Tonight’s Agenda

1. Staff Presentation (40 minutes)
   - Recap discussions from 2016-17 and confirm plan for 2017-18 (5)
   - Review data from the 2017-18 enrollment cycle (10)
   - Explore potential policy changes for 2019-20 and beyond (10)
   - Review preliminary enrollment projections and identify questions for the demographers to explore further (15)

2. Public Comment (20 minutes)

3. Board Discussion (60 minutes)
Recap 2016-17 & Plan for 2017-18
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.
Board’s Student Assignment Policy Goals (P5101)

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.
### Recap 2016-17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>May 15, 2017</th>
<th>Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partner with Department of Technology to create a larger team of people with</td>
<td>Teams and structures fully engaged and actively preparing for March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the skills and knowledge needed to complete runs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore leveraging district SIS online registration functionality with a</td>
<td>Exploring but not ready to pilot in October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>potential online application pilot for 18-19</td>
<td>Continues to be a high priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner with Communications to strengthen how we communicate with</td>
<td>Redesigned Enrollment Guide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>families, students, and staff.</td>
<td>Reduced number of enrollment rounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore the possibility of turning off the transfer mechanism for the</td>
<td>EPC &amp; AAPAC partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-20 school year.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shift to a centralized capacity setting process that considers</td>
<td>Cross departmental collaboration: EPC, MPD, SpEd, LEAD, Budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enrollment projections and that’s aligned with Budget and HR</td>
<td>HR timelines, and enrollment projections factored into process and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>practices and timelines.</td>
<td>discussions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-envision CTIP1 along with some balancing measures to prevent racial</td>
<td>Will discuss further tonight.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>isolation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Recap 2016-17 Continued

### May 15, 2017

**Coordinate with transportation to strengthen how it supports choice as a tactic for reversing the trend of racial isolation.**

**The Why Questions**

- While slightly more diverse than the 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?

- Our choice system increases inequity. Language programs are a specific example of choice distribution. Asian and Hispanic/Latino students make up the majority of all programs; African American students constitute a disproportionate minority. How do we assign preferences to choices to redress these inequities?

- Many schools in the Bayview are heavily under-selected. 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?

### Update

- Launched process to hire Executive Director for Transportation Department. Partnering with Sustainability on Transportation Plan.

- Staff will continue working to bring information to the February 8 and May 3 Ad Hoc Committee meetings.
Educational Placement Center (EPC) should continue working with the Board’s Ad Hoc Committee on Student Assignment to bring a well-articulated policy recommendation to the full Board.
Policy Development Timeline

- **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)
  - 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 process moves quickly**
  - Confirm Changes by May 2019
  - Modify Infrastructure by Oct 2020
  - Launch Enrollment October 2020
  - Application Deadline January 2021
  - Start of School Year August 2021

- **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
Plans for the 2017-18 SY

1. Approve modest policy changes for 2019-20
2. Update the Enrollment Projections
3. Work to develop a well-articulated policy recommendation

- Discuss and Gather Input
  - December 7
  - February 8

- Share and Review Recommendations
  - May 3

- Approve Changes for 2019-20
  - June 12 & 26
2017-18 Enrollment Data
Decrease in # Schools with More Than 60% of Single Race/Ethnicity: 2011 and 2017

- The number of schools with more than 60% of a single racial/ethnic group has declined from 22 to 17 schools since 2011.

- 8 schools no longer have more than 60% of a single race/ethnicity.

See hand out for more details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drew ES</td>
<td>76% African Am</td>
<td>44% African Am</td>
<td>-32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carver ES</td>
<td>70% African Am</td>
<td>43% African Am</td>
<td>-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutro ES</td>
<td>67% Chinese</td>
<td>49% Chinese</td>
<td>-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malcolm X</td>
<td>67% African Am</td>
<td>51% African Am</td>
<td>-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galileo HS</td>
<td>61% Chinese</td>
<td>49% Chinese</td>
<td>-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawton K8</td>
<td>61% Chinese</td>
<td>54% Chinese</td>
<td>-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moscone ES</td>
<td>63% Latino</td>
<td>56% Latino</td>
<td>-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francisco MS</td>
<td>62% Chinese</td>
<td>59% Chinese</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Decrease in # Schools with More Than 60% of Single Race/Ethnicity: 2011 and 2017

