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## Study Overview

The Superintendent and Board of Education of the Webster Groves School District (District) authorized an update of the District's enrollment projections with resident 2015 birth counts and a study of transfer students. The update to the District's enrollment projection model and birth series are provided in the report, Webster Groves School District, Enrollment Projections Study, 2015 Birth Update, August 2016. The focus of this report is the geocoding of transfer students, District housing types by attendance area, student transfer status by grade and attendance area, and student transfer status by housing type and attendance area. These topics emerged from conversations with the Superintendent and two Board members. The Letter of Agreement authorizing this work is contained in the Appendix (see Administrative Documents, Scope of Work, Appendix).

Student transfer data were obtained from the District in a special tabulation of student records from the 2015 school year. In this study, transfer students are defined as students that came into the district and reside in the District after Kindergarten. Non transfer students are students that reside in the District and started in Kindergarten. The District coded student transfer status in a separate field that included nontransferring (NT), transferring (T), VICC (V), and Normandy/Riverview (NR) transfer students. The District produced 4,487 student records with these codes, grades, and addresses. These data were geocoded using the data developed in the benchmark study and obtained from the St. Louis County, GIS Service Center for the current calendar year (2016). Address points and street centerlines were used to geocode or identify the residential address locations associated with the student records. Accordingly, the results and observations in this study pertain to student residential locations and not necessarily District schools that students attend. The District's authoritative digital boundary map was used to identify and count student falling within the District and elementary attendance areas. This map (Map 1) is provided in the Appendix (Maps).

Of the total, 4,467 student records were matched to St. Louis County address points and street centerlines. The table below summarizes the data sources that were used to geocode student addresses.

## Table 1: Geocoding Summary for 2015 Student Records

| Data Source | Record Count |
| :--- | ---: |
| Unmatched | 20 |
| Matched to Address Points | 4303 |
| Matched to Parcels | 2 |
| Matched to Street Centerlines | 162 |
| Total | 4487 |

These data were spatially joined to the District's boundary and attendance area map. There were 153 address locations that were outside the District's boundaries and 20 student records that could not be matched to address points or street centerlines. These records (a total of 173 records) were defined as missing in crosstabulations involving student transfer characteristics.

Parcel polygons and associated information were used to identify housing and land use characteristics of attendance areas. These data provided tenure (owner and non-owner) and land use characteristics of parcels which included the type of housing on the parcel (Duplex/Townhome, Multi-Family, and Single Family). Overlaying the District's digital boundary map assigned the District's attendance areas to each parcel which provided the means of crosstabulating District parcel land use characteristics by attendance area. These data are provided in the table below.

Table 2: District Parcels by Tenure, Land Use, and Attendance Area
LAND USE * ATTENDANCE AREAS * TENURE Crosstabulation



|  |  |  | \% within <br> ATTENDANCE <br> AREAS | . $6 \%$ | . $2 \%$ | . $0 \%$ | . $0 \%$ | . $4 \%$ | . $2 \%$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Institution | Count | 13 | 23 | 4 | 9 | 5 | 54 |
|  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \% within LAND } \\ & \text { USE } \end{aligned}$ | 24.1\% | 42.6\% | 7.4\% | 16.7\% | 9.3\% | 100.0\% |
|  |  |  | \% within <br> ATTENDANCE <br> AREAS | . $6 \%$ | 1.0\% | . $2 \%$ | . $4 \%$ | . $3 \%$ | . $5 \%$ |
|  |  | Multi-Family | Count | 10 | 34 | 56 | 13 | 54 | 167 |
|  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \% within LAND } \\ & \text { USE } \end{aligned}$ | 6.0\% | 20.4\% | $33.5 \%$ | 7.8\% | $32.3 \%$ | 100.0\% |
|  |  |  | \% within <br> ATTENDANCE <br> AREAS | . $4 \%$ | 1.5\% | 2.8\% | . $5 \%$ | 2.8\% | 1.5\% |
|  |  | Park | Count | 2 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 13 |
|  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \% within LAND } \\ & \text { USE } \end{aligned}$ | 15.4\% | 15.4\% | . $0 \%$ | $38.5 \%$ | 30.8\% | 100.0\% |
|  |  |  | \% within <br> ATTENDANCE <br> AREAS | .1\% | .1\% | . $0 \%$ | . $2 \%$ | . $2 \%$ | .1\% |
|  |  | Recreation | Count | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
|  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \% within LAND } \\ & \text { USE } \end{aligned}$ | 50.0\% | 25.0\% | 25.0\% | . $0 \%$ | . $0 \%$ | 100.0\% |
|  |  |  | \% within <br> ATTENDANCE <br> AREAS | .1\% | . $0 \%$ | .1\% | . $0 \%$ | .0\% | .0\% |
|  |  | Single Family | Count | 2120 | 2089 | 1929 | 2502 | 1823 | 10463 |
|  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \% within LAND } \\ & \text { USE } \end{aligned}$ | 20.3\% | 20.0\% | 18.4\% | 23.9\% | 17.4\% | 100.0\% |
|  |  |  | \% within <br> ATTENDANCE <br> AREAS | 95.1\% | 94.5\% | 96.5\% | 98.2\% | 94.8\% | 95.9\% |
|  |  | Vacant/Agriculture | Count | 33 | 16 | 4 | 9 | 5 | 67 |
|  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \% within LAND } \\ & \text { USE } \end{aligned}$ | 49.3\% | 23.9\% | 6.0\% | 13.4\% | 7.5\% | 100.0\% |
|  |  |  | \% within <br> ATTENDANCE <br> AREAS | 1.5\% | .7\% | . $2 \%$ | . $4 \%$ | . $3 \%$ | .6\% |
|  | Total |  | Count | 2229 | 2211 | 1999 | 2547 | 1924 | 10910 |
|  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \% within LAND } \\ & \text { USE } \end{aligned}$ | 20.4\% | 20.3\% | 18.3\% | 23.3\% | 17.6\% | 100.0\% |
|  |  |  | \% within <br> ATTENDANCE <br> AREAS | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% |
| Total | LAND | Not Coded | Count | 10 | 9 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 26 |

