest | Full rehabilitation for community hub / skilled labor training | Public-private partnership |
| Pruitt | Potential office or professional development space | Teacher training facility |
| Dunbar | Reopen | GOB / Bond planning |
| Carver | Potential expansion of Clyde C. Miller or alternative education site | Program expansion |
| Adult Education | Consider potential sale | Disposition review |
| Stevens | Maintain as extra school facility for emergency relocation | District use |
| Wyman | Virtual learning and selected special education services | Districtwide program use |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Des Peres | Potential redevelopment into early childhood / PIIP | GOB / Bond planning |
| Gallaudet | Maintain as extra school facility for emergency relocation | District use |
| ESOL Office | Utilize for ESOL office space, ESOL Family Center, and Adult Education | District administrative use |
| Turner Middle | Full rehabilitation, (cradle to career campus model) | Public-private partnership |
| Turner Branch | Full rehabilitation, (cradle to career campus model) | Public-private partnership |
| Soldan | Reopening as neighborhood high school (Jan 2027) | GOB/Insurance funds |
| Sumner | Reopening as neighborhood high school (Jan 2027) | GOB/Insurance funds |
| Peabody | Birth-through-three childcare with sliding scale | Staff/family support model |
| Blewett | Potential early childhood site | Potential partnership |
| Stix | Early childhood planning | Review PreK–2 vs. PreK–KG configuration |
| Wilkinson | Early childhood planning | Review PreK–2 vs. PreK–KG configuration |

## APPENDICES

### APPENDIX A: DATA SOURCES AND PLANNING INPUTS

- Historical PK–12 Enrollment Data, 1991–2025
- Current Enrollment Comparisons and 2026–2027 Projection
- Zip Code Analysis
- Demographic and Facility Condition Dashboard
- SLPS Demographic and School Proximity Planning Tool
- Blueprint 2023
- Bond / Capital Planning Assumptions

### APPENDIX B: SCHOOL-BY-SCHOOL PLANNING MATRIX

| School | Current Grade Span | Current Function | Model A Status | Model B Status | Model C Status | Building Capacity | Projected Enrollment 26-27 | Planning Notes |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Adams | PK-5 | Reg Elementary | Closed/ Repurposed | Closed/ Repurposed | Closed/ Repurposed | 364 | 155 | |
| AESM @ L'Overture | 6-8 | Reg Middle/ESOL Center | Closed/ Repurposed | Closed/ Repurposed | Open/Reconfigured | 560 | 240 | Model C: PK-8 |
| Ames | PK-5 | VPA | Closed/ Repurposed | Closed/ Repurposed | Closed/ Repurposed | 462 | 104 | |
| Ashland | PK-5 | Reg Elementary | Closed/ Repurposed | Closed/ Repurposed | Closed/ Repurposed | 440 | 138 | |
| Betty Wheeler | PK-5 | Gifted Elementary | Open/Retained | Open/Retained | Open/Retained | 567 | 296 | Advanced Academics Programming (Gifted) |
| Bryan Hill | PK-5 | Reg Elementary | Closed/ Repurposed | Closed/ Repurposed | Closed/ Repurposed | 300 | 114 | |
| Buder | PK-5 | Reg Elementary | Open/Retained | Open/Retained | Closed/ Repurposed | 416 | 343 | |
| Busch Middle | 6-8 | Magnet Middle – Character | Open/Retained | Open/Retained | Open/Reconfigured | 405 | 375 | Reconfigured to neighborhood school |
| Carnahan | 6-8 | Magnet Middle – STEM | Open/Retained | Open/Retained | Open/Reconfigured | 256 | 223 | Reconfigured to neighborhood school |
| Carr Lane | 6-8 | Magnet Middle – VPA | Open/Retained | Open/Retained | Open/Retained | 832 | 401 | VPA Specialized Programming |
| Central VPA | 9-12 | Magnet HS - VPA | Open/Reconfigured | Open/Reconfigured | Open/Reconfigured | 774 | 283 | VPA Specialized Programming, Advanced Academics Programming |
| Clyde C Miller | 9-12 | Magnet HS - CTE | Open/Reconfigured | Open/Reconfigured | Open/Reconfigured | 1026 | 325 | Sunsetting HS programming by 2030 |
| CSMB | 9-12 | Magnet HS – Medicine/ Bioscience | Open/Retained | Open/Retained | Open/Retained | 782 | 323 | Advanced Academics Programming |
| Columbia | PK-5 | Reg Elementary | Closed/ Repurposed | Closed/ Repurposed | Closed/ Repurposed | 364 | 191 | |
| Compton Drew | 6-8 | Magnet Middle | Open/Reconfigured | Open/Reconfigured | Open/Reconfigured | 589 | 384 | Reconfigured to neighborhood school |
| Dewey | PK-5 | Magnet Elem – International Studies | Open/Reconfigured | Open/Reconfigured | Open/Reconfigured | 506 | 279 | Reconfigured to neighborhood school, Model C: PK-8 |
| Fresh Start | 9-12 | Alternative | Open/Retained | Open/Retained | Open/Retained | | 1 | |
| Froebel | PK-5 | Reg Elementary | Open/Retained | Open/Reconfigured | Open/Reconfigured | 448 | 187 | Model B & C: PK-8 |

