Each year, the Board of Education’s Ad Hoc Committee on Student Assignment hosts a series of public working meetings with staff to monitor SFUSD’s student assignment policy.

Current focus: 

Resolution 189-25A1 Developing a Community Based Student Assignment System for SFUSD
Approved by the Board on December 11, 2018

Supporting Materials

Current Student Assignment System
- Video showing how students are assigned to school
- Board Policy governing current system
- Interactive highlights of recent offers

Resolution 189-25A1

Presentations to the Board
- March 18, 2019
- December 4, 2018
- www.sfusd.edu/adhoccommittee
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Notes from March 18 2019

Presentation Topics
1. Round 1 Offers for 2019-20 SY
2. Online Application Form
3. Policy Development Process and Timeline

Board-Staff Discussion
- Definitions: How will we engage the Board?
- Transportation: What’s been done in the past?
- Pilots: Can we do pilots to phase-in/test ideas?
- Timeline: May 2021 too long. Sense of urgency.

Action Items (in process)
- Develop a shorter timeline. Consider trade-offs and pilots.
- Add update on work to promote under enrolled schools to future agenda.
- Share transportation studies with the Board.
Tonight’s Agenda

1. Staff Presentation (45 mins)
   a. Case studies of other districts’ choice/neighborhood systems
   b. Modeling elementary attendance area boundaries
   c. Next steps

2. Public Comment (25 mins)

3. Board Discussion (50 mins)
Case Studies of Choice/Neighborhood Systems

Hannah Lambert
Masters Candidate
Stanford Graduate School of Education
National School Assignment Models: What Can We Learn?

A review of school choice and assignment models from Boston, San Diego, Seattle, and Berkeley
Presentation Objectives

This presentation will:

1. Offer a high-level overview of sample school assignment models
2. Identify obstacles shared by choice districts for consideration
3. Synthesize promising trends across districts of choice
Selection Criteria / Rationale

The following case studies were chosen after conducting a broad initial review of a number of California and national districts of school choice.

The districts emerged as relevant points of comparison given a variety of considerations, such as:

➢ Similarity in size and/or population to SFUSD
➢ Their history relating to school diversity initiatives
➢ Their status as recognized, unique, or exemplar models
➢ The availability of school choice information and data (e.g., policies, assignment results)
➢ Similarity to SFUSD in terms of school choice implementation obstacles

Though the case studies offer a preliminary overview of choice models, the subsequent learnings are not exhaustive.
Boston: Overview

Boston’s model stems from a history of court-ordered busing to desegregate schools.

The most recent school assignment model, which replaces the 25-year-old court-ordered plan, was approved in 2013-2014 and implemented in 2014-2015. Goals of the new model included:

- Promoting access to “quality schools, close to home”
- Reducing transportation costs
- Increasing predictability
- Connecting elementary schools to nearby K-8s and middle schools
- Maintaining diversity created by the former model that relied heavily on busing
Home-Based Assignment Policy (HBAP)

Students receive a customized list of at least six or more schools (up to 14) based on their home address. The list includes:

➢ All schools within a mile from the student’s home
➢ At least four schools considered “high-quality” based on MCAS scores and MCAS growth data
➢ Several citywide options and additional schools with programs for which they are eligible

Elementary schools are connected to middle or K-8 schools that offer a guaranteed “pathway.” In 5th grade, families can choose to continue in the guaranteed seat for 6th grade or participate in HBAP.
Boston: Equity and Diversity

Reports commissioned by BPS suggest that the school assignment model may have exacerbated issues of inequitable access:

- Inequities inherent in the city’s geography continue to limit access to quality schools
  - 80 percent of kindergarten students in wealthier, predominantly white neighborhoods attend a “high-quality” school
  - Only 5 percent of kindergarten students in Mattapan (a predominantly Black neighborhood with high numbers of students who qualify for FRPL) attend a “high-quality” school

- The model has not created neighborhood schools or improved integration, but rather “showed signs of lowering racial and geographic integration across the district”
Boston: Equity and Diversity

**Figure 6-2.** Proportion of kindergarten students receiving their first choice in the lottery under HBAP, by race.

**Figure 6-3.** Proportion of 6th grade students receiving their first choice in the lottery under HBAP, by race.
San Diego Unified School District: Overview

SDUSD views school choice as a way to increase racial integration and reduce inequality in student outcomes (Zau, A. & Betts, J., 2004).