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline USE \& \& \begin{tabular}{l}
\% within LAND USE \\
\% within \\
ATTENDANCE \\
AREAS
\end{tabular} \& \(38.5 \%\)
\(.4 \%\) \& \(34.6 \%\)
\(.3 \%\) \& \(26.9 \%\)
\(.3 \%\) \& \(.0 \%\)
\(.0 \%\) \& \(.0 \%\)
\(.0 \%\) \& \(100.0 \%\)

$.2 \%$ <br>
\hline \& \multirow[t]{3}{*}{Commercial} \& Count \& 111 \& 98 \& 26 \& 16 \& 76 \& 327 <br>
\hline \& \& \% within LAND USE \& 33.9\% \& 30.0\% \& 8.0\% \& 4.9\% \& 23.2\% \& 100.0\% <br>

\hline \& \& | \% within |
| :--- |
| ATTENDANCE |
| AREAS | \& 3.9\% \& 3.4\% \& 1.1\% \& . $5 \%$ \& 3.2\% \& 2.4\% <br>

\hline \& \multirow[t]{3}{*}{Duplex/Townhome} \& Count \& 21 \& 47 \& 2 \& 19 \& 4 \& 93 <br>
\hline \& \& \% within LAND USE \& 22.6\% \& 50.5\% \& 2.2\% \& 20.4\% \& 4.3\% \& 100.0\% <br>

\hline \& \& | \% within |
| :--- |
| ATTENDANCE |
| AREAS | \& .7\% \& 1.6\% \& .1\% \& .6\% \& . $2 \%$ \& .7\% <br>

\hline \& \multirow[t]{3}{*}{Industrial/Utility} \& Count \& 52 \& 32 \& 5 \& 7 \& 35 \& 131 <br>
\hline \& \& \% within LAND USE \& 39.7\% \& 24.4\% \& 3.8\% \& 5.3\% \& 26.7\% \& 100.0\% <br>

\hline \& \& | \% within |
| :--- |
| ATTENDANCE |
| AREAS | \& 1.8\% \& 1.1\% \& . $2 \%$ \& . $2 \%$ \& 1.5\% \& 1.0\% <br>

\hline \& \multirow[t]{3}{*}{Institution} \& Count \& 26 \& 41 \& 10 \& 12 \& 9 \& 98 <br>
\hline \& \& \% within LAND USE \& 26.5\% \& 41.8\% \& 10.2\% \& 12.2\% \& 9.2\% \& 100.0\% <br>

\hline \& \& | \% within |
| :--- |
| ATTENDANCE |
| AREAS | \& . $9 \%$ \& 1.4\% \& . $4 \%$ \& . $4 \%$ \& . $4 \%$ \& .7\% <br>

\hline \& \multirow[t]{3}{*}{Multi-Family} \& Count \& 47 \& 107 \& 62 \& 39 \& 91 \& 346 <br>
\hline \& \& \% within LAND USE \& 13.6\% \& 30.9\% \& 17.9\% \& 11.3\% \& 26.3\% \& 100.0\% <br>