- 7 of the schools with more than 60% of a single/racial ethnic group in 2011 have seen a decrease in the %
- 1 school has remained the same
- 9 schools have seen an increase in the % Latino

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parker ES</td>
<td>82% Chinese</td>
<td>65% Chinese</td>
<td>-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chin ES</td>
<td>85% Chinese</td>
<td>72% Chinese</td>
<td>-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevenson ES</td>
<td>73% Chinese</td>
<td>60% Chinese</td>
<td>-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lau ES</td>
<td>83% Chinese</td>
<td>73% Chinese</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulloa ES</td>
<td>71% Chinese</td>
<td>61% Chinese</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryant ES</td>
<td>87% Latino</td>
<td>85% Latino</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall ES</td>
<td>83% Latino</td>
<td>81% Latino</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanchez ES</td>
<td>81% Latino</td>
<td>81% Latino</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland ES</td>
<td>77% Latino</td>
<td>79% Latino</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chavez ES</td>
<td>83% Latino</td>
<td>86% Latino</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serra ES</td>
<td>69% Latino</td>
<td>73% Latino</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revere K-8</td>
<td>59% Latino</td>
<td>65% Latino</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairmount ES</td>
<td>67% Latino</td>
<td>73% Latino</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flynn ES</td>
<td>57% Latino</td>
<td>64% Latino</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BV/ Mann K8</td>
<td>72% Latino</td>
<td>82% Latino</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lick MS</td>
<td>64% Latino</td>
<td>75% Latino</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF Intern'l HS</td>
<td>49% Latino</td>
<td>61% Latino</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Race/Ethnicity of Applicant Pool and October CBEDS Enrollment

- The Round 1 applicant pool and October enrollments are **diverse with no majority group**.

- **Latino** and **Decline to State increased**; all other racial/ethnic groups decreased.

Round 1 March 2017 data
Where Kindergartens Live

- 80% live in one of 13 zip codes

- 36% of all applicants live in south-east:
  - Inner Mission (94110)
  - Bayview (94124)
  - Vis Valley/Sunnydale (94134)
  - Ingelside-Excelsior (94112)

- 15% live in Sunset (94122) and Parkside/Forest Hill (94116)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zip Code</th>
<th>% All K Applicants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>94112</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94110</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94122</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94124</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94134</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94116</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94121</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94118</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94131</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94117</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94115</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94127</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94109</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>80%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Round 1 March 2017 data
The size of applicant pools ranged from 97 to 2,333 requests.

On average, kindergarten applicants had 10 requests:
- Ranged from 1 to 92 requests
- 16% had only 1 request
- 75% had 10 or fewer requests
- 3% had more than 50 requests

There's a direct connection between the size and diversity of the applicant pools and the size and diversity of enrollment; if some applicant pools are small and/or lack diversity, this will be reflected in enrollments.

There are tensions between demand patterns and the opportunity:
- a) for students to receive a choice assignment; and
- b) to create robust enrollment in all our schools.

Round 1 March 2017 data
Kindergarten Tiebreakers

- Tiebreakers are preferences used to place students in a requested school when the number of requests for that school is greater than the number of spaces available.

- Requests can have more than one tiebreaker e.g., a younger sibling might also live in areas of the city with the lowest average test scores (CTIP1).

- About 27% of applicants were younger siblings applying to attend the same school as their older sibling.

- Approximately 15% of applicants lived in CTIP1 - areas of the city with the lowest average test score.

Kindergarten Applicants

- Applicants With the Tiebreaker: 73% (siblings) / 85% (CTIP1)
- Applicants Without the Tiebreaker: 27% (siblings) / 15% (CTIP1)

Round 1 March 2017 data
Kindergarten **Tiebreakers**

15% of requests had at least 1 tiebreaker; 85% had none

3% of requests had Sibling tiebreaker, and 8% had CTIP1

Round 1 March 2017 data
Kindergarten **Requests:** Attendance Area

- The percent of kindergarten applicants requesting their attendance area school as a **first choice** has **declined from 25% to 20%**.