In 2009, the district launched a 12-year accountability and implementation plan called Vision 2020 to carry out their stated mission to graduate students “with the skills, motivation, curiosity and resilience to succeed in their choice of college and career in order to lead and participate in the society of tomorrow.”
SDUSD: School Assignment Model

➢ SDUSD encourages families to consider their neighborhood school first, which are situated within 16 “community clusters” meant to re-emphasize centrality of school site within neighborhood
  ○ Students are automatically enrolled in neighborhood school, unless they choose to participate in the school choice process

➢ Other schools are open to all families in the district, dependent on availability
  ○ Participating families submit an online application during a month long open-enrollment period in October; Assignments are made using a lottery in February

➢ Application allows families to pick up to three schools
  ○ Families must provide reasoning, e.g., a specific program or service at the school

➢ Receive ~10,000 applications annually and pair 70%+ of students with their top picks

➢ 35% of students (>38,000) attend a school other than their assigned neighborhood campus
Voluntary Enrollment Exchange Program (VEEP)

- A result of Carlin vs. Board of Education, which called for SDUSD to desegregate schools
- SDUSD created voluntary busing and established magnet schools to allow students to attend schools outside of their neighborhood
  - Until Prop 209, this was explicitly to encourage non-white student enrollment in schools with primarily white student populations
- Now, transfer criteria is not determined by race, but through established “VEEP-sending” and VEEP-receiving” patterns that are based on students’ geographic residence and availability
  - Transportation is provided to VEEP receiving schools and some magnet schools

School Access: 24 schools have acceptance rate < 14%. Most of the top 10 performing schools serve populations of students from higher socioeconomic backgrounds.
Seattle: Overview

1977: Seattle Public Schools began district-wide efforts to integrate its schools through busing and the development of magnet schools.

1997: SPS ended busing and began utilizing a race-based tiebreaker system to assign spots in high-demand schools.

2007: The Supreme Court ruled that schools across the country could no longer take account of students’ race as a means of maintaining or achieving integration in *Parents Involved In Community Schools v. Seattle School District*.

2009: The case led to new school choice policies nationally, and a new assignment model in Seattle.
Seattle: School Assignment Model

- Guarantees students a spot at their neighborhood school
- Families can apply to another school with space, or to a number of citywide “option” schools
- “GeoZones” give tiebreaker priority for students who live near the school, but outside of its attendance area
- Has undergone multiple revisions in recent years

2018-19, as of 3/30/18

| Total applications                      | 5,478 |
| On-time* applications                  | 5,071 |
| Choice assignments                     | 1,979 |
| Waitlisted students                    | 2,722 |
| Percent assigned                       | 36.1  |
Seattle: Equity and Diversity

➢ The assignment plan resulted in more students attending their neighborhood school.

➢ The plan represents an intentional shift away from emphasizing diversity in schools and towards creating quality schools in every neighborhood.

➢ District officials acknowledge they have changed their thinking on the topic of integrating schools, saying it’s not because they no longer value diversity but that busing became an expense the district can no longer afford (district is facing a $40 million budget shortfall).

➢ SPS has twice adopted and eliminated a director of equity and race relations position and the department along with it.

➢ Schools across the district still face segregated school programming, segregated schools, and discipline disparities.
Berkeley: Overview

- Berkeley has a long history of prioritizing school diversity.
- The BUSD voluntarily integrated its junior high schools in 1954 and all of its elementary schools in 1968, by utilizing two-way bussing.
- This remained in place until the current attendance zone model was begun in 1995.
- At the beginning, racial quotas were used to ensure each school reflected the demographics of the city.
- However, when Proposition 209 was passed, prohibiting schools from determining enrollment based on race, sex or ethnicity, BUSD had to revisit their model.
Berkeley: School Assignment Model

Model: Controlled Choice

The model relies on 448 “planning areas,” or sections of four to eight city blocks, and census data to assign each section a “diversity index” score.