\hline \& \& | \% within |
| :--- |
| ATTENDANCE |
| AREAS | \& 1.6\% \& 3.7\% \& 2.7\% \& 1.3\% \& 3.8\% \& 2.6\% <br>

\hline \& \multirow[t]{3}{*}{Park} \& Count \& 4 \& 4 \& 0 \& 5 \& 5 \& 18 <br>
\hline \& \& \% within LAND USE \& 22.2\% \& 22.2\% \& . $0 \%$ \& 27.8\% \& 27.8\% \& 100.0\% <br>

\hline \& \& | \% within |
| :--- |
| ATTENDANCE |
| AREAS | \& .1\% \& .1\% \& . $0 \%$ \& . $2 \%$ \& . $2 \%$ \& .1\% <br>

\hline \& \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Recreation} \& Count \& 2 \& 6 \& 1 \& 0 \& 1 \& 10 <br>
\hline \& \& \% within LAND USE \& 20.0\% \& 60.0\% \& 10.0\% \& . $0 \%$ \& 10.0\% \& 100.0\% <br>
\hline
\end{tabular}

|  |  | \% within <br> ATTENDANCE <br> AREAS | . $1 \%$ | . $2 \%$ | . $0 \%$ | . $0 \%$ | . $0 \%$ | .1\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Single Family | Count | 2401 | 2361 | 2116 | 2876 | 2093 | 11847 |
|  |  | \% within LAND USE | 20.3\% | 19.9\% | 17.9\% | 24.3\% | 17.7\% | 100.0\% |
|  |  | \% within <br> ATTENDANCE <br> AREAS | 84.1\% | 82.0\% | 93.5\% | 94.3\% | 87.8\% | 88.2\% |
|  | Vacant/Agriculture | Count | 181 | 173 | 33 | 77 | 71 | 535 |
|  |  | \% within LAND USE | 33.8\% | $32.3 \%$ | 6.2\% | 14.4\% | 13.3\% | 100.0\% |
|  |  | \% within <br> ATTENDANCE <br> AREAS | 6.3\% | 6.0\% | 1.5\% | 2.5\% | 3.0\% | 4.0\% |
| Total |  | Count | 2855 | 2878 | 2262 | 3051 | 2385 | 13431 |
|  |  | \% within LAND USE | 21.3\% | 21.4\% | 16.8\% | 22.7\% | 17.8\% | 100.0\% |
|  |  | \% within <br> ATTENDANCE <br> AREAS | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% |

The format of this table and the other crosstabulation tables in this report includes frequency counts, percentages of cells to row totals and percentages of cell to column totals. This table is broken down into 3 main sections; non owner, owner, and totals with frequency counts and percentages found in each attendance area. The total (last) section of this table shows the total breakdown of land uses within the District. In the last column and cell, the count of parcels within the District numbers 13,431 which represents $100 \%$ of parcels within District boundaries. Of the total, more parcels are found within the Edgar Road attendance area $(22.7 \%, \mathrm{n}=3,051)$ while the Clark attendance area has fewer parcels $(16.8 \%$ of the total, $\mathrm{n}=2,878$ ). The Avery and Bristol attendance areas have close to the same number of parcels ( $21.3 \%$ and $21.4 \%$ of the total, respectively) while the balance of the District with $17.8 \%$ of the total is found in the Hudson attendance area.

The breakdown of the totals by tenure (not owner and owner) and attendance area shows that the larger percentage of not owning resident parcels are found in the Bristol attendance area ( $26.4 \%, \mathrm{n}=658$ ). Avery is close to Bristol with $24.7 \%$ ( $n=616$ ), while Clark has the fewer number of not-owner parcels $(10.3 \%, \mathrm{n}=256)$. The larger categories of not-owner parcels are single family ( $\mathrm{n}=1,384$ ) and multi-family ( $\mathrm{n}=179$ ). Among owner tenure parcels, the larger percentage across attendance areas is found in the Edgar Road attendance area ( $23.3 \%, \mathrm{n}=2,547$ ), with Avery and Bristol following up at $20.4 \%$ ( $\mathrm{n}=2,229$ ) and $20.3 \%(\mathrm{n}=2,211)$, respectively. This table shows that there are far more single family than multifamily and owner than not owner parcels in the District.

Geocoded student records with student transfer status coding were overlaid with parcel data containing these housing characteristics. These data provided the basis for crosstabulating student transfer status by housing type by attendance area and student transfer status by grade by attendance area.

