



Student Assignment Report

Committee of the Whole

November 28, 2006

Presentation Outline

- ▶ Historical Context
- ▶ Ongoing Review of the Diversity Index Lottery
- ▶ Context for Change
- ▶ Analysis of Current Conditions
- ▶ General Recommendations

Historical Context

Historical Context

SFNAACP v SFUSD filed against SFUSD and State of CA in 1978

- ▶ Consent Decree approved by US District Court in 1983
 - **Optional Enrollment Process – 1983 through 2000-01 SY (17 years)**
 - Students automatically assigned to their attendance area school unless they requested other schools through an Optional Enrollment Form (OER)
 - OER assignments made using a computer random selection process
 - Maximum percent of students for any racial/ethnic group was 45% for non-alternative schools, and 40% for alternative schools

Ho v SFUSD filed against SFUSD and State of CA in 1994

- ▶ 1999 Settlement Agreement
 - **Random computerized process – 2001-02 SY (1 year)**
 - No longer automatically assigned to attendance area school
 - Race not used -- 40% and 45% caps abolished
- ▶ 2001 Settlement Agreement
 - **Diversity Index Lottery – 2002-03 SY to present (5 years)**



Ongoing Review of the Diversity Index Lottery

Ongoing Review of the Diversity Index Lottery

- ▶ 2002-03 SY – Student Assignment Task Force
 - Allow any student that could be assigned to more than one choice to be assigned to their highest choice
- ▶ 2003-04 SY – Student Assignment Task Force
 - Expand the number of schools a family can request on the enrollment application form from five to seven
- ▶ 2004-05 SY – Community Advisory Committee on Student Assignment
 - 13 recommendations submitted to the Board of Education
- ▶ May 2005 to present – Board of Education Review
 - Eliminate *language proficiency* from the Diversity Index Lottery
 - Eliminate *mother's educational background* as a factor from the Diversity Index Lottery and add a factor for *extreme poverty*
 - Increase outreach and recruitment efforts
 - Omega Group to create a geographic database for SFUSD and assist the Board of Education in developing boundary options (Resolution 63-28K22)
 - Planning process to study and develop long-range recommendations related to student enrollment, recruitment, and retention (Resolution 63-14S03)
 - Community Conversations

Context for Change

Context for Change

- ▶ Under the current system, both the number of schools with high concentrations of a single racial/ethnic group and the magnitude of such concentrations have increased since 1999
- ▶ There has been a great deal of discussion in the community about whether the current student assignment process is fair and reasonable for families. In particular, numerous families have complained that the current system does not allow their children to attend schools close to their home.
- ▶ The Board of Education wishes to develop a student assignment method that will:
 - Help close the achievement gap
 - Provide equitable educational opportunities in integrated learning environments, and
 - Sustain and build enrollment

Analysis of Current Conditions

Analysis of Current Conditions

- ▶ The applicant pools are not racial/ethnically diverse
 - 44% (43 schools out of 97) of the applicant pools in Round 1 had more than 45% of one racial/ethnic group
 - 22% (21 schools) had more than 60% of one racial ethnic/group
- ▶ The most requested schools vary widely by race/ethnicity
 - The number one requested elementary school is different for each racial/ethnic group: African American - Drew; Chinese – Lawton; Latino - Buena Vista; Other White – Lilienthal
 - Not one of the six most requested elementary school is common across all racial/ethnic groups
- ▶ The diversity index is not designed to optimize racial/ethnic diversity and it doesn't, especially when the applicant pool already has high concentrations of single racial /ethnic groups requesting specific schools
 - 53% (51 schools) of the offer pools after Round 1 had more than 45% of one racial/ethnic group
 - 17% (16 schools) had more than 60% of one racial/ethnic group

Analysis of Current Conditions

- ▶ African American and Latino students are not participating in Round 1 at the same rate as other racial/ethnic groups
 - At the kindergarten level, 50% (250) of African American students and 32% (317) of Latino students present in CBEDS did not submit an application on time for Round 1, compared to 5% (59) of Chinese students and 15% (69) of Other White students
 - As a result African American and Latino students are less likely to have the opportunity for placement at high demand schools while becoming over-represented in low demand schools
- ▶ The most significant determinants of a student's school assignment are parental choice and school capacity; the greater the ratio of seats to students the greater the chance a student has to get assigned to one of their choices
 - Approximately 21% of schools have more first choice requests than seats available
 - Approximately 19% of schools have fewer total requests than seats available

Analysis of Current Conditions

- ▶ The most requested schools have higher API scores than the least requested schools
- ▶ Schools with a low API are concentrated in the southeast section of the city
- ▶ 17% of students who apply in Round 1 do not become SFUSD students
 - Almost half of the students who do not enroll received their first choice
 - This attrition varies by grade and race/ethnicity
 - 44% of the Round 1 students who do not enroll are entering kindergarten
 - Attrition rates are highest among Other White applicants and lowest among Chinese applicants; 36% of all Other White applicants and 9% of all Chinese applicants in Round 1 choose not to become students
- ▶ Goals and objectives for the transportation infrastructure are not clearly articulated

Analysis of Current Conditions

Attendance Areas

- ▶ Parents are not requesting their attendance area school; less than 30% listed their attendance area as their first choice
- ▶ 29 schools do not have an attendance area; attendance areas were not drawn as new schools opened (e.g., June Jordan, SMSE, Diane Feinstein)
- ▶ A number of attendance area schools have been closed/merged in recent years (e.g., McAteer, Golden Gate, Franklin, Maxwell, Cabrillo, Swett, etc.) and as a result an increasing number of applicants do not have an attendance area school
- ▶ Non-contiguous attendance areas are based on student assignment policies that no longer exist
- ▶ The distinction between 'alternative' schools, for which attendance areas do not exist, and attendance area schools has been blurred over time

General Recommendations

General Recommendations

- ▶ Review and revise the attendance area boundaries
- ▶ Survey parents to better understand family demand patterns
- ▶ Improve outreach to African American and Latino students
- ▶ Change demand patterns for schools that do not attract a diverse pool
 - Project demand patterns for each school and establish recruitment targets for the various racial/ethnic groups
- ▶ Change the demand patterns for undersubscribed schools
 - Design and launch an aggressive recruitment campaign
 - Place high demand programs in low demand schools
- ▶ Improve the quality of schools and programs
 - Create a strong portfolio of rigorous academic program options throughout every neighborhood in the city
 - Target underperforming schools in the south east section of the city
 - Create an infrastructure to develop, implement, and monitor new programs

General Recommendations

- ▶ Increase retention rates among Round 1 applicants
 - Survey parents to understand the needs of applicants who are assigned to schools but do not enroll, particularly incoming kindergartners
- ▶ Create a working group to review the admission process for Lowell and SOTA
- ▶ Create a definition for alternative schools and identify alternative schools
- ▶ Create clearly articulated goals and objectives for transportation
- ▶ Create a working group to explore the possibility of creating a stronger partnership between kindergarten and our Child Development Program
- ▶ Change the name from Diversity Index Lottery to Student Assignment Lottery
- ▶ Systematically define enrollment capacities for all schools