How Much Capacity Do Public Schools in Kansas REALLY Have?

The Cases of the Wichita, Andover, Auburn-Washburn USD, Shawnee Mission, Blue Valley, and Olathe School Districts

Ben Scafidi
Kennesaw State University
March 2025

Key Takeaways

1) Enrollments in many Kansas public schools have fallen significantly since fall 2019, giving those schools a large amount of capacity in their buildings to enroll out-of-district transfer students.

2) Collectively, the six Kansas districts analyzed in this brief (Wichita, Andover, Auburn-Washburn USD, Shawnee Mission, Blue Valley, and Olathe) have experienced an enrollment decline of 8,455 students between fall 2019 and fall 2024, yet these districts self-reported that they had only had the capacity to serve 2,518 out-of-district transfer students for the 2024-25 academic year.

3) States like Kansas could better enforce open enrollment laws at an extremely low cost by: (a) using the change in enrollment method presented here as a baseline for comparison with districts' self-reports of capacity to serve transfer students who reside outside of district lines; and (b) employing a part-time state auditor who would visit individual public schools to make an independent assessment of building capacity, especially public schools that have a large number of requests for interdistrict transfers relative to their self-reported capacity and public schools that self-report capacity at much lower levels compared to their recent enrollment declines.

4) States could also better enforce open enrollment laws—which would allow thousands more students to have the ability to attend public schools their families deem better for them—by putting monetary penalties in law for districts that underreport building capacity and by defining capacity as "capacity in the building" to serve more students (and not as capacity based on whatever staffing levels districts have, as some districts are currently defining capacity).

5) Wichita Public Schools does not currently report its capacity for out-of-district students for individual schools on its website, but a news report said the district self-reported a total of 455 openings, https://www.ksn.com/news/local/open-enrollment-impact-on-schools-with-declining-enrollment/amp/ . Efforts to obtain this information for individual schools from the district were unsuccessful.

Introduction

With the goal of allowing more students to attend public schools that are better academic and/or social matches for their unique interests and needs, the interdistrict choice law in Kansas is designed to allow families to send their children to K-12 public schools outside of their residentially assigned school district. However, many desirable districts are not actually accepting out-of-district students. These desirable districts, to which many families residing outside district lines would like to send their children, are able to opt out of interdistrict choice by self-reporting that their schools lack capacity.

By claiming their schools do not have capacity to serve out-of-district students, these districts are technically not in violation of state law—**if they are telling the truth**. Thus, the legal and policy issue is:

How can the state of Kansas objectively determine whether these districts, in fact, have capacity?

Given the enrollment declines in most public schools around the nation since fall 2019, public schools that served more children in fall 2019—as compared to today—clearly have capacity. For example, if a given school had a headcount enrollment of 600 in the 2019-20 academic year (AY 2020), but served only 500 students in 2024-25 (AY 2025), that school building has an unused capacity of ***at least*** 100 students. Schools that served more students in the very recent past, clearly have capacity in the present to serve more students, including students who reside outside district lines.

Change in Enrollment Approach to Determining Capacity at Individual Public Schools

To determine the extent to which individual public schools have capacity in the 2024-25 academic year (AY 2025), I use publicly available data from the Kansas State Department of Education (KSDE) on headcount enrollment at each public school.[1] For each public school in the following six Kansas public school districts: Wichita, Andover, Auburn-Washburn USD, Shawnee Mission, Blue Valley, and Olathe, I compare enrollment in the 2019-20 (AY 2020) school year to their enrollment in 2024-25 (AY 2025). I call this method for determining building capacity to serve additional students the "change in enrollment" method, and this method is as follows:

For each school, I start with AY 2020 enrollment and subtract AY 2025 enrollment,

AY 2020 enrollment – AY 2025 enrollment

[1] The headcount enrollment data for each public school in Kansas for AY 2020 and 2025 were retrieved from the Kansas State Department of Education, https://datacentral.ksde.org/report_gen.aspx .

If this difference produces a positive number, the school currently has capacity in its building to serve more students—because it served more students in the recent past. Specifically, if a given school served more students in AY 2020 than in AY 2025, the school building could serve at least that same number of students now. This approach yields an undercount of the true enrollment capacity of individual schools, as those schools may have had extra capacity back in AY 2020. I present a solution for this undercount issue in the next section. If this approach yields a negative number for a given school—the school served more students in 2025 relative to 2020—one cannot use the enrollment method to ascertain whether this school truly has more capacity at present (solution offered in the next section).