## Student Transfer Status

The geocoding of student records created $\mathrm{X}, \mathrm{Y}$ coordinate points that were spatially overlaid onto the District's parcel layer. Map 2 (Appendix) shows the spatial distribution of geocoded student records. As parcels were tagged with attendance area definitions, the attributes of student records with the overlay included attendance area of residence, land use (and housing) characteristics of parcels, and the District's coding of transfer status of students. Map 3 (Appendix) shows student records within District parcels and attendance areas.

The data contained in the following table shows counts of student records broken down by transfer status, land use codes, and stratified by District attendance areas.

## Table 3: Student Transfer Status by Land Use and Attendance Area

| Attendance Area |  |  | Transfer Status |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Normandy/Riverview | Nontransferring | Transferring | VICC |  |
| LUCODE |  | Count | 3 | 25 | 18 | 127 | 173 |
|  |  | \% within <br> LUCODE | 1.7\% | 14.5\% | 10.4\% | 73.4\% | 100.0\% |
|  |  | \% within <br> Transfer_S | 21.4\% | 34.2\% | 39.1\% | 97.7\% | 65.8\% |
|  | Duplex/Townhome | Count | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
|  |  | \% within <br> LUCODE | . $0 \%$ | 50.0\% | 50.0\% | . $0 \%$ | 100.0\% |
|  |  | \% within <br> Transfer_S | .0\% | 1.4\% | 2.2\% | . $0 \%$ | .8\% |
|  | Industrial/Utility | Count | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 |
|  |  | \% within <br> LUCODE | .0\% | . $0 \%$ | 100.0\% | . $0 \%$ | 100.0\% |
|  |  | \% within <br> Transfer_S | . $0 \%$ | . $0 \%$ | 6.5\% | . $0 \%$ | 1.1\% |
|  | Institution | Count | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
|  |  | \% within <br> LUCODE | 50.0\% | . $0 \%$ | 50.0\% | . $0 \%$ | 100.0\% |
|  |  | \% within <br> Transfer_S | 7.1\% | . $0 \%$ | 2.2\% | . $0 \%$ | .8\% |
|  | Multi-Family | Count | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 5 |
|  |  | \% within <br> LUCODE | . $0 \%$ | 20.0\% | 80.0\% | . $0 \%$ | 100.0\% |
|  |  | \% within <br> Transfer_S | . $0 \%$ | 1.4\% | 8.7\% | . $0 \%$ | 1.9\% |
|  | Single Family | Count | 10 | 46 | 19 | 3 | 78 |
|  |  | \% within <br> LUCODE | 12.8\% | 59.0\% | 24.4\% | 3.8\% | 100.0\% |
|  |  | \% within <br> Transfer_S | 71.4\% | 63.0\% | 41.3\% | 2.3\% | 29.7\% |
| Total |  | Count | 14 | 73 | 46 | 130 | 263 |
|  |  | \% within <br> LUCODE | 5.3\% | 27.8\% | 17.5\% | 49.4\% | 100.0\% |
|  |  | \% within <br> Transfer_S | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% |