| School | Current Grade Span | Current Function | Model A Status | Model B Status | Model C Status | Building Capacity | Projected Enrollment 26-27 | Planning Notes |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Gateway Elementary | PK-5 | STEM Magnet | Open/Reconfigured | Open/Reconfigured | Open/Reconfigured | 660 | 328 | Reconfigured to neighborhood school, Model B & C: PK-8 |
| Gateway Michael | KG-8 | SPED Public Separate Site | Open/Retained | Open/Retained | Open/Retained | | 40 | |
| Gateway Middle | 6-8 | STEM Magnet | Open/Reconfigured | Open/Reconfigured | Open/Reconfigured | 645 | 323 | Reconfigured to neighborhood school, Model B & C: PK-8 |
| Gateway STEM High | 9-12 | STEM Magnet/CTE Center | Open/Reconfigured | Open/Reconfigured | Open/Reconfigured | 1800 | 880 | Reconfigured to neighborhood school |
| George W Carver | PK-5 | Reg Elementary | Closed/ Repurposed | Closed/ Repurposed | Closed/ Repurposed | 285 | 84 | |
| Griscom | 6-12 | Juvenile Det. | Open/Retained | Open/Retained | Open/Retained | | 38 | |
| Hamilton | PK-5 | Reg Elementary | Closed/ Repurposed | Closed/ Repurposed | Closed/ Repurposed | 442 | 201 | |
| Henry | PK-5 | Reg Elementary | Closed/ Repurposed | Closed/ Repurposed | Closed/ Repurposed | 350 | 161 | |
| Herzog | PK-5 | Reg Elementary | Open/Retained | Open/Retained | Open/Reconfigured | 494 | 198 | Model C: PK-8 |
| Hickey | PK-5 | Reg Elementary | Pending | Pending | Pending | 408 | 146 | Decision pending between Hickey & Lexington |
| High School Success | 9-12 | Dropout Prevention | Open/Retained | Open/Retained | Open/Retained | | 17 | |
| Hodgen | PK-5 | Reg Elementary | Open/Retained | Open/Retained | Open/Reconfigured | 330 | 209 | Model C: PK-8 |
| Humboldt | 3-5 | Upper Elementary | Closed/ Repurposed | Closed/ Repurposed | Closed/ Repurposed | 374 | 168 | |
| Innovative Concept Academy | 6-12 | Alternative | Open/Retained | Open/Retained | Open/Retained | | 47 | Moving to new location |
| Jefferson | PK-5 | Reg Elementary | Closed/ Repurposed | Closed/ Repurposed | Closed/ Repurposed | 522 | 99 | |
| Laclede | PK-5 | Reg Elementary | Closed/ Repurposed | Closed/ Repurposed | Closed/ Repurposed | 338 | 256 | |
| Lexington | PK-5 | Reg Elementary | Pending | Pending | Pending | 420 | 161 | Decision pending between Hickey & Lexington |
| Long Middle School | 6-8 | Reg Middle School | Open/Retained | Open/Retained | Open/Reconfigured | 493 | 416 | Model C: PK-8 |
| Lyon @ Blow | PK-8 | PK-8 Center/ Magnet | Closed/ Repurposed | Closed/ Repurposed | Closed/ Repurposed | 300 | 213 | |
| Madison | KG-8 | SPED Public Separate Site | Open/Retained | Open/Retained | Open/Retained | 520 | 49 | |
| Mallinckrodt | PK-5 | Gifted Elementary | Open/Retained | Open/Retained | Open/Retained | 342 | 286 | Advanced Academics Programming (Gifted) |
| Mann | PK-5 | Reg Elementary | Open/Retained | Open/Retained | Closed/ Repurposed | 322 | 273 | |
| Mason | PK-5 | Reg Elementary | Open/Retained | Open/Retained | Open/Reconfigured | 459 | 351 | Model C: PK-8 |
| McKinley | 6-12 | Gifted Middle Advanced Academics HS | Open/Reconfigured | Open/Reconfigured | Open/Reconfigured | 1000 | 649 | Sunsetting HS programming by 2030 |
| Meramec | PK-5 | Reg Elementary | Closed/ Repurposed | Closed/ Repurposed | Closed/ Repurposed | 266 | 147 | |