In the table below, this "change in enrollment" method for determining building capacity is compared to self-reported capacity figures provided by the school districts themselves.

Measuring AY 2025 Capacity: Change in Enrollment Method Compared to District Self-Reports

	Capacity	
	Change in Enrollment Method	**District Self-Reported**
Wichita	2,636	455
Andover	165	344
Auburn-Washburn	468	0
Shawnee Mission	1,367	1,043
Blue Valley	1,239	86
Olathe	2,580	590
TOTAL	**8,455**	**2,518**

Using the "change in enrollment" method, **across these six districts, there are at least 8,455 open seats in the current academic year (2024-25), but these districts self-reported that they only had capacity for 2,518 out-of-district students.** Olathe Public Schools, for example, has 51 schools, and 40 of these schools served more students in AY 2020 than they currently serve in AY 2025 (thus, 78% of Olathe schools saw enrollment declines). Adding up the unused capacity in these 40 Olathe public schools yields 2,580 open seats. Despite the fact that these 40 Olathe public schools served 2,580 more students just five years ago, the Olathe Public School District self-reported that their schools only had 590 open seats for out-of-district students. Clearly, Olathe public schools could serve ***at least*** 2,580 additional students in the current academic year. The district could likely serve even more than 2,580 additional students in the current academic year, as the district's school buildings likely had at least some excess capacity in AY 2019.

As indicated above, true building capacity should be greater than or equal to the capacity estimate produced by the change in enrollment method—because individual schools may have had capacity in AY 2020, and this capacity to serve more students is not accounted for in the change in enrollment method. As an example, Andover Public Schools self-reports that its schools have more capacity than indicated by the change in enrollment method.

The final pages of this document contain lists of all public schools in each of the six districts and shows capacity measured by the change in enrollment method as compared to the capacity levels self-reported by districts. For example, Blue Valley High School served 1,613 students in 2019-20, but its enrollment fell to 1,434 by 2024-25. If Blue Valley High could serve 1,613 students five years ago, there is no reason they could not do so today. Here, we cannot ascertain whether Blue Valley high has the capacity to serve more than 1,613 students. Thus, Blue Valley high could accept at least 179 students as interdistrict transfers. However, the Blue Valley School District reported that Blue Valley High was at capacity and thus could not serve any additional students—despite the fact that they served 179 more students in the very recent past.

Another example is Indian Hills Elementary in Auburn-Washington. This school saw an enrollment decline of 103 students between AY 2020 and AY 2025, yet the district claims that this school has no capacity to serve out-of-district students! In fact, the tables below show that eight out of nine schools in Auburn-Washington experienced enrollment declines over the past five years, but the district claims that none of their schools have capacity to serve students who live outside of district lines.

The Sentinel has done excellent reporting about several districts' outward hostility to open-enrollment, and their authors Dave Trabert and David Hicks have also noted that districts are self-reporting capacity levels significantly below recent enrollment declines.[2]

Nevertheless, many schools have a self-reported capacity that is higher than the estimate produced by the change in enrollment method, which is to be expected when districts tell the truth about building capacity. For example, Broken Arrow Elementary in the Shawnee Mission School District had an increase in enrollment of 19 students over the past five years, but the district reports that this school has the capacity to serve an additional 21 students.

Data Notes: Aspen Grove Elementary in Blue Valley was opened in the 2023-24 academic year (AY 2024). Between AY 2024 and AY 2025, its enrollment increased. Shawanoe Elementary in Shawnee Mission does not have enrollment data reported on the KSDE website for AY 2025, so I used AY 2024 data to show that its enrollment dropped from 529 students in AY 2020 to 500 in AY 2024. Wichita does not currently have publicly available information on capacity at individual schools for the current academic year.

[2] Please see these two well-reported articles from *The Sentinel*, https://sentinelksmo.org/some-schools-resist-open-enrollment/ and https://sentinelksmo.org/shawnee-county-open-enrollment/ .

Policy and Legal Solutions to Give More Families Access to Better Public Schools

Based on the analysis presented here, I see three extremely low cost policy solutions that states like Kansas could implement to better enforce interdistrict open enrollment laws. Districts would continue to self-report capacity to serve out-of-district students, but these three policy solutions would give districts more of an incentive to truthfully reveal how many out-of-district students they could actually serve. First, states like Kansas with open enrollment laws could easily adopt this objective and easy to understand "change in enrollment" approach to determine how much capacity public schools **REALLY** have, at a minimum, to serve students who reside outside of district lines.