- **2nd or lower choice** has **grown from 23% to 29%**. The transfer mechanism might be a factor.
  - Over 160 applicants ranked their attendance area school as a 10th through 20th choice
  - Over 80 applicants listed it as 21st to 83rd choice

- The number **not requesting** their attendance area school anywhere among their choices **decreased from 52% to 51%**.

Round 1 March 2017 data
CTIP1 Analysis

Note: The race/ethnicity of students who did not enroll in SFUSD is Unknown.
CTIP1 Analysis

- What are the top 3 attendance area schools among applicants with CTIP1 preference?
  - Carver (111 applicants)
  - Moscone (89 applicants)
  - Chavez (58 applicants)

- Top 4 schools requested by CTIP1 applicants as their first choice:
  - Buena Vista/Horace Mann (48 applicants)
  - Marshall (41 applicants)
  - Alvarado and Moscone (40 applicants each)
Kindergarten: % Receiving Choice Consistent Year to Year
Kindergarten: 1st Choice by Race/Ethnicity and Zip Code

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>% Received First Choice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decline to State</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Kinders</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other White</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiethnic</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% Received First Choice: by Zip (Kinder March 2017)

- 94124: 79%
- 94110: 66%
- 94134: 65%
- 94127: 65%
- 94121: 65%
- 94109: 61%
- 94115: 60%
- 94112: 58%
- 94116: 57%
- 94117: 51%
- 94122: 50%
- 94131: 47%
- 94118: 43%
Explore Policy Changes for 2019-20
Policy Development Timeline

**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)
- 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 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
Five Ideas Currently Being Explored

1. Brown Preference for Lowell and RASOTA (new)
2. Middle school preference for elementary schools in Bayview (new)
3. SFUSD Staff Preference (new/change)
4. Transfer mechanism (change)
5. CTIP1 (change)
Brown Preference for Lowell and Ruth Asawa SOTA (New)

Currently

Board Policy 5101: For the high school choice process, students graduating from Willie L. Brown, Jr. MS and who attended WBMS in 6th, 7th, and 8th grade will have a third level preference. [This does not apply to Lowell or RASOTA]

Lowell Admissions- point system based on GPA, standardized test scores, and school recommendations.

SOTA Admissions: Essay, recommendation and audition based admission

Board Suggestion

• Consider a tiebreaker for graduates from Willie Brown Middle School (WBMS) in the admission process for Lowell and RASOTA

Initial Review

• Help promote WBMS as a choice for all middle school students
• Might increase the number of WBMS students applying to Lowell and RASOTA
• Possible strategy to address racial isolation and concentration of underserved students

Policy Considerations

• Which of the Board’s policy goals for student assignment might this help realize? (1) Facilitate diversity; (2) Create robust enrollments in WBMS.
• Would require amendments to the Lowell and RASOTA application and admissions process.
Currently

Board Policy 5101: Students attending the four Bayview elementary schools receive a preference to enroll in Willie L. Brown, Jr. middle school (WBMS)

- **Student Assignment Policy Goal**: Create robust enrollments in WBMS
- Not clear yet about impact

Board Suggestion

- Consider offering all students attending the four Bayview elementary schools a tiebreaker to ANY middle school

Initial Review

- Help promote Bayview elementary schools as a choice for students throughout the city
- Possible strategy to addresses racial isolation and concentration of underserved students

Policy Considerations

- Which of the Board’s policy goals for student assignment might this help realize? (1) Create robust enrollments in the 4 Bayview elementary schools
- Might unintentionally work against the 94124 and Bayview tiebreakers that are intended to help create robust enrollment in WBMS
SFUSD Staff Preference (New/Change)

Currently

Board Resolution 68-22A1 (2006): Permanent site-based staff who live in San Francisco, who have worked full time for SFUSD for at least three years, will be provided a priority in the student assignment appeals process to have their child attend the school where they currently work.