|  |  |  | \% within LUCODE <br> \% within <br> Transfer_S |  | $\begin{aligned} & 70.7 \% \\ & 98.3 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 29.3 \% \\ & 96.0 \% \end{aligned}$ |  | $100.0 \%$ $97.6 \%$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Vacant/Agriculture |  |  | 3 | 0 |  | 3 |
|  |  |  | \% within <br> LUCODE |  | 100.0\% | .0\% |  | 100.0\% |
|  |  |  | \% within <br> Transfer_S |  | . $5 \%$ | . $0 \%$ |  | . $3 \%$ |
|  | Total |  | Count |  | 653 | 277 |  | 930 |
|  |  |  | \% within <br> LUCODE |  | 70.2\% | 29.8\% |  | 100.0\% |
|  |  |  | \% within <br> Transfer_S |  | 100.0\% | 100.0\% |  | 100.0\% |
| Hudson | LUCODE | Multi-Family | Count |  | 6 | 12 | 0 | 18 |
|  |  |  | \% within <br> LUCODE |  | 33.3\% | 66.7\% | . $0 \%$ | 100.0\% |
|  |  |  | \% within <br> Transfer_S |  | 2.3\% | 7.8\% | . $0 \%$ | 4.4\% |
|  |  | Single Family | Count |  | 249 | 142 | 1 | 392 |
|  |  |  | \% within <br> LUCODE |  | 63.5\% | 36.2\% | . $3 \%$ | 100.0\% |
|  |  |  | \% within <br> Transfer_S |  | 96.9\% | 92.2\% | 100.0\% | 95.1\% |
|  |  | Vacant/Agriculture | Count |  | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
|  |  |  | \% within <br> LUCODE |  | 100.0\% | .0\% | . $0 \%$ | 100.0\% |
|  |  |  | \% within <br> Transfer_S |  | .8\% | .0\% | . $0 \%$ | . $5 \%$ |
|  | Total |  | Count |  | 257 | 154 | 1 | 412 |
|  |  |  | \% within <br> LUCODE |  | 62.4\% | 37.4\% | .2\% | 100.0\% |
|  |  |  | \% within <br> Transfer_S |  | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% |
| Total | LUCODE |  | Count | 3 | 25 | 18 | 127 | 173 |
|  |  |  | \% within <br> LUCODE | 1.7\% | 14.5\% | 10.4\% | 73.4\% | 100.0\% |
|  |  |  | \% within <br> Transfer_S | 21.4\% | . $9 \%$ | 1.3\% | 96.9\% | 3.9\% |
|  |  | Commercial | Count | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
|  |  |  | \% within <br> LUCODE | . $0 \%$ | 50.0\% | 50.0\% | . $0 \%$ | 100.0\% |
|  |  |  | \% within <br> Transfer_S | . $0 \%$ | . $0 \%$ | .1\% | . $0 \%$ | . $0 \%$ |
|  |  | Duplex/Townhome | Count | 0 | 23 | 27 | 0 | 50 |
|  |  |  | \% within <br> LUCODE | . $0 \%$ | 46.0\% | 54.0\% | . $0 \%$ | 100.0\% |
|  |  |  | \% within <br> Transfer_S | . $0 \%$ | .8\% | 1.9\% | . $0 \%$ | 1.1\% |
|  |  | Industrial/Utility | Count | 0 | 0 | 60 | 0 | 60 |
|  |  |  | \% within <br> LUCODE | . $0 \%$ | .0\% | 100.0\% | . $0 \%$ | 100.0\% |
|  |  |  | \% within <br> Transfer_S | . $0 \%$ | .0\% | 4.3\% | . $0 \%$ | 1.3\% |



The first block of counts refers to student records that were matched outside of District boundaries with location indexes not related to District parcels or address points. In all, there were 263 student records that were located outside of District parcels and the larger percentage of these records were VICC students ( $49.4 \%, \mathrm{n}=130$ ). The last block of data provides a summary of student records by transfer status. In the Total area, the counts and percentages show that $65.4 \%$ of District students were categorized as non-transferring ( $\mathrm{n}=2,934$ ). There were 1,408 transferring students or students moving into District schools which accounted for $31.4 \%$ of all student records. Larger percentages of nontransferring students were found in the Avery ( $69.6 \%$ ), Clark ( $70.4 \%$ ), and Edgar Road ( $70.2 \%$ ) attendance areas. Bristol (35.9\%) and Hudson (37.7\%) attendance areas had higher percentages of transferring students. There was 1 anomaly in the crosstabulation where 60 transferring students were located in parcels categorized with an industrial/utility land use in the District. Most of these students were found in the Bristol attendance area ( $\mathrm{n}=57$ ).

A pattern of increasing student transfers with grade levels is observed in the crosstabulation of student records by transfer status and grade. These data are shown in Table 4 on the following pages. Looking at the total summary block at the end of the table and the $\%$ within Transfer_S rows in the Transferring column, the relationship appears to be positive and direct between grades K through 6 where percentages of transferring students increase with succeeding grades (e.g., $K=0.0 \%, 1=3.3 \%, 2=4.5 \%, 3=5.8 \%$, $4=6.3 \%, 5=8.0 \%, 6=8.8 \%)$.