Second, states could physically audit school buildings with the largest differences between requests for interdistrict transfers and districts' self-reported capacity. In Kansas, perhaps a staff person, as part of their job, in the Kansas Legislative Division of Post Audit could be tasked with visiting schools that have more families requesting interdistrict transfers relative to space available (using the approach described here) and make their own determination of how much capacity these schools actually have.[3] It is likely that most, if not all, schools will have more actual capacity than indicated by the change in enrollment method in the tables below. This policy change would permit more Kansas families to enroll their students in the most desirable public schools.

Third, states could physically audit school buildings with the largest differences between the change in enrollment approach and districts' self-reported capacity. That is, this staff person could visit schools that districts claim have no capacity or very little capacity—based on district's self-reports—where the "change in enrollment" method indicates that the school has significant excess capacity.

Taken together, these three extremely low cost policy changes—reporting capacity based on the change in enrollment method and physically auditing buildings to determine capacity in schools with the highest excess demand by families and auditing schools with the largest differences between the change in enrollment method and district self-reports—would give districts a greater incentive to truthfully self-report capacity to serve

---

[3] I would have Legislative Post Audit in Kansas perform these physical audits, because a recent news report indicates that the Kansas State Department of Education does not appear interested in enforcing the state's open enrollment law. Quoting from a July 30, 2024 news story in the *The Beacon Wichita*,

"Districts have the last word on enrollment capacity and whether students are in good standing.

Frank Harwood of the Kansas State Department of Education will conduct open enrollment audits, but his office can't do much beyond passing along statistics to state lawmakers.

'We're just collecting information," Harwood said, "and we'll make a report to the Legislature.'"

https://thebeaconnews.org/stories/2024/07/30/how-the-kansas-open-enrollment-law-is-playing-out-in-wichita-area-schools/

out-of-district students in order to avoid visits from the state auditor. Specifically, districts that have the state auditor visit their schools run the risk of having the state compel them to accept a very large number of interdistrict transfer students. So, better to tell the truth on capacity (or close to it) to avoid an audit.

Based on the analysis in this brief, I also see two legal issues. First, should there be a penalty in law for districts that significantly underreport capacity? District self-reports of capacity would be compared to both the enrollment change method and physical audits when schools are significantly oversubscribed or report significantly less capacity than the enrollment change method. Placing a tangible penalty in law, such as withholding funds, would give districts even more incentive to truthfully tabulate each of their school's capacity.

The second legal issue concerns the definition of "capacity." In this brief, "capacity" means capacity in the building—if the building can physically serve X number of students, then the capacity is X students. However, some (and maybe all) of the districts analyzed here interpret capacity differently. Specifically, several districts analyzed here based their self-reported capacity on their current staffing levels. For example, in their open enrollment policy document, the Shawnee Mission School District states "capacity is determined based on current enrollment, current staffing, enrollment projections, and the district class size guidelines."[4] Thus, districts with policies that base self-reported capacity on current staffing levels—and not on building capacity—will self-report lower student capacity levels relative to the number of students that their school buildings may actually accommodate.

From the standpoint of promoting excellence in public education, building capacity is the better measure of capacity, because if many parents wish to send their children to specific schools across school district lines, it is likely because the school is a better academic and/or social fit for their students than the school that serves their neighborhood. Therefore, if a given public school could physically house 200 more students and Kansas families wish to transfer 200 or more students there, we should want that school to be filled to capacity—so that the largest number of students can make it to the school their parents deem better. If the staffing at that school can only accommodate an additional 50 students, to promote the policy goal of educational excellence, we should want that desirable school to hire more staff to accommodate the additional 150 students, in this example.

Finally, residents of states with open enrollment laws, the education policy communities in these states, and elected officials should discuss and answer these legal questions—hopefully in a manner that is best for students and their families.

---

[4] Shawnee Mission's open enrollment policy is found here: https://go.boarddocs.com/ks/smsd/Board.nsf/files/D48Q56637CC2/$file/OpenEnrollment4-11-1.pdf . Olathe and Blue Valley have similar policies regarding the definition of "capacity." Other districts may have similar definitions as well.