- Scores are based on the racial demographics, the median income level, and the mean adult education level of the planning area.
- A particular student’s information is not the deciding factor

Schools are then divided across three attendance zones, utilizing diversity index scores

- Each school gets the same proportion of students from the diversity index categories.
- Children are assigned to an elementary school in the attendance zone
- There is one district-wide dual immersion school open to all zones
- About 72 percent of families get their first choice of school
- Assignments made by lottery
Berkeley: Equity and Diversity

The Berkeley Unified School District states that it “believes that diversity in [their] student population enriches the educational experiences of students.”

According to their website, BUSD maintains that the diversity in their schools:

➢ Advances educational and occupational aspirations;
➢ Enhances critical thinking skills;
➢ Facilitates the equitable distribution of resources;
➢ Reduces, prevents or eliminates the effects of racial and social isolation;
➢ Encourages positive relationships across racial and economic lines
➢ Fosters a community of tolerance and appreciation of students from diverse backgrounds; and
➢ Promotes participation in a pluralistic society
Promising trends across districts

- Offering a range of programming options across schools that make individual schools attractive to families for different reasons (e.g., language immersion, STEAM, early college, visual and performing arts programs, CTE pathways, etc.). This variation seems to be credited for comparatively satisfactory processes.

- Offering the neighborhood school as an enrollment site for either in-person enrollment or to offer computer stations.

- Offering multiple opportunities to engage with available school options to allow families exposure to a range of schools, to help determine fit, and to help schools be seen as more than scores.

- Considering ways to increase participation in early rounds or otherwise address inequities produced by inconsistent participation across demographics that exacerbate inequities in placement.
Shared hurdles across districts

- Limited amount of “high-quality” schools equitably dispersed across district
  - From the 2012 study on Berkeley:
    - Housing segregation is an obstacle for most large districts
    - “when you look at a [large urban district], which is mostly poor, no matter what, each school is going to be predominantly poor. Really the biggest barrier to integration is district boundaries.”
- Lack of transportation is an obstacle to true choice to be possible for all families
- Students enrolling in earlier rounds are more likely to be assigned to “high-quality” and/or competitive options
  - There are demographic disparities in early round application participation and subsequent placements
- Offering only in-person enrollment, particularly if there is only one center, may limit access for families
- Over-enrollment at some neighborhood schools means students cannot be guaranteed space there
## Comparison of the four models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elementary School Assignment Model</th>
<th>Berkeley</th>
<th>Boston</th>
<th>San Diego</th>
<th>Seattle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Controlled Choice</td>
<td>Home Based Assignment Policy</td>
<td>Neighborhood schools</td>
<td>Initial Assignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope of Choice</td>
<td>Families may apply to any of their 3 zone schools plus 1 citywide option.</td>
<td>Individual choice baskets vary from 6-14 schools.</td>
<td>Families may apply to any 3 schools (neighborhood schools with available space or magnet schools).</td>
<td>Families may apply to any school (neighborhood schools with available space, or citywide options).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographical Constraints</td>
<td>Zones</td>
<td>1 mile radius</td>
<td>Attendance Areas</td>
<td>Attendance Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Goals</td>
<td>● To integrate schools by utilizing (i) parent education level, (ii) parent income level and (iii) race and ethnicity.</td>
<td>● Promoting access to “quality schools, close to home”</td>
<td>SDUSD views school choice as a way to increase racial integration and reduce inequality in student outcomes</td>
<td>● Provide greater predictability for families while still offering opportunities for school choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Reducing transportation costs</td>
<td></td>
<td>● Enable stronger family engagement with schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Increasing predictability</td>
<td></td>
<td>● Provide equitable access to programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Connecting elementary schools to nearby K-8s and middle schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Maintaining diversity created by the former model that relied heavily on busing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Modelling Elementary Attendance Area Boundaries
Motivation for work

Why redraw Elementary School Attendance Areas (ESAA)?
- New housing and new schools
- Opportunity to better meet BP5101 priorities (adopted 10/9/2018):
  1. Reverse trend of **racial isolation** & **concentration of underserved students** in same school.
  2. Provide **equitable access** to range of opportunities offered to students.
  3. Provide **transparency** at every stage of assignment process.
- Note that ESAA boundaries are only one possible lever among many alternatives.
Lapkoff & Gobalet
Demographic Research, Inc.
Shelley Lapkoff, PhD
Jeanne Gobalet, PhD
Context

where SFUSD students currently live
where new housing is expected
1. More students live in the SE portion of the city than the NW.