Table 4: Student Transfer Status by Grade and Attendance Area







|  |  | \% within <br> Transfer_S |  | 8.0\% |  | 7.5\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 05 | Count |  | 53 |  | 68 |
|  |  | \% within Grade |  | 77.9\% |  | 100.0\% |
|  |  | \% within <br> Transfer_S |  | 8.1\% |  | 7.3\% |
|  | 06 | Count |  | 47 |  | 68 |
|  |  | \% within Grade |  | 69.1\% |  | 100.0\% |
|  |  | \% within <br> Transfer_S |  | 7.2\% |  | 7.3\% |
|  | 07 | Count |  | 50 |  | 76 |
|  |  | \% within Grade |  | 65.8\% |  | 100.0\% |
|  |  | \% within <br> Transfer_S |  | 7.7\% |  | 8.2\% |
|  | 08 | Count |  | 52 |  | 81 |
|  |  | \% within Grade |  | 64.2\% |  | 100.0\% |
|  |  | \% within <br> Transfer_S |  | 8.0\% |  | 8.7\% |
|  | 09 | Count |  | 40 |  | 66 |
|  |  | \% within Grade |  | 60.6\% |  | 100.0\% |
|  |  | \% within <br> Transfer_S |  | 6.1\% |  | 7.1\% |
|  | 10 | Count |  | 54 |  | 84 |
|  |  | \% within Grade |  | 64.3\% |  | 100.0\% |
|  |  | \% within <br> Transfer_S |  | 8.3\% |  | 9.0\% |
|  | 11 | Count |  | 43 |  | 87 |
|  |  | \% within Grade |  | 49.4\% |  | 100.0\% |
|  |  | \% within <br> Transfer_S |  | 6.6\% |  | 9.4\% |
|  | 12 | Count |  | 31 |  | 60 |
|  |  | \% within Grade |  | 51.7\% |  | 100.0\% |
|  |  | \% within <br> Transfer_S |  | 4.7\% |  | 6.5\% |
|  | K | Count |  | 62 |  | 62 |
|  |  | \% within Grade |  | 100.0\% |  | 100.0\% |
|  |  | \% within <br> Transfer_S |  | 9.5\% |  | 6.7\% |
|  | KA | Count |  | 13 |  | 13 |
|  |  | \% within Grade |  | 100.0\% |  | 100.0\% |
|  |  | \% within <br> Transfer_S |  | 2.0\% |  | 1.4\% |
| Total |  | Count |  | 653 |  | 930 |





In $7^{\text {th }}$ grade, the percentage of transferring students drops back to $7.8 \%$, but increases with $8^{\text {th }}$ graders to $8.7 \%$. The percentages of in-bound students are notably higher in the high school grades (e.g., $9=11.9 \%$, $10=11.5 \%, 11=12.9 \%$, and $12=10.6 \%)$.

Considering patterns within attendance areas, the percentages vary but the trend of increasing percentages of transferring students with grades appears to hold true in the elementary grades. In grades 6 through 8 transferring student percentages differ considerably. For example, the percentages of transferring students range from a low of $7.1 \%$ in Avery to a high of $11.7 \%$ in Hudson. The percentages of transferring student in $7^{\text {th }}$ grade range from $4.7 \%$ in Avery to $9.4 \%$ in Edgar Road and the range of $8^{\text {th }}$ graders is $5.9 \%$ in Avery to $10.5 \%$ in Edgar Road. It appears that the constant in these percentage comparisons is the lower percentage of transferring students in grades 6 to 8 residing in Avery.

The high school percentages of transferring students are notably higher than the percentages observed in the elementary and some middle grades in the District's attendance areas. The percentages of $9^{\text {th }}$ grade transferring students range from a low of $9.4 \%$ in Edgar Road to $13.4 \%$ in Avery. The percentages of $10^{\text {th }}$ grade transferring students are lower than the $9^{\text {th }}$ grade range with $9.4 \%$ transferring in Clark to $12.5 \%$ transferring in Bristol. The percentages bounce back in $11^{\text {th }}$ grade with a range of $9.1 \%$ in Hudson to $15.3 \%$ in Bristol. Students transferring in $12^{\text {th }}$ grade range from $9.2 \%$ in Bristol to $13.0 \%$ in Hudson.

## Students At Address

Overlaying student records also provided the capability of determining students at address. Associated with student records on parcels were parcel identification or locator text strings. The frequencies of these locator strings represent the number of student records at parcel addresses. The locator frequency with a count of 0 indicates no students living at District addresses. Only student addresses that were matched to address points or parcels are included in this analysis. The results of crosstabulating these data by attendance area appear in the table below.

