

Newark Unified School District
School Consolidation Advisory Committee

Criteria		Scoring methodology	Weighted methodology
Demographics and Capacity			
1.	School enrollment is low and projected to remain low (enrollment below 70% of capacity)	Yes=2; No=1	Highest score (8) goes to school with lowest enrollment-rank down
2.	Demographically diverse population based on the unduplicated pupil percentage	Yes=1; No=2	Highest score (8) goes to school with least diverse population-rank down
3.	Excess classroom capacity	Yes=2; No=1	Highest score (8) goes to school with most excess capacity-rank down
4.	Proximity to schools with capacity to accommodate incoming students	Yes=2; No=1	Highest score (8) goes to school with the closest three schools with the highest total available capacity-rank down
Facilities			
5.	Facilities are in good condition (based on cost of facility needs and proposed modernization/ construction projects)	Good=1; Fair=2; Poor=3	Highest score (8) goes to school with most expensive needs
6.	Modernization, construction or other projects (e.g., technology upgrades) recently completed	Yes=1; No=2	Highest score (dependent on number of applicable schools) goes to school with least expensive projects
7.	Unique facilities (i.e., facilities that could not be readily replicated) not found at other school sites	Yes=1; No=2	
8.	Support spaces (e.g., cafeteria, multi-purpose room, playgrounds, etc.) have sufficient capacity to meet current and projected enrollment	Yes=1; No=2	
9.	Environmental factors effect current or future use of property (e.g., earthquake faults, high speed rail, etc.)	Yes=2; No=1	
Educational/Student Support Services			
10.	District-wide programs would need to be relocated	Yes=1; No=2	
11.	District-wide programs can be relocated	Yes=2; No=1; N/A=0	
Business Services and Other/Community Impacts and Considerations			
12.	Safety concerns regarding traffic and safe routes to school if students are relocated	Yes=2; No=1	
13.	District would benefit from net savings if closed	Yes=2; No=1	Highest score (8) goes to school with most savings

		Birch Grove Primary			Birch Grove Intermediate				
		Data	Score	Weighted	Data	Score	Weighted		
(a)	2025/26 Enrollment:	457	1	1	528	1	3		
(b)	Capacity:	576			633				
(a)/(b)	Ratio:	79.3%			83.4%				
UPP:		41%	1	4	43%	1	3		
(b)-(a)	Excess Capacity:	119	2	1	105	2	3		
School 1:		BG Inter.	105	348	56.8%	BG Pri.	119	291	64.5%
School 2:		Graham ES	343			Graham ES	343		
School 3:		Musick ES	357			Musick ES	357		
Total:		805	2	4		819	2	6	
Year built:		1966		3	1961		7		
Mod/Maint. Costs:		\$32,015,662			\$39,595,732				
Completed/ Encumbered Bond Projects:		\$2,590,913	1	2	\$3,402,694	1	7		
Unique Facilities:		n/a	2		n/a	2			
Support Spaces:		Need larger office	2		n/a	1			
Environmental Factors:		Easement for Hetch Hetchy aqueduct	2			1			
Programs:									
Net Savings:									
TOTAL			13	15			11	29	

Newark Unified School District
School Consolidation Advisory Committee

Criteria		Scoring methodology	Weighted methodology
Demographics and Capacity			
1.	School enrollment is low and projected to remain low (enrollment below 70% of capacity)	Yes=2; No=1	Highest score (8) goes to school with lowest enrollment-rank down
2.	Demographically diverse population based on the unduplicated pupil percentage	Yes=1; No=2	Highest score (8) goes to school with least diverse population-rank down
3.	Excess classroom capacity	Yes=2; No=1	Highest score (8) goes to school with most excess capacity-rank down
4.	Proximity to schools with capacity to accommodate incoming students	Yes=2; No=1	Highest score (8) goes to school with the closest three schools with the highest total available capacity-rank down
Facilities			
5.	Facilities are in good condition (based on cost of facility needs and proposed modernization/ construction projects)	Good=1; Fair=2; Poor=3	Highest score (8) goes to school with most expensive needs
6.	Modernization, construction or other projects (e.g., technology upgrades) recently completed	Yes=1; No=2	Highest score (dependent on number of applicable schools) goes to school with least expensive projects
7.	Unique facilities (i.e., facilities that could not be readily replicated) not found at other school sites	Yes=1; No=2	
8.	Support spaces (e.g., cafeteria, multi-purpose room, playgrounds, etc.) have sufficient capacity to meet current and projected enrollment	Yes=1; No=2	
9.	Environmental factors effect current or future use of property (e.g., earthquake faults, high speed rail, etc.)	Yes=2; No=1	
Educational/Student Support Services			
10.	District-wide programs would need to be relocated	Yes=1; No=2	
11.	District-wide programs can be relocated	Yes=2; No=1; N/A=0	
Business Services and Other/Community Impacts and Considerations			
12.	Safety concerns regarding traffic and safe routes to school if students are relocated	Yes=2; No=1	
13.	District would benefit from net savings if closed	Yes=2; No=1	Highest score (8) goes to school with most savings