2. Many students choose to attend schools outside their ESAA.

3. Citywide enrollment is concentrated near Citywide schools (shown in red).

Size of pie: Number of students
Pie slice color: Type of school attended
Where new housing & students are expected

1. Mismatch between where facilities are located and students live, but capacity assumptions affect findings.

2. New housing would worsen the mismatch unless capacity is added.

3. Many citywide schools are in areas with capacity surplus. Changing citywide schools to attendance-area schools will not address capacity shortages.
1. Students are concentrated in lower-income areas.

2. Income is generally correlated with student race/ethnicity. However, Asian students live in both high- and low-income areas.

3. It is difficult to draw diverse ESAAs and contiguous zones because of residential patterns.

Census Bureau estimate of income levels for 2013-17
Exploration: Redrawing Elementary School Attendance Areas (ESAAAs)
Our Task

- Redraw attendance boundaries to improve capacity balance and diversity
- When drawing boundaries, consider all students, including citywide and charter
- For now, assume citywide and charter schools will remain and will have no attendance boundaries
- Study capacity mismatch and diversity, both with and without citywide and charter students

We also explored current choice patterns to help us understand what might happen under a neighborhood model. We found that many students attend neighborhood and citywide schools outside their neighborhood, which complicates matters.
We explored many ways to draw ESAA boundaries, and report on **three scenarios:**

- **Current ESAAs:** We drew these boundaries in 2008—they are based somewhat on neighborhoods and previous ESAA boundaries.

- **Scenario 1:** Features small adjustments to the current ESAAs to reduce the capacity mismatch and to improve diversity to the extent possible, while still considering ease of access (not crossing freeways, etc.)

- **Scenario 2:** Makes some major boundary adjustments to reduce the capacity mismatch and to improve diversity. Ease of access is sometimes sacrificed (freeways, compactness, and walkability not considered in some areas).

We assumed that planned and potential new schools in Mission Bay, Treasure Island, Candlestick, and Hunters Point will accommodate most students from the new housing and did not create attendance areas for them.
What We Discovered

- Current facilities usage patterns do not guarantee every student a seat in their neighborhood school.
- Theoretically, big improvements would result from switching from the current choice system to any neighborhood model. Redrawing attendance boundaries (alone) improves diversity and capacity imbalance only slightly. However,
  - Actual diversity patterns will differ from predictions because students choose/need to (a) enroll in citywide and charter schools and (b) transfer to another neighborhood school if there is room. As a result, our statistics likely overestimate the improvement in diversity under a neighborhood model.
  - A neighborhood model would disproportionately reduce choices for students in the Southeast.
  - New housing in the South Central and Central zones will worsen current capacity shortages there.
Not all students could be guaranteed a seat in their neighborhood school, even when we drew odd-shaped attendance boundaries to reduce the mismatch (Scenario 2).

**Capacity Surplus/Deficit in Current, Scenario 1, & Scenario 2 ESAAs**

**Current ESAAs**

- **Red** = more residents than capacity (deficit)
- **Green** = more capacity than residents (surplus)

All 2017 K-5 residents, but no citywide and charter facilities
Scenario 2 ESAAs

Color shading indicates the current ESAAs; Lines indicate Scenario 2 ESAAs

Better capacity and diversity balance; ease of access limited in some areas
Hypothetical Neighborhood Model more “diverse” than Current Choice System

Comparison of Current Choice System and Hypothetical ESAAs
(Excludes citywide and charter students and schools)

Models Compared
- Test scores
- Race/ethnic mix of ESAA residents (note that about one-quarter of SFUSD students respond Decline to State or Multiple Race)
Neighborhood models affect residents differently by region & by race/ethnicity

- The Southeast has the smallest share of residents attending a school in their region.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>% who stay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest Central</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Central</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Central</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race / Ethnicity</th>
<th>% who stay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declined to state / Other</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Race</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- These #s underestimate the impact of removing choice, since they do not capture within-region transfers.