Wichita Public Schools – part 1

(self-reported capacity for individual schools not available from the district)

School Name	AY 2020 Enrollment	AY 2025 Enrollment	"Change in Enrollment" Method for Determining Capacity	Self-Reported Capacity by the District
Adams Elem	481	447	34	
Allen Elem	494	514	-20	
Allison Traditional Magnet Middle	512	536	-24	
Anderson Elem	591	479	112	
Beech Elem	575	540	35	
Benton Elem	325	273	52	
Black Traditional Magnet Elem	378	335	43	
Bostic Traditional Magnet Elem	277	305	-28	
Brooks Magnet Middle School	567	578	-11	
Bryant Opportunity Academy	56	36	20	
Buckner Performing Arts Magnet Elem	353	313	40	
Caldwell Elem	467	465	2	
Cessna Elem	423	356	67	
Chisholm Life Skills Center	92	96	-4	
Chisholm Trail Elem	444	382	62	
Christa McAuliffe Academy	904	829	75	
Cloud Elem	563	578	-15	
Coleman Middle School	494	631	-137	
College Hill Elem	426	379	47	
Colvin Elem	649	571	78	
Curtis Middle School	869	846	23	
Dodge Literacy Magnet	517	548	-31	
Earhart Environ Magnet Elem	431	471	-40	
East High	2323	2438	-115	
Education Imagine Academy	384	566	-182	
Enders STEM and Leadership Magnet	440	509	-69	
Enterprise Elem	458	424	34	
Franklin Elem	346	392	-46	
Gammon Elem	425	450	-25	
Gardiner Elem	498	405	93	
Gordon Parks Academy	410	485	-75	
Griffith Elem	409	372	37	
Hamilton Middle School	658	605	53	
Harry Street Elem	372	310	62	
Heights High	1148	1508	-360	
Horace Mann Dual Language Magnet	588	643	-55	

Wichita Public Schools – part 2

(self-reported capacity for individual schools not available from the district)

School Name	AY 2020 Enrollment	AY 2025 Enrollment	"Change in Enrollment" Method for Determining Capacity	Self-Reported Capacity by the District
Hyde Intl Studies/Commun Elem Magnet	297	260	37	
Irving Elementary	394	447	-53	
Isely Traditional Magnet Elem	552	622	-70	
Jackson Elementary	413	337	76	
Jefferson Elem	454	381	73	
Kelly Liberal Arts Academy	438	429	9	
Kensler Elem	515	489	26	
Lawrence Elem	441	394	47	
Levy Sp Ed Center	74	81	-7	
Linwood Elementary	489	452	37	
L'Ouverture Computer Technology Magnet	305	232	73	
Marshall Middle School	544	599	-55	
Mayberry Cultural and Fine Arts Magnet Middle	651	623	28	
McCollom Elem	408	288	120	
McLean Science/Tech Magnet Elem	265	262	3	
Mead Middle School	544	681	-137	
Minneha Core Knowledge Elem	629	645	-16	
Mueller Aerospace/Engineering Discovery Magnet	428	304	124	
North High	2115	2041	74	
Northeast Magnet High School	718	686	32	
Northwest High	1233	1425	-192	
O K Elem	348	261	87	
Ortiz Elementary School	350	323	27	
Peterson Elem	444	321	123	
Pleasant Valley Elem	345	307	38	
Pleasant Valley Middle School	646	760	-114	
Price-Harris Communications Magnet	404	477	-73	
Riverside Leadership Magnet Elem	251	255	-4	
Robinson Middle School	806	682	124	
Seltzer Elem	545	494	51	
South High	1739	1663	76	
Southeast High	1984	2067	-83	

Wichita Public Schools – part 3

(self-reported capacity for individual schools not available from the district)

School Name	AY 2020 Enrollment	AY 2025 Enrollment	"Change in Enrollment" Method for Determining Capacity	Self-Reported Capacity by the District
Sowers Alternative High School	84	61	23	
Spaght Multimedia Magnet	469	480	-11	
Stanley Elem	456	439	17	
Stucky Middle School	597	518	79	
Truesdell Middle School	1038	924	114	
Washington Accelerated Learning Elem	525	470	55	
Wells Alternative Middle School	46	36	10	
West High	1307	1307	0	
White Elem	480	413	67	
Wichita Alternative High	103	133	-30	
Wilbur Middle School	837	822	15	
Woodland Health / Wellness Magnet Elem	325	347	-22	
Woodman Elem	616	614	2	