- 11 teachers living in San Francisco submitted family hardship appeal after Round 1
- All appeals approved
- 10 families received school in Round 2
- Consistent with prior years

Board Suggestion

- Consider a teacher preference in student assignment to help recruit and retain teachers

Initial Review

- Might help recruit and retain teachers; hard to quantify; currently less than a dozen appeals; hiring timelines and enrollment timelines vary; preference not same as a guarantee
- Should we be exploring for all staff or just teachers?
- Should it we consider any SFUSD school, or the school where they work?

Policy Considerations

- Which of the Board’s policy goals for student assignment might this help realize?
- Might the Board want to amend the existing Board Resolution to decrease the number of years employed?
- If the Board would like to add a tiebreaker for staff, where should it be ranked among other tiebreakers?
Transfer Mechanism (Current)

- **What**: Mechanism in the student assignment software that swaps assignments after tiebreakers are used. Designed to maximize choice. (Administrative)

- **Policy Goals**:

- **Concerns**: The transfer mechanism is complicated and difficult to understand. It encourages families to list schools they don’t want as a strategy to get a choice school. Not aligned with following policy goals: (1) Provide equitable access to the range of opportunities available. (2) Be simple, easy to understand, and transparent at every stage. (3) Minimize the degree of effort families must invest.

Staff Proposal (Future)

Turn off swapping mechanism in the software on time for the 2019-20 school year.

- Doesn’t require policy change – it’s an administrative feature of the algorithm

- About 10% of Round 1 offers last March were impacted by transfer mechanism. and ⅓ of these students did not enroll in SFUSD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Races</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declined to State</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>477</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The race/ethnicity of students who did not enroll in SFUSD is Unknown.
Census Tract Integration Preference CTIP1 (Current)

- **What:** A tiebreaker in the choice process for students who live in areas of the city with the lowest average test score. About 20% of students live in CTIP1. 68% were African American or Latino when last analysis completed. (Policy)

- **Policy Goals:** Provide equitable access to students in areas of the city with the lowest average test score; help reverse the trend of racial isolation and concentration of historically underserved students in the same school.

- **Concern:** Last updated in 2013. Needs to be updated to reflect current demographic data.

Staff Proposal (Future)

1. Engage demographers to reanalyze CTIP and explore different demographic characteristics that might have a greater impact on the Board’s policy goals (Bring contract to Board for Approval 1/9/18 Regular Board Meeting)

2. Review analysis and share any recommended adjustments with the Board on May 3 2018

3. Submit to Board for approval - First and Second Reading in June 2018

4. Incorporate changes into enrollment materials for the 2019-20 school year
Preliminary Enrollment Projections
(to help inform a well-articulated policy recommendation)
Update of Enrollment Projections
San Francisco Unified School District

Shelley Lapkoff, Ph.D.
Jeanne Gobalet, Ph.D.
Lapkoff & Gobalet Demographic Research, Inc.
December 7, 2017
Purpose of Presentation

- Share preliminary findings
- Build a common understanding of the major components of our forecast model
- Receive feedback on next steps from Committee members
Preliminary Findings

- Major enrollment increases expected from new housing by 2040
  - 3,000 to 7,000 more TK-5 students
  - 1,500 – 3,500 more 6-8 students
  - 2,000 – 5,000 more 9-12 students

- 7,000 – 16,000 more TK-12 students

- Much depends on:
  - What housing is actually built – 88,534 possible units identified, of which 23,099 are below-market-rate housing
  - "Student yields" – the average number of students per housing unit

- Modest enrollment increases expected from existing housing during the next 10 years
  - Stable or slightly increasing elementary enrollments
  - Stable or slightly increasing 6-8 students
  - About 1,000 more 9-12 students
The timing of enrollments from future housing

Projected Enrollments from Major New Housing

Number of Students Projected from New Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The location of enrollments from future housing
# Housing and Student Forecast Through 2040