		Graham ES			Kennedy ES				
		Data	Score	Weighted	Data	Score	Weighted		
(a)	2025/26 Enrollment:	385		2	5	423		1	4
(b)	Capacity:	728				534			
(a)/(b)	Ratio:	52.9%				79.2%			
UPP:		66%		2	7	37%		2	5
(b)-(a)	Excess Capacity:	343		2	7	111		2	2
School 1:		Lincoln ES	120	263	59.4%	Graham	343	470	47.4%
School 2:		Schilling ES	335			Musick ES	357		
School 3:		Snow ES	193			Snow ES	193		
			648	2	2		893	2	8
F									
Year built:		1960			6	1963			1
Mod/Maint. Costs:		\$36,257,774				\$29,409,114			
Completed/ Encumbered Bond Projects:		\$3,176,192		1	6	\$2,759,877		1	3
Unique Facilities:		Mini pitch		1		n/a		2	
Support Spaces:		Need larger office		2		n/a		1	
Environmental Factors:				1				1	
Educational/Student Support Services									
Programs:									
Business Services and Other/Community Impacts and Considerations									
Net Savings:									
TOTAL				13	33			12	23

Newark Unified School District
School Consolidation Advisory Committee

Criteria		Scoring methodology	Weighted methodology
Demographics and Capacity			
1.	School enrollment is low and projected to remain low (enrollment below 70% of capacity)	Yes=2; No=1	Highest score (8) goes to school with lowest enrollment-rank down
2.	Demographically diverse population based on the unduplicated pupil percentage	Yes=1; No=2	Highest score (8) goes to school with least diverse population-rank down
3.	Excess classroom capacity	Yes=2; No=1	Highest score (8) goes to school with most excess capacity-rank down
4.	Proximity to schools with capacity to accommodate incoming students	Yes=2; No=1	Highest score (8) goes to school with the closest three schools with the highest total available capacity-rank down
Facilities			
5.	Facilities are in good condition (based on cost of facility needs and proposed modernization/ construction projects)	Good=1; Fair=2; Poor=3	Highest score (8) goes to school with most expensive needs
6.	Modernization, construction or other projects (e.g., technology upgrades) recently completed	Yes=1; No=2	Highest score (dependent on number of applicable schools) goes to school with least expensive projects
7.	Unique facilities (i.e., facilities that could not be readily replicated) not found at other school sites	Yes=1; No=2	
8.	Support spaces (e.g., cafeteria, multi-purpose room, playgrounds, etc.) have sufficient capacity to meet current and projected enrollment	Yes=1; No=2	
9.	Environmental factors effect current or future use of property (e.g., earthquake faults, high speed rail, etc.)	Yes=2; No=1	
Educational/Student Support Services			
10.	District-wide programs would need to be relocated	Yes=1; No=2	
11.	District-wide programs can be relocated	Yes=2; No=1; N/A=0	
Business Services and Other/Community Impacts and Considerations			
12.	Safety concerns regarding traffic and safe routes to school if students are relocated	Yes=2; No=1	
13.	District would benefit from net savings if closed	Yes=2; No=1	Highest score (8) goes to school with most savings

		Lincoln ES			Musick ES				
		Data	Score	Weighted	Data	Score	Weighted		
		Demographics and Capacity							
(a)	2025/26 Enrollment:	384		1	6	230		2	8
(b)	Capacity:	504				587			
(a)/(b)	Ratio:	76.2%				39.2%			
UPP:		54%		1	2	64%		2	6
(b)-(a)	Excess Capacity:	120		2	4	357		2	8
School 1:		Graham ES	343	487	44.1%	BG Inter.	105	329	41.1%
School 2:		Schilling ES	335			Graham ES	343		
School 3:		Snow ES	193			Kennedy	111		
			871	2	7		559	2	1
Facilities									
Year built:		1965			2	1955			5
Mod/Maint. Costs:		\$31,467,428				\$34,130,331			
Completed/ Encumbered Bond Projects:		\$2,823,946		1	4	\$3,660,820		1	8
Unique Facilities:		Classroom pod		1		n/a		2	
Support Spaces:		n/a		1		n/a		1	
Environmental Factors:				1				1	
Student Support Services									
Programs:									
Community Impacts and Considerations									
Net Savings:									
TOTAL				10	25			13	36