Andover Public Schools

School Name	AY 2020 Enrollment	AY 2025 Enrollment	"Change in Enrollment" Method for Determining Capacity	Self-Reported Capacity by the District
Andover Central High School	876	886	-10	23
Andover Central Middle School	628	642	-14	36
Andover eCademy	3540	3815	-275	
Andover High	959	1019	-60	16
Andover Middle School	738	773	-35	0
Cottonwood Elementary	438	388	50	40
Meadowlark Elementary	299	372	-73	60
Prairie Creek Elementary	366	401	-35	41
Robert M. Martin Elementary	534	480	54	44
Sunflower Elementary School	417	367	50	52
Wheatland Elementary	454	443	11	32

Auburn-Washburn Public Schools

School Name	AY 2020 Enrollment	AY 2025 Enrollment	"Change in Enrollment" Method for Determining Capacity	Self-Reported Capacity by the District
Auburn Elementary	425	331	94	0
Farley Elementary	591	585	6	0
Indian Hills Elementary	543	440	103	0
Jay Shideler Elementary	580	492	88	0
Pauline Central Primary	428	406	22	0
Pauline South Intermediate	318	277	41	0
Wanamaker Elem	503	473	30	0
Washburn Rural High	1962	1878	84	0
Washburn Rural Middle School	962	967	-5	0

Shawnee Mission School District, part 1

School Name	AY 2020 Enrollment	AY 2025 Enrollment	"Change in Enrollment" Method for Determining Capacity	Self-Reported Capacity by the District
Apache Elem	574	526	48	21
Belinder Elem	503	489	14	0
Bluejacket-Flint	423	387	36	75
Briarwood Elem	619	674	-55	0
Broken Arrow Elem	362	381	-19	21
Brookridge Elem	583	547	36	0
Brookwood Elem	425	437	-12	34
Christa McAuliffe Elem	425	400	25	58
Comanche Elem	430	363	67	23
Corinth Elem	562	576	-14	0
Crestview Elem	395	373	22	44
East Antioch Elem	336	282	54	34
Highlands Elem	352	334	18	0
Hocker Grove Middle	763	714	49	6
Indian Hills Middle	863	879	-16	0
Indian Woods Middle	778	809	-31	0
John Diemer Elem	398	427	-29	44
Lenexa Hills Elementary	269	285	-16	19
Merriam Park Elementary	466	405	61	41
Mill Creek Elem	528	495	33	27

Shawnee Mission School District, part 2

School Name	AY 2020 Enrollment	AY 2025 Enrollment	"Change in Enrollment" Method for Determining Capacity	Self-Reported Capacity by the District
Nieman Elem	463	451	12	39
Oak Park-Carpenter Elementary	543	480	63	1
Overland Park Elem	448	391	57	27
Pawnee Elem	455	374	81	51
Prairie Elem	445	446	-1	0
Ray Marsh Elem	533	458	75	41
Rhein Benninghoven Elem	471	400	71	36
Rising Star Elem	469	468	1	51
Roesland Elem	357	341	16	36
Rosehill Elem	545	468	77	22
Rushton Elem	326	332	-6	35
Santa Fe Trail Elem	295	307	-12	25
Shawanoe Elem	529	500*	29	4
Shawnee Mission East High	1780	1738	42	12
Shawnee Mission North High	1568	1502	66	42
Shawnee Mission Northwest High	1655	1600	55	30
Shawnee Mission South High	1523	1576	-53	8
Shawnee Mission West High	1656	1599	57	32
Sunflower Elem	363	390	-27	24
Tomahawk Elem	292	278	14	0
Trailridge Middle	782	752	30	13
Trailwood Elem	465	402	63	66
Westridge Middle	858	763	95	5
Westwood View Elem	304	321	-17	0

