

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	3	528	1	1		
(b)	Capacity:	576			633				
(a)/(b)	Utilization Rate:	79.3%			83.4%				
(c)	Capacity (Perm):	480			580				
(a)/(c)	Utilization Rate:	95.2%			91.0%				
UPP:		41%	1	3	43%	1	3		
(b)-(a)	Excess Capacity:	119	2	1	105	2	1		
(c)-(a)	Excess Capacity (Perm):	23			52				
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	
School 1 (Perm):		BG Inter.	52	224	67.1%	BG Pri.	23	124	81.0%
School 2 (Perm):		Graham ES	319			Graham ES	319		
School 3 (Perm):		Musick ES	310			Musick ES	310		
Total:		681				652			
Year built:		1966		4	1961		7		
Mod/Maint. Costs:		\$29,684,062			\$34,482,232				
5 Year Deferred Maint.:		\$2,331,600			7.9%			\$5,113,500	14.8%
Completed/ Encumbered Bond		\$2,590,913	1	7	\$3,402,694	1	2		
Unique Facilities:		Flexible class rooms	1		n/a	2			
Support Spaces:		n/a	1		Need larger office	2			
Environmental Factors:		Easement for Hetch Hetchy aqueduct	2		n/a	1			
Programs:					Band				
Safety Concerns:		Railroad tracks; Thornton Ave			Railroad tracks; congested drop-off/pick-up; Thornton Ave				
Net Savings:		\$617,630	2	5	\$605,074	2	4		
TOTAL			13	27		14	24		

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)	Utilization Rate:	52.9%			79.2%				
(c)	Capacity (Perm):	704			432				
(a)/(c)	Utilization Rate:	54.7%			97.9%				
UPP:		66%	2	7	37%	2	5		
(b)-(a)	Excess Capacity:	343	2	7	111	2	2		
(c)-(a)	Excess Capacity (Perm):	319			9				
School 1:		Lincoln ES	120	263	59.4%	Graham ES	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	
School 1 (Perm):		Lincoln ES	48	66	85.4%	Graham ES	319	399	51.5%
School 2 (Perm):		Schilling ES	210			Musick ES	310		
School 3 (Perm):		Snow ES	193			Snow ES	193		
		451				822			
Year built:		1960		6	1963		1		
Mod/Maint. Costs:		\$31,201,074			\$26,015,714				
5 Year Deferred Maint.:		\$5,056,700			\$3,393,400			13.0%	
Completed/Encumbered Bond		\$3,176,192	1	3	\$2,759,877	1	6		
Unique Facilities:		Mini pitch	1		n/a	2			
Support Spaces:		Need larger office	2		n/a	1			
Environmental Factors:		n/a	1		n/a	1			
Educational/Student Support Services									
Programs:									
Business Services and Other/Community Impacts and Considerations									
Safety Concerns:		Railroad tracks							
Net Savings:		\$622,380	2	6	\$632,306	2	8		
TOTAL			15	36		14	34		

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)	Utilization Rate:	76.2%			39.2%				
(c)	Capacity (Perm):	432			540				
(a)/(c)	Utilization Rate:	88.9%			42.6%				
UPP:		54%	1	2	64%	2	6		
(b)-(a)	Excess Capacity:	120	2	4	357	2	8		
(c)-(a)	Excess Capacity (Perm):	48			310				
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
School 1 (Perm):		Graham ES	319	338	53.2%	BG Inter.	52	150	60.5%
School 2 (Perm):		Schilling ES	210			Graham ES	319		
School 3 (Perm):		Snow ES	193			Kennedy	9		
			722				380		
Facilities									
Year built:		1965		2	1955			5	
Mod/Maint. Costs:		\$26,939,428			\$31,067,131				
5 Year Deferred Maint.:		\$4,528,000			16.8%	\$3,063,200			9.9%
Completed/Encumbered Bond		\$2,823,946	1	5	\$3,660,820		1	1	
Unique Facilities:		Classroom pod	1		Play Structure		1		
Support Spaces:		n/a	1		n/a		1		
Environmental Factors:		n/a	1		n/a		1		
Student Support Services									
Programs:									
Community Impacts and Considerations									
Safety Concerns:		Railroad tracks			Railroad tracks; Thorton Ave				
Net Savings:		\$629,528	2	7	\$528,412		2	2	
TOTAL			12	33			14	31	

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)	Utilization Rate:	60.5%			61.1%				
(c)	Capacity (Perm):	724			496				
(a)/(c)	Utilization Rate:	71.0%			61.1%				
UPP:		73%	2	8	52%	1	1		
(b)-(a)	Excess Capacity:	335	2	6	193	2	5		
(c)-(a)	Excess Capacity (Perm):	210			193				
School 1:		Graham ES	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
School 1 (Perm):		Graham ES	319	46	91.8%	Graham ES	319	73	80.6%
School 2 (Perm):		Lincoln ES	48			Kennedy ES	9		
School 3 (Perm):		Snow ES	193			Lincoln ES	48		
			560				376		
Year built:		1959	9.1%	8	1960	17.8%	3		
Mod/Maint. Costs:		\$38,396,588			\$27,253,903				
5 Year Deferred Maint.:		\$3,495,500			\$4,843,000				
Completed/ Encumbered Bond		\$3,052,982	1	4	\$2,073,095	1	8		
Unique Facilities:		Classroom pod Mini pitch	1		n/a	2			
Support Spaces:		n/a	1		Need larger office	2			
Environmental Factors:		n/a	1		n/a	1			
Programs:									
Safety Concerns:		Railroad tracks			Railroad tracks*				
Net Savings:		\$547,283	2	3	\$503,949	2	1		
TOTAL			14	34		15	30		

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)	Utilization Rate:			62.2%
(c)	Capacity (Perm):	460		1,263
(a)/(c)	Utilization Rate:			67.2%
UPP:				
(b)-(a)	Excess Capacity:			517
(c)-(a)	Excess Capacity (Perm):	376		414
School 1:				
School 2:				
School 3:				
School 1 (Perm):				
School 2 (Perm):				
School 3 (Perm):				
Year built:		1960		
Mod/Maint. Costs:		\$34,309,276		
5 Year Deferred Maint.:		\$7,632,200	22.2%	
Completed/ Encumbered Bond		\$6,699,785		
Unique Facilities:		Science, culinary arts, etc.		
Support Spaces:				
Environmental Factors:				
Programs:				
Safety Concerns:				
Net Savings:		\$278,621		
TOTAL				