SFUSD Fall 2017 K-5 students (excluding city-wide schools)
Source: "Matrices 100418 SFUSD Region CTIP.xlsx" from LGDR.
Implications for Capacity

- Modeling a neighborhood system reveals capacity mismatches that are obscured by the current choice model.

- We assume facilities will be added in some area with large housing developments (Treasure Island, Candlestick, Hunters Point). But new South Central housing will increase capacity deficits without an obvious facilities solution.

- Future schools in the Southeast as part of the development plans will be needed to accommodate students from future housing, so those schools are not expected to resolve the current capacity mismatch in the southeast.
Implications for Diversity

- In theory, *any* neighborhood model would reduce racial isolation and the concentration of underserved students.

- Significant redrawing of some attendance boundaries could reduce racial isolation and the concentration of underserved students, as well as reduce the capacity mismatch. However, in some areas access to schools is reduced.

- In practice, some students will still enroll outside their neighborhood, and it is impossible to know and difficult to estimate the effect that future choice will have on the schools’ diversity mix.

- It is difficult to draw ESAAs (or zones) that are diverse because of residential patterns.
Implications for Equity of Choice

- Our work on neighborhood models is necessarily hypothetical because many students will still exercise choice (citywide and charter schools plus intra-district transfers), so accurate prediction of the future student mix under a neighborhood model is impossible.

- Limiting choice will have different impacts by region and race/ethnicity—families in the Southeast are likely to have the greatest reduction in choice because a large share currently choose schools away from their region.
Assumptions about citywide schools?
- Will the programs continue? In their current locations?
- Will future citywide students resemble current ones?

How to prioritize the various criteria we use to draw attendance boundaries? Trade-offs (could vary by location):
- What share of students will be guaranteed a seat at their neighborhood school? What to assume about percentage of SFUSD students who will attend a citywide school?
- Diversity of students assigned to the school (race/ethnicity, test scores?)
- Ease of access to schools
- Possible public reactions to the shape of ESAA boundaries
Appendix

- Maps that show capacity mismatch excluding citywide and charter students and schools
- Additional maps showing socioeconomic variations within the District
- Additional data and map of regions
- Larger versions of slide 37 maps
Next Steps
How Might We....

- Leverage **lessons learned** from other districts?
- Mitigate **space** constraints in the southeast and south central?
- Determine which school **facilities** to consider when developing models?
- Establish school enrollment **capacities** that reflect our evolving ideas about the built environment and Vision 2025 teaching and learning?
- Use **geography** (e.g., proximity, attendance areas, zones, clusters) to help achieve the Board’s goals?
- Develop models that support **diversity** given residential patterns?
- Decide on the extent and type of **choice** to include in models? Which schools should be choice schools and why? How might school clusters help achieve the Board’s goals?
Scope of Work

1. Recommend concrete, measurable definitions:
   a. Quality schools
   b. Equitable access
   c. Diversity
   d. Integrated schools
   e. Neighborhood schools

2. Prioritize the different goals and confirm the theory of action

3. Model and present different options indicating how well each model meets the Board’s goals for student assignment

4. Support extensive community outreach

5. Develop policy recommendation and implementation plan

6. Analyze transportation needs and plans

Outlined in Board Resolution 189-25A1
UPDATES: Round 1 offers; online application; policy development process and timeline
March 18, 2019

RESEARCH: Case studies of Boston, Berkeley, Seattle, and San Diego; elementary school attendance areas
April 15, 2019

UPDATES: African American student recruitment; transportation; policy development process
May 13, 2019

RESEARCH: Predicting family participation in school choice; factors that determine which schools parents choose
September 16, 2019
Questions?
Appendix
Appendix

Maps that show capacity mismatch excluding citywide and charter students and schools

SFUSD K-5 students in neighborhood schools compared to capacity in neighborhood schools
Current ESAAs

With capacity surplus/deficit

Regular students, neighborhood (regular) school capacities

Shows capacity mismatch if current citywide and charter students continue in their schools
Scenario 1
ESAAs