| School | Current Grade Span | Current Function | Model A Status | Model B Status | Model C Status | Building Capacity | Projected Enrollment 26-27 | Planning Notes |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Metro | 9-12 | Magnet HS – Advanced Academics/IB | Open/Retained | Open/Retained | Open/Retained | 374 | 361 | Advanced Academics Pathway |
| Monroe | PK-5 | Elementary | Closed/ Repurposed | Closed/ Repurposed | Closed/ Repurposed | 390 | 140 | |
| Mullanphy | PK-5 | Magnet Elem – Botanical/STEM | Open/Reconfigured | Open/Reconfigured | Open/Reconfigured | 560 | 453 | Reconfigured to neighborhood school, Model C: PK-8 |
| Nance | PK-5 | Reg Elementary | Open/Retained | Open/Retained | Open/Reconfigured | 380 | 262 | Model C: PK-8 |
| Nottingham CAJT | 9-12 | SPED Public Separate Site | Open/Retained | Open/Retained | Open/Retained | | 51 | |
| Oak Hill | PK-5 | Elementary | Open/Retained | Open/Retained | Open/Reconfigured | 345 | 337 | Model C: PK-8 |
| Pamoja | PK-8 | African Centric Magnet | Open/Reconfigured | Open/Reconfigured | Open/Reconfigured | 378 | 221 | Reconfigured to neighborhood school, Model A: PK-5, Model B: 6-8 |
| Peabody | PK-5 | Elementary | Closed/ Repurposed | Closed/ Repurposed | Closed/ Repurposed | 336 | 125 | |
| Roosevelt | 9-12 | High School | Open/Retained | Open/Retained | Open/Retained | 1710 | 676 | |
| Shaw VPA | PK-5 | Magnet Elementary | Open/Retained | Open/Retained | Open/Retained | 390 | 267 | VPA Specialized Programming |
| Shenandoah | PK-5 | Elementary | Closed/ Repurposed | Closed/ Repurposed | Closed/ Repurposed | 204 | 161 | |
| Sigel | PK-5 | Elementary | Open/Retained | Open/Reconfigured | Open/Reconfigured | 408 | 229 | Model B & C: PK-8 |
| SLPS Virtual (9-12) | 9-12 | Virtual School | Open/Retained | Open/Retained | Open/Retained | | 95 | |
| SLPS Virtual (K-8) | KG-8 | Virtual School | Open/Retained | Open/Retained | Open/Retained | | 18 | |
| Soldan | 9-12 | Magnet HS – International | Open/Reconfigured | Open/Reconfigured | Open/Reconfigured | 1232 | 222 | Reconfigured to neighborhood school Reopening: Jan 2027 |
| Stix ECE | PK-2 | Early Childhood Center | Open/Retained | Open/Retained | Open/Retained | 435 | 423 | Consideration for PK-K |
| Sumner | 9-12 | Reg High School | Open/Retained | Open/Retained | Open/Retained | 940 | 321 | Building reopening: Jan 2027 |
| Vashon | 9-12 | Reg High School | Open/Retained | Open/Retained | Open/Retained | 1281 | 491 | |
| Walbridge | PK-5 | Reg Elementary | Closed/ Repurposed | Closed/ Repurposed | Closed/ Repurposed | 495 | 109 | |
| Washington Montessori | PK-5 | Magnet Elem – Montessori | Open/Reconfigured | Open/Reconfigured | Open/Reconfigured | 462 | 207 | Reconfigured to neighborhood school, Model C: PK-8 |
| Wilkinson ECE | PK-2 | Early Childhood Center | Open/Retained | Open/Retained | Open/Retained | 252 | 298 | Consideration for PK-K |
| Woerner | PK-5 | Reg Elementary | Open/Retained | Open/Retained | Open/Reconfigured | 414 | 345 | Model C: PK-8 |
| Woodward | PK-5 | Reg Elementary | Open/Retained | Open/Retained | Open/Reconfigured | 459 | 376 | Model C: PK-8 |
| Yeatman | 6-8 | Reg Middle | Open/Retained | Open/Retained | Open/Reconfigured | 625 | 382 | Model C: PK-8 |

## APPENDIX C: STUDENT TRANSPORTATION ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS

**Distance-Based Eligibility**

- Students living **1 mile or less** from their assigned neighborhood school are **not eligible for district transportation** and are expected to walk, unless covered by an approved exception.
- Students living **more than 1 mile** from their assigned neighborhood school are eligible for district-provided transportation.
- Eligible students will be assigned to the **nearest safe neighborhood bus stop** based on the following maximum walking distances:
    - **Elementary School Students (Grades K–5)**
        - Maximum walk distance to a neighborhood bus stop: **0.3 miles**
    - **Middle School Students (Grades 6–8)**
        - Maximum walk distance to a neighborhood bus stop: **0.5 miles**
    - **Hybrid Schools (Grades K–8)**
        - Maximum walk distance to a neighborhood bus stop: **0.3 miles**
    - **High School Students (Grades 9–12)**
        - Maximum walk distance to a neighborhood bus stop: **0.5 miles**

