Ad Hoc Committee on Student Assignment

May 15, 2017
Tonight’s Agenda

• Round 1, 2017-18 SY
  – Public Comment (20 minutes)
  – Staff Update (10 minutes)

• Student Assignment Policy (P5101, last revised Aug 2016)
  – Staff Presentation (25 minutes)
  – Public Comment (20 minutes)
  – Board Discussion (40 minutes)
  – Summary of Next Steps (5 minutes)
ROUND 1, MARCH 2017
## Lessons Learned from Round 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lessons Learned</th>
<th>Next Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We need a larger number of staff with the technical skills and knowledge needed to complete assignment runs.</td>
<td>Partner with Department of Technology to create a larger team of people with the skills and knowledge needed to complete runs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper applications are time consuming for families and data entry is significant and time consuming for staff.</td>
<td>Explore leveraging district SIS online registration functionality with a potential online application pilot for the 2018-19 SY.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The complexity of the system generates mistrust from families towards staff and district.</td>
<td>Partner with Communications to strengthen how we communicate with families, students, and staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The transfer mechanism is complex and lacks transparency.</td>
<td>Explore the possibility of turning off the transfer mechanism for the 2019-20 school year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting enrollment capacities is complex and lacks transparency.</td>
<td>Shift to a centralized process that considers enrollment projections and that’s aligned with Budget and HR practices and timelines.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Changes for 2018-19 SY

**Actively communicate** more information about choices to all families

- EPC Placement Counselor to partner with AAALI and AAPAC
- PD to strengthen EPC’s customer service and cultural competency
- Partner with Communications to strengthen how we communicate with families, students, and staff

Explore leveraging district SIS online registration functionality with a **potential online application pilot** for the 2018-19 SY.

Centralize the process for establishing **enrollment capacities**; incorporate enrollment projections and align efforts with Budget and HR practices and timelines.
Modifications for 2019-20 SY

Explore possibility of turning off transfer mechanism.
- Complicated and lacks transparency
- Does it help reverse the trend of racial isolation and the concentration of underserved students in the same school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>% Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Specified</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Indian</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Asian</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decline To State</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or AfrAmerican</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>225</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Modifications for 2019-20 SY

Re-envision **CTIP1** along with some balancing measures to prevent racial isolation.

- What is the demographic profile and what are the choice patterns of families living in CTIP1 and how have these changed over time?

Coordinate with **transportation** to strengthen how it supports choice as a tactic for reversing the trend of racial isolation and concentration of underserved students in the same school.
Staff Presentation

STUDENT ASSIGNMENT POLICY
Introduction

Tonight is the fifth of five meetings scheduled this year.

During transition in leadership goal was to explore topics and hear from internal and external stakeholders.

www.sfusd.edu/adhoccommittee

1. **September 21** – 2008-10 student assignment development process

2. **November 29** – Diversity under current and neighborhood models

3. **January 31** – Special Education and Multilingual Programs

1. **March 8** – African American Parent Advisory Committee

2. **May 15** – Reflect on discussions to date and provide guidance for 2017-18
Why These Topics in 2016-17?

• Diversity under current and neighborhood models
  – Current system is not reversing the trend of racial isolation and the concentration of historically underserved students in the same school
  – Some community members have expressed an interest in more of a neighborhood school system
  – Wanted to explore simpler school assignment models that increase diversity

• Special Education, Multilingual, African American populations
  – Board of Education’s priority policy areas (P20 TL.TL)
    • Lau Action Plan for English Learners
    • African American Achievement and Leadership Initiative
    • Students with Disabilities/Promotion of Inclusive Practices
Context: Board Policy

If SFUSD has:

- a **student assignment system** that is aligned with and supports other initiatives within SFUSD that are designed to create and support diverse enrollments and quality schools in every neighborhood;
- a **human capital** allocation system that ensures quality teaching and instructional leadership and promotes diversity among the faculty at each school;
- strong and **effective programs** that attract a diverse student body and meet the needs of the students within each school;
- professional development focused on **culturally and linguistically responsive instruction** and strategies to support integrated learning environments within each school; and
- an **equitable distribution of resources** designed to promote and support diverse enrollments and quality schools in every neighborhood;

Then SFUSD can:

1. reverse the trend of racial isolation and the concentration of underserved students in the same school;
2. provide equitable access to the range of opportunities available;
3. provide transparency at every stage of the assignment process;

and this will dramatically accelerate the achievement of those who are currently less academically successful, and increase the achievement of already high performing students.
Context: Board’s Goals