Newark Unified School District
School Consolidation Advisory Committee

Criteria		Scoring methodology	Weighted methodology
Demographics and Capacity			
1.	School enrollment is low and projected to remain low (enrollment below 70% of capacity)	Yes=2; No=1	Highest score (8) goes to school with lowest enrollment-rank down
2.	Demographically diverse population based on the unduplicated pupil percentage	Yes=1; No=2	Highest score (8) goes to school with least diverse population-rank down
3.	Excess classroom capacity	Yes=2; No=1	Highest score (8) goes to school with most excess capacity-rank down
4.	Proximity to schools with capacity to accommodate incoming students	Yes=2; No=1	Highest score (8) goes to school with the closest three schools with the highest total available capacity-rank down
Facilities			
5.	Facilities are in good condition (based on cost of facility needs and proposed modernization/ construction projects)	Good=1; Fair=2; Poor=3	Highest score (8) goes to school with most expensive needs
6.	Modernization, construction or other projects (e.g., technology upgrades) recently completed	Yes=1; No=2	Highest score (dependent on number of applicable schools) goes to school with least expensive projects
7.	Unique facilities (i.e., facilities that could not be readily replicated) not found at other school sites	Yes=1; No=2	
8.	Support spaces (e.g., cafeteria, multi-purpose room, playgrounds, etc.) have sufficient capacity to meet current and projected enrollment	Yes=1; No=2	
9.	Environmental factors effect current or future use of property (e.g., earthquake faults, high speed rail, etc.)	Yes=2; No=1	
Educational/Student Support Services			
10.	District-wide programs would need to be relocated	Yes=1; No=2	
11.	District-wide programs can be relocated	Yes=2; No=1; N/A=0	
Business Services and Other/Community Impacts and Considerations			
12.	Safety concerns regarding traffic and safe routes to school if students are relocated	Yes=2; No=1	
13.	District would benefit from net savings if closed	Yes=2; No=1	Highest score (8) goes to school with most savings

		Schilling ES			Snow ES				
		Data	Score	Weighted	Data	Score	Weighted		
(a)	2025/26 Enrollment:	514	2	2	303	2	7		
(b)	Capacity:	849			496				
(a)/(b)	Ratio:	60.5%			61.1%				
UPP:		73%	2	8	52%	1	1		
(b)-(a)	Excess Capacity:	335	2	6	193	2	5		
School 1:		Graham	343	142	78.4%	Graham ES	343	508	37.4%
School 2:		Lincoln ES	120			Kennedy ES	111		
School 3:		Snow ES	193			Lincoln ES	357		
			656	2	3		811	2	5
Year built:		1959		8	1960		4		
Mod/Maint. Costs:		\$41,892,088			\$32,096,903				
Completed/ Encumbered Bond Projects:		\$3,052,982	1	5	\$2,073,095	1	1		
Unique Facilities:		Classroom pod Mini pitch	1		n/a	2			
Support Spaces:		n/a	1		Need larger office	2			
Environmental Factors:			1			1			
Programs:									
Net Savings:									
TOTAL				12	32			13	23

**Newark Unified School District
School Consolidation Advisory Committee**

Criteria		Scoring methodology	Weighted methodology
Demographics and Capacity			
1.	School enrollment is low and projected to remain low (enrollment below 70% of capacity)	Yes=2; No=1	Highest score (8) goes to school with lowest enrollment-rank down
2.	Demographically diverse population based on the unduplicated pupil percentage	Yes=1; No=2	Highest score (8) goes to school with least diverse population-rank down
3.	Excess classroom capacity	Yes=2; No=1	Highest score (8) goes to school with most excess capacity-rank down
4.	Proximity to schools with capacity to accommodate incoming students	Yes=2; No=1	Highest score (8) goes to school with the closest three schools with the highest total available capacity-rank down
Facilities			
5.	Facilities are in good condition (based on cost of facility needs and proposed modernization/ construction projects)	Good=1; Fair=2; Poor=3	Highest score (8) goes to school with most expensive needs
6.	Modernization, construction or other projects (e.g., technology upgrades) recently completed	Yes=1; No=2	Highest score (dependent on number of applicable schools) goes to school with least expensive projects
7.	Unique facilities (i.e., facilities that could not be readily replicated) not found at other school sites	Yes=1; No=2	
8.	Support spaces (e.g., cafeteria, multi-purpose room, playgrounds, etc.) have sufficient capacity to meet current and projected enrollment	Yes=1; No=2	
9.	Environmental factors effect current or future use of property (e.g., earthquake faults, high speed rail, etc.)	Yes=2; No=1	
Educational/Student Support Services			
10.	District-wide programs would need to be relocated	Yes=1; No=2	
11.	District-wide programs can be relocated	Yes=2; No=1; N/A=0	
Business Services and Other/Community Impacts and Considerations			
12.	Safety concerns regarding traffic and safe routes to school if students are relocated	Yes=2; No=1	
13.	District would benefit from net savings if closed	Yes=2; No=1	Highest score (8) goes to school with most savings

		MacGregor Alternative	Newark JHS
		Data	Data
(a)	2025/26 Enrollment:	84	849
(b)	Capacity:	460	1,366
(a)/(b)	Ratio:		62.2%
UPP:			
(b)-(a)	Excess Capacity:		517
School 1:			
School 2:			
School 3:			
Year built:		1960	
Mod/Maint. Costs:		\$41,941,476	
Completed/ Encumbered Bond Projects:		\$6,699,785	
Unique Facilities:		Science, culinary arts, etc.	
Support Spaces:			
Environmental Factors:			
Programs:			
Net Savings:			
TOTAL			