**Exceptions to the 1-Mile Rule**

The following student groups will continue to receive district transportation regardless of distance:

- Students with disabilities whose IEP or 504 Plan requires transportation
- Students experiencing homelessness (McKinney-Vento)
- Foster care students requiring transportation to maintain school stability
- Students attending approved specialized programs (e.g., therapeutic placements, alternative education)
- Students assigned to temporary school locations due to construction, emergency closure, or district-directed relocation
- Students with documented hazardous walking conditions identified through the Safe Pathway Assessment process

**Specialized Pathway Transportation Eligibility**

(4-Mile Threshold + Hub Stops + Walking Distance + Public Transit Option)

- **Distance-Based Eligibility**
    - Approved Specialized Pathway students will receive transportation if their assigned school is **4.0 miles or more from their residence**.
    - Specialized Pathway transportation will be provided through **designated hub stops only**; neighborhood bus stops will not be utilized.
        - Hub Stop Requirement
        - Students must utilize an assigned hub stop.
    - **Walking Distance Requirement**
        - Students must be able to walk up to **1.0 miles** to access the assigned hub stop.

**Hub Stop Transportation Model**

A hub stop is a centralized, high-capacity transportation location designed to improve efficiency and accessibility. Hub stops may be located at:

- Neighborhood schools
- Community centers
- Safe and accessible public locations

**Public Transit Option for High School Specialized Pathway Students**

SLPS students may utilize MetroBus or MetroLink as part of the Specialized Pathway transportation model for eligible high school students who:

- Attend a Specialized Pathway school located 4+ miles from their residence; **and**
- Live more than 1 mile from the nearest designated hub stop

## APPENDIX D: PREDICTIVE ENROLLMENT MODELS

**Enrollment Models**

Using internal student-by-student zip code enrollment data for the 26-27 school year, the number of students per zip code currently attending Specialized Programming schools, and the feeder patterns outlined in Models A and C, the following school sizes are estimated per attendance zone.

| **High School Attendance Zone** Neighborhood Schools | **Model A** | **Model C** |
|---|---|---|
| Vashon | 3 Elementaries of 440 each<br>1 Middle of 420<br>1 High of 400 | 3 PK-8s of 575 each<br>1 High of 400 |
| Sumner | 3 Elementaries of 430 each<br>1 Middle of 470<br>1 High of 560 | 4 PK-8s of 440 each<br>1 High of 560 |
| Soldan | 3 Elementaries of 520 each<br>1 Middle of 490<br>1 High of 670 | 4 PK-8s of 510 each<br>1 High of 670 |
| Gateway | 5 Elementaries of 415 each<br>2 Middles of 430<br>1 High of 760 | 6 PK-8s of 450 each<br>1 High of 760 |
| Roosevelt | 5 Elementaries of 415 each<br>1 Middle of 450<br>1 High of 715 | 6 PK-8s of 455 each<br>1 High of 715 |

**Note: Model B was not calculated as it is yet unclear how many families in each attendance zone would choose the PK-8 school rather than the traditional PK-5 and 6-8 middle school option(s).**

## APPENDIX E: ESTIMATED COST SAVINGS (STAFFING & TRANSPORTATION)

**Cost Savings via Staffing**

Using the predictive enrollment model above, current Specialized Programming schools' enrollment, and the staff allocation formulas for the district, the following savings are estimated for Models A, B, and C.

- Salaries were estimated via the lowest starting salary per role per the 2023-2026 Local 420 Labor Agreement.
- District-paid benefits were under-estimated for cost savings based on a 30% additional cost per position.
- Savings were estimated based on budgeted positions, which include vacancies. Not all savings are represented by employees as several removed positions would be vacant.
- Based on having less school buildings, savings areas include, but are not limited to, reductions in the following allocation areas:
    - Academic Coaches
    - School Nurses
    - School Counselors
    - Building Substitutes
    - Long-Term Substitutes
    - School Administrators
    - School Secretarial

| Model | Model A | Model B | Model C |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Approximate Cost Savings in Salaries and Benefits** | $16.6 million | $17.2 million | $17.9 million |

**Cost Savings via Transportation**

Using the predictive enrollment models above, current student transportation routes, student transportation eligibility requirements (Appendix C), and predictive routing software, the following cost savings are estimated for Models A, B, and C.

| Model | Model A | Model B | Model C |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Approximate # of Routes & Cost Savings for Transportation** | # of Routes = 210<br>$2 - $4 million | # of Routes = 190<br>$5 - $8 million | # of Routes = 150<br>$10 - $13 million |