1. Facilitate student diversity within the parameters of current law.
2. Work in alignment with other initiatives designed to avoid racial isolation and the concentration of underserved students.
3. Support the strategic use of limited resources to provide PreK-12 program pathways and quality schools in every neighborhood.
4. Provide equitable access to the range of opportunities available.
5. Create robust enrollments in all schools.
6. Be simple, easy to understand, and transparent at every stage.
7. Offer families a degree of predictability.
8. Minimize the degree of effort families must invest.
9. Permit the efficient use of school facilities and transportation.
10. Be cost effective to implement and sustain overtime.
Concerns About Current System

- Many families find the current system time consuming, unpredictable, and difficult to understand.
- Not meeting SFUSD’s longtime goals of reducing racial isolation and improving educational opportunities.
  - Participation in choice varies by racial/ethnic group.
  - Choice assignments do not result in integrated schools because applicant pools are racially isolated.
  - Over 80% of Bayview students go to school outside the Bayview.
- Choice as a tactic to achieve diversity and equitable access can only be successful if the following are true:
  - Schools have high-quality programs that appeal to diverse populations; and
  - Families from all racial/ethnic groups have the same opportunity to understand which schools they like and to submit their choices on-time for the assignment process.

SFUSD and urban districts throughout the country experience similar challenges creating these conditions.
While slightly more diverse than current system, neighborhood schools preserve the segregation of the city and are more socioeconomically segregated than our current model.

— How will residential demographics change over the next 10 years or under a neighborhood schools model?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Neighborhood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under the neighborhood assignment policy, the socio-economic separation of schools—in terms of the percentage of students eligible for free-and-reduced lunch—in the district becomes even starker.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Our choice system increases inequity.
- Choice—meaningful ability to choose—is fundamentally inequitably distributed.
- Language programs are a specific example of choice distribution.
- How do we assign preferences to choices to redress these inequities?

Asian and Hispanic/Latino students make up the majority of all programs.

African-American students constitute a disproportionate minority.
Student Assignment Policy Development: The “Why?” (3/3)

• For choice to increase diversity, families need to want those choices.
  – How does the pattern of demand for quality, diversity, and distance vary across different demographic groups in the district?

Many schools in the Bayview are heavily under-selected.
Student Assignment Policy Development: The “What If?”

Establish **measurable aims:**

- High levels of school **quality** for all students.
  - *How are we defining and measuring school quality?*

- Increase **diversity** and **equity** at all schools.
  - *How are we defining and measuring diversity and disadvantage?*
  - *Racial, socioeconomic, academic? ±10% of district average?*

- Minimize the **distance** students must travel.
  - *What is a reasonable length of time students spend on the road?*
  - *Should we impose a fixed or flexible limit? How much? For whom?*

**What trade-offs** do we make to balance these three separate aims?
Student Assignment Policy Development: How was it done in 2008-2010?

- **Over $500,000** - Hellman Family Foundation, Zellerbach Family Foundation, and US Department of Education
  - *Full time Project Manager, Demographers, Communications Consultants, visits to other Districts*
- **Council of Great City Schools and NAACP Legal Defense & Education Fund** sponsored *qualitative study* at 24 randomly selected schools
- **Legal Counsel** (internal and external)
- **Monthly Board Meetings and Weekly Steering Committee Meetings**
- **Donated Time and Expertise**
  - *Quantitative Research*
    - School Redesign Network at Stanford
    - Researchers from Stanford, Duke, Harvard, MIT, and UC Berkeley
  - *Community Engagement*
    - Parent Advisory Council
    - Parents for Public Schools

- **Set Priorities** (Dec 08–June 09)
- **Explore Options** (July 09-Jan 10)
- **Develop Policy** (Jan-March 10)
- **Build Infrastructure** (March-Oct 10)
- **Launch Enrollment** (Nov 10)
- **Start of School Year** (Aug 11)
Timeline Scenarios

Resource needs and sources to be determined

**Modest Changes to the Current Policy (5 month build)**

- **Confirm Changes by May 2018**
- **Modify Infrastructure by Oct 2018**
- **Launch Enrollment October 2018**
- **Application Deadline January 2019**
- **Start of School Year August 2019**

**Major Policy Change (17 month build)**

- **If policy development process moves quickly**
  - **Confirm Changes by May 2018**
  - **Modify Infrastructure by Oct 2019**
  - **Launch Enrollment October 2019**
  - **Application Deadline January 2020**
  - **Start of School Year August 2020**

- **If policy development needs more time for community engagement**
  - **Confirm Changes by May 2019**
  - **Modify Infrastructure by Oct 2020**
  - **Launch Enrollment October 2020**
  - **Application Deadline January 2021**
  - **Start of School Year August 2021**
Questions and Discussion