## Table 5: Numbers of Students at Address by Attendance Area

|  |  |  | Attendance Areas |  |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | AVERY | BRISTOL | CLARK | $\begin{aligned} & \text { EDGAR } \\ & \text { ROAD } \end{aligned}$ | HUDSON |  |
| Frequencies | 0 | Count | 2203 | 2296 | 1844 | 2479 | 2124 | 10946 |
|  |  | $\%$ within <br> FREQ | 20.1\% | 21.0\% | 16.8\% | 22.6\% | 19.4\% | 100.0\% |
|  |  | $\%$ within <br> ATTND | 77.2\% | 79.8\% | 81.5\% | 81.3\% | 89.1\% | 81.5\% |
|  | 1 | Count | 329 | 277 | 208 | 308 | 152 | 1274 |
|  |  | \% within <br> FREQ | 25.8\% | 21.7\% | 16.3\% | 24.2\% | 11.9\% | 100.0\% |
|  |  | \% within <br> ATTND | 11.5\% | 9.6\% | 9.2\% | 10.1\% | 6.4\% | 9.5\% |
|  | 2 | Count | 228 | 211 | 167 | 196 | 74 | 876 |
|  |  | $\%$ within <br> FREQ | 26.0\% | 24.1\% | 19.1\% | 22.4\% | 8.4\% | 100.0\% |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \% within } \\ & \text { ATTND } \end{aligned}$ | 8.0\% | 7.3\% | 7.4\% | 6.4\% | 3.1\% | 6.5\% |
|  | 3 | Count | 68 | 79 | 32 | 52 | 29 | 260 |
|  |  | \% within <br> FREQ | 26.2\% | 30.4\% | 12.3\% | 20.0\% | 11.2\% | 100.0\% |
|  |  | \% within <br> ATTND | 2.4\% | 2.7\% | 1.4\% | 1.7\% | 1.2\% | 1.9\% |
|  | 4 | Count | 18 | 6 | 10 | 8 | 5 | 47 |
|  |  | \% within <br> FREQ | 38.3\% | 12.8\% | 21.3\% | 17.0\% | 10.6\% | 100.0\% |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \% within } \\ & \text { ATTND } \end{aligned}$ | . $6 \%$ | . $2 \%$ | . $4 \%$ | . $3 \%$ | . $2 \%$ | . $3 \%$ |
|  | 5 | Count | 6 | 4 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 17 |
|  |  | \% within <br> FREQ | 35.3\% | 23.5\% | . $0 \%$ | 35.3\% | 5.9\% | 100.0\% |
|  |  | \% within ATTND | . $2 \%$ | .1\% | . $0 \%$ | . $2 \%$ | . $0 \%$ | .1\% |
|  | 6 | Count | 3 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 6 |
|  |  | \% within <br> FREQ | 50.0\% | 16.7\% | . $0 \%$ | 33.3\% | .0\% | 100.0\% |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \% \text { within } \\ & \text { ATTND } \end{aligned}$ | .1\% | . $0 \%$ | . $0 \%$ | .1\% | . $0 \%$ | . $0 \%$ |
|  | 7 | Count | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
|  |  | \% within <br> FREQ | . $0 \%$ | .0\% | 100.0\% | . $0 \%$ | .0\% | 100.0\% |


|  |  | \% within <br> ATTND | .0\% | .0\% | .0\% | .0\% | . $0 \%$ | . $0 \%$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 9 | Count | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
|  |  | \% within <br> FREQ | . $0 \%$ | 100.0\% | .0\% | . $0 \%$ | . $0 \%$ | 100.0\% |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \% within } \\ & \text { ATTND } \end{aligned}$ | . $0 \%$ | .1\% | . $0 \%$ | . $0 \%$ | . $0 \%$ | . $0 \%$ |
|  | 27 | Count | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
|  |  | \% within <br> FREQ | . $0 \%$ | 100.0\% | . $0 \%$ | . $0 \%$ | . $0 \%$ | 100.0\% |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \% within } \\ & \text { ATTND } \end{aligned}$ | . $0 \%$ | . $0 \%$ | . $0 \%$ | . $0 \%$ | . $0 \%$ | . $0 \%$ |
|  | 57 | Count | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
|  |  | \% within <br> FREQ | . $0 \%$ | 100.0\% | . $0 \%$ | . $0 \%$ | .0\% | 100.0\% |
|  |  | \% within <br> ATTND | . $0 \%$ | . $0 \%$ | .0\% | . $0 \%$ | .0\% | .0\% |
| Total |  | Count | 2855 | 2878 | 2262 | 3051 | 2385 | 13431 |
|  |  | \% within <br> FREQ | 21.3\% | 21.4\% | 16.8\% | 22.7\% | 17.8\% | 100.0\% |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \% within } \\ & \text { ATTND } \end{aligned}$ | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% |

Of the total number of parcels in the District, over $81 \%$ of the parcels do not send students to District schools. Close to $10 \%$ of the District parcels have 1 student enrolled in District schools. The greater frequency of only 1 student enrolled is found in the Avery attendance area ( $25.8 \%$ of parcels with 1 student attending) with Edgar Road following at $24.2 \%$. The Avery attendance area also has the higher frequency of 2 students enrolled in District schools (26.0\%). Bristol and Edgar Road attendance areas follow with $24.1 \%$ and $22.4 \%$ of the total number of parcels with 2 students enrolled, respectively. The numbers of households sending 3 or more students fall off dramatically.

## Summary

The data used in this study support the following observations.