With capacity surplus/deficit

Regular students, neighborhood (regular) school capacities

Shows capacity mismatch if current citywide and charter students continue in their schools
Scenario 2

ESAs

With capacity surplus/deficit

Regular students, neighborhood (regular) school capacities

Shows capacity mismatch if current citywide and charter students continue in their schools
Appendix

Additional maps showing socioeconomic variations within the District
Socioeconomic measure:

Estimated median household income

Pies show SFUSD 2017 TK-5 resident race/ethnic mix

Census tracts
ACS 2013-2017
Socioeconomic measure:
Estimated share of adults with a high school diploma or less
Pies show SFUSD 2017 TK-5 resident race/ethnic mix

Census tracts ACS 2013-17
Percent of Households Below Poverty Level
American Community Survey Estimate 2013-17
with Fall 2017 TK-5 SFUSD student race/ethnic mix

Socioeconomic measure:
Estimated share of households below the poverty level

Pies show SFUSD 2017 TK-5 resident race/ethnic mix

Census tracts
ACS 2013-17
Appendix

Additional Data Table & Map of Regions
Racially isolated schools using the 60% Definition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% Hispanic in 2017-18 in Schools and Hypothetical ESAAs</th>
<th>2017-18 Actuals</th>
<th>Current ESAA, excluding citywide and charter students</th>
<th>Scenario 1, all</th>
<th>Scenario 1, excluding citywide and charter students</th>
<th>Scenario 2, all</th>
<th>Scenario 2, excluding citywide and charter students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chavez</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryant</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanchez</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serra</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flynn</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guadalupe</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moscone</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% Asian in 2017-18 in Schools and Hypothetical ESAAs</th>
<th>2017-18 Actuals</th>
<th>Current ESAA, excluding citywide and charter students</th>
<th>Scenario 1, all</th>
<th>Scenario 1, excluding citywide and charter students</th>
<th>Scenario 2, all</th>
<th>Scenario 2, excluding citywide and charter students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chin</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lau</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevenson</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulloa</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parker</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutro</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Valley</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regions used for some analyses (in addition to ESAAs and Census Tracts)

ESAA = Elementary School Attendance Area
Larger versions of slide 37 maps

(Capacity Surplus/Deficit in Current ESAAs, Scenarios 1 & 2)
Current ESAAs with difference between Fall 2017 TK-5th Grade Resident Counts (attending all schools) and Regular Elementary School Capacities

All students, neighborhood school capacities
SFUSD
Scenario 1 ESAAs with difference between Fall 2017 TK-5th Grade Resident Counts (attending all schools) and Regular Elementary School Capacities

Label:
top # = regular elementary school capacity (including TK)
middle # = number of Fall 2017 TK-5 residents (regular + citywide + charter)
bottom # = percent deficit/surplus

The apparent capacity deficits result, in part, from including citywide and charter students in the resident counts.

MAP LAYERS
- Scenario 1 ESAA
- Highway/Freeway
- Elementary School (TK-5)

Capacity Deficit/Surplus by Scenario 1 ESAA
- >515 to >599
- 500 to >501
- 250 to 500
- 100 to 249
- 0 to 99

All students, neighborhood school capacities

School capacity numbers from SFUSD

LEDR, Inc. rev. 3/25/10 www.DennysMaps.com
Scenario 2 ESAAs with difference between Fall 2017 TK-5th Grade Resident Counts (attending all schools) and Regular Elementary School Capacities

Label:
top # = regular elementary school capacity (including TK)
middle # = number of Fall 2017 TK-5 residents (regular + citywide + charter)
bottom # = percent deficit/surplus

The apparent capacity deficits result, in part, from including citywide and charter students in the resident counts.

MAP LAYERS
- Scenario 2 ESAA
- Highway/Freeway
- Elementary School (TK-5)

Capacity Deficit/Surplus by Scenario 2 ESAA
-500 to -251
-250 to -100
-99 to 99
99 to 249

School capacity numbers from SFUSD

Scenario 2 ESAAs
With capacity surplus/deficit
All students, neighborhood school capacities