* AY 2024 enrollment; AY 2025 enrollment not present in KSDE data

Blue Valley School District

School Name	AY 2020 Enrollment	AY 2025 Enrollment	"Change in Enrollment" Method for Determining Capacity	Self-Reported Capacity by the District
Aspen Grove Elem	114 (AY 24)	163	-49	46
Aubry Bend Middle School	750	792	-42	0
Blue River Elementary	468	472	-4	0
Blue Valley High	1613	1434	179	0
Blue Valley Middle	611	594	17	0
Blue Valley North High	1519	1406	113	0
Blue Valley Northwest High	1639	1582	57	0
Blue Valley Southwest High School	1111	1086	25	40
Blue Valley West High	1590	1654	-64	0
Cedar Hills Elementary	649	587	62	0
Cottonwood Point Elementary	405	352	53	0
Harmony Elementary	546	562	-16	0
Harmony Middle	555	536	19	0
Heartland Elementary	401	412	-11	0
Indian Valley Elementary	365	431	-66	0
Lakewood Elementary	616	456	160	0
Lakewood Middle	598	538	60	0
Leawood Elementary	551	533	18	0
Leawood Middle	513	493	20	0
Liberty View Elementary	436	430	6	0
Mission Trail Elementary	410	384	26	0
Morse Elementary	387	338	49	0
Oak Hill Elementary	419	491	-72	0
Overland Trail Elementary	595	531	64	0
Overland Trail Middle	593	540	53	0
Oxford Middle	571	620	-49	0
Pleasant Ridge Middle	598	581	17	0
Prairie Star Elementary	374	371	3	0
Prairie Star Middle	470	438	32	0
Stanley Elementary	521	520	1	0
Stilwell Elementary	231	266	-35	0
Sunrise Point Elementary	406	476	-70	0
Sunset Ridge Elementary	443	380	63	0
Timber Creek Elementary School	623	566	57	0
Valley Park Elementary	634	549	85	0
Wolf Springs Elementary School	452	523	-71	0

Olathe Public Schools – part 1

School Name	AY 2020 Enrollment	AY 2025 Enrollment	"Change in Enrollment" Method for Determining Capacity	Self-Reported Capacity by the District
Arbor Creek Elementary	386	336	50	19
Bentwood Elem	323	360	-37	12
Black Bob Elem	283	354	-71	0
Briarwood Elem	378	304	74	6
Brougham Elem	312	289	23	14
California Trail Middle School	673	584	89	13
Canyon Creek Elementary	304	450	-146	13
Cedar Creek Elem	428	370	58	0
Central Elem	266	248	18	0
Chisholm Trail Middle School	750	570	180	22
Clearwater Creek Elementary	540	520	20	0
Countryside Elementary	349	344	5	13
Fairview Elem	284	233	51	9
Forest View Elem	518	410	108	16
Frontier Trail Middle School	772	693	79	21
Green Springs Elem	293	235	58	10
Havencroft Elem	305	257	48	0
Heatherstone Elem	450	337	113	20
Heritage Elementary	368	326	42	11
Indian Creek Elem	369	337	32	12
Indian Trail Middle School	662	582	80	18
Madison Place Elementary	438	377	61	11
Mahaffie Elem	419	430	-11	24
Manchester Park Elementary	559	616	-57	0
Meadow Lane Elem	409	347	62	4
Millbrooke Elementary	435	365	70	4
Mission Trail Middle School	795	680	115	7
Northview Elem	271	217	54	11
Olathe East Sr High	1937	1844	93	48
Olathe North Sr High	2138	2012	126	0
Olathe Northwest High School	1883	1958	-75	0
Olathe South Sr High	2007	1778	229	37
Olathe West High School	1540	1557	-17	0

Olathe Public Schools – part 2

School Name	AY 2020 Enrollment	AY 2025 Enrollment	"Change in Enrollment" Method for Determining Capacity	Self-Reported Capacity by the District
Oregon Trail Middle School	702	632	70	0
Pioneer Trail Middle School	673	617	56	1
Pleasant Ridge Elem	307	298	9	8
Prairie Center Elem	369	357	12	15
Prairie Trail Middle School	649	709	-60	0
Ravenwood Elementary	484	414	70	18
Regency Place Elementary	409	433	-24	14
Ridgeview Elem	248	244	4	19
Rolling Ridge Elem	433	346	87	26
Santa Fe Trail Middle School	733	623	110	12
Scarborough Elem	325	299	26	10
Summit Trail Middle School	595	577	18	25
Sunnyside Elementary School	375	316	59	5
Tomahawk Elem	294	344	-50	7
Walnut Grove Elem	373	385	-12	10
Washington Elem	444	377	67	0
Westview Elem	173	159	14	24
Woodland Elem	343	303	40	21