- The 2016 St. Louis County parcel data identifies 346 parcels with multi-family housing which is similar to the finding with the 2015 parcel land use data. More than $56 \%$ of the multi-family housing is located in the Bristol and Hudson attendance areas. The predominant type of housing in the District is single family ( $88.2 \%$ of the parcels in the District).
- Parcels are distributed fairly evenly across District attendance areas with Edgar Road having the larger percentage of parcels.
- Less than $20 \%$ of the parcels in the District are not occupied by property owners ( $18.6 \%$ ). Owner occupied or used parcels comprise $81.3 \%$ of the District parcels.
- Over 31\% of District resident student enrollments are transfer students. The non-transferring resident student enrollment base comprises $65.4 \%$ of District students. There were 145 students from the Normandy/Riverview and VICC programs that were included in the District's resident student base.
- Larger percentages of transferring students were found in the Bristol and Hudson attendance areas, although similar percentages of transferring students were found in all attendance areas.
- There appears to be a pattern related to grade and percentages of transferring students. At the District level, increases in grade seem to be directly related to increasing percentages of transfer students. The relationship was noted in in grades K-6 and 9-12.
- The pattern of increasing percentages of transfer students with increasing grades holds true for grades K-5 across all attendance areas. Middle and high school grades vary in percentages of transfer students.
- Students at address tabulations found close to $10 \%$ of District parcels with 1 student enrolled in the District. Within attendance areas, more than 1 in 4 parcels (households) in the Avery attendance area enroll 1 student in District schools. The percentages in Bristol and Edgar Road follow with $24.1 \%$ and $22.4 \%$, respectively.


## Recommendations for Further Study

The data used in this report were taken from the District's student information system and reflect 2015 resident enrollments. The coding of student transfer status was accomplished in-house. The methods used to code and process these data can be replicated for future school years. The value of these tables will be enhanced as tabulations for additional years are compared. At the very least, this study should be replicated with 2016 enrollment data.

There are other opportunities for data mining that haven't been explored in this report. For example, the main stratifying variable of this study was the District's attendance areas. Other parcel data tied to student records (including property tax assessment data) may prove useful in explaining differences within and between attendance areas. The detailed explanation of data blocks in these tables will hopefully generate ideas for other tables.

## Appendix

Maps


## Webster Groves School District Student Record Geocoding Overlay
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## Letter of Agreement

## Charles Kofron, Ph.D.

June 20, 2016
Sarah Booth Riss, Ed.D.
Superintendent of Schools
Webster Groves School District
400 E. Lockwood Ave.
Webster Groves, MO 63119

## Dear Dr Riss,

Thank you for giving me the opportunity of proposing an update to the enrollment projection model for the Webster Groves School District (District) and a spatial study of transfer student address locations. This is the letter of agreement that authorizes the study.

For the sum of $\$ 1,000$, I propose to do the following:

1. Geocode births for 2015 and add birth counts to the projection model
2. Update enrollment projections based on 2015 birth counts
3. Geocode transfer student address locations
4. Provide a summary report with the results

The District agrees to provide the 2015 birth data in a machine-readable format (Excel file). If the District needs to acquire these data through the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services (MoDHSS), the District will use the same zip code query that was used in the District's benchmark enrollment study for extracting these data. If these data are available through EducationPlus, the District will obtain copies of birth data sets of surrounding Districts. I will extract the birth record data using the original zip codes from these data sets. Both processes will ensure that all District birth records are captured and processed.

The District agrees to provide records of students that transferred to the District which will include complete residential address information and any other data that the District or Board will want to include in the analysis of these data.

The District agrees to provide staff assistance to manually geocode birth and student records that don't match parcel or street centerline data. In addition to locating these addresses in or outside of the District, District staff will identify the attendance area and approximate transfer student residential locations on the District's base map. The District understands that Charles Kofron, Ph.D. has no control over the timing of the release of birth data by the MoDHSS.

The District agrees to release, indemnify and hold harmless Charles Kofron, $\mathrm{Ph} . \mathrm{D}$. and his assigns, from and against all liability for conducting the study and the results, conclusions, interpretations, and any uses of any of the data, graphs, exhibits, or materials that ensue from this study.

Both Charles Kofron, Ph.D. and the District will agree to any additional work in writing.
A typical billing arrangement is for half of the amount to be paid at the beginning of the study. The remaining half of the contract amount will be due when the report is delivered.

If this meets with your expectations, please retum to me a signed copy of this letter.
Sincerely,


Charles Kofron, PhD.
Accepted by:

Sarah Riss, Superintendent