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Development</th>
<th>All Units</th>
<th>Subsidized Units</th>
<th>Historical Yield Simulation</th>
<th>Modified Yield Simulation</th>
<th>Neighborhood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candlestick</td>
<td>6,225</td>
<td>1,945</td>
<td>1,015</td>
<td>1,858</td>
<td>Bayview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunters Point Shipyard, 1&amp;2</td>
<td>4,768</td>
<td>1,168</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>1,279</td>
<td>Bayview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Park</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>Bayview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transbay</td>
<td>4,919</td>
<td>4,240</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>Financial District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Center District</td>
<td>3,400</td>
<td>3,400</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Financial District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkmerced</td>
<td>5,679</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>878</td>
<td>Lakeshore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market and Octavia</td>
<td>5,646</td>
<td>791</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balboa Park Station</td>
<td>1,780</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pier 70 Area</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>Potrero Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Bay (future units only)</td>
<td>1,738</td>
<td>865</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>736</td>
<td>South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Corridor</td>
<td>11,715</td>
<td>2,343</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>1,523</td>
<td>South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Neighborhoods</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>1,350</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>1,106</td>
<td>South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Rock</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western SOMA</td>
<td>2,900</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rincon Hill</td>
<td>2,685</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM Project</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Is</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,102</td>
<td>2,374</td>
<td>TI/YBI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitacion Valley/Schlage Lock</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>Visitacion Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Hub</td>
<td>2,626</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>325</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of the City</td>
<td>10,180</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>1,106</td>
<td>1,106</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other off-site BMR</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>148</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HOPE SF Projects - excluding replacement units**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Development</th>
<th>All Units</th>
<th>Subsidized Units</th>
<th>Historical Yield Simulation</th>
<th>Modified Yield Simulation</th>
<th>Neighborhood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hunters View</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>Bayview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunnydale</td>
<td>952</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>Visitation Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potrero</td>
<td>998</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>Potrero Hill</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** 88,534 23,099 7,178 15,663
Major Components of Forecast Model

- The amount of future housing growth and the number of students who will live in new units
- Current enrollment by grade, advanced one grade for each forecasted year
- Adjustments for students moving into and out of SFUSD schools
- The numbers of births (they suggest future kindergarten enrollments)
What Housing will Definitely be Built?

- Under construction or entitled
  - Hunters Point
  - Candlestick
  - Park Merced
  - Mission Bay (BMR units)
  - Eastern Neighborhoods, the Hub,
  - Subsidized housing

- Varied status
  - Some projects in Eastern Neighborhoods (delayed)
  - Treasure Island development plan (delayed)
  - Central SoMa (Plan going through adoption)
Student Yields – average number of students per unit (see handout for specifics)

- Yields depend on
  - Number of units that are below-market rate (BMR)
  - Age of housing (which affects price)
  - Whether BMR units are designed for special populations, like seniors
  - Location in city

- Student yields in recently constructed housing:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th># BMR Units</th>
<th>% BMR</th>
<th>K to 5</th>
<th>6 to 8</th>
<th>9 to 12</th>
<th>K to 12</th>
<th>2016 Yield</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stand-alone BMR Housing</td>
<td>1,550</td>
<td>1,545</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusionary Housing</td>
<td>8,192</td>
<td>1,309</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market rate Housing</td>
<td>7,690</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stand-alone, special populations</td>
<td>1,021</td>
<td>1,017</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>18,453</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,871</strong></td>
<td><strong>21%</strong></td>
<td><strong>376</strong></td>
<td><strong>179</strong></td>
<td><strong>199</strong></td>
<td><strong>754</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recent years’ kindergarten enrollments suggest future high school enrollment increases

Because kindergarten cohort sizes have increased in recent years, we expect future high school enrollments to grow.
Actual fall 2016 enrollments compared with our forecasts based on fall 2014 enrollments

- Elementary enrollments are close to forecasts
- Middle and high school enrollments are lower than forecasted
- We still expect high school enrollments to increase during the next decade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2016-17 Enrollments Compared to 2014-15 Forecast</th>
<th>K to 5</th>
<th>6 to 8</th>
<th>9 to 12</th>
<th>K to 12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actual Enrollment</td>
<td>27,757</td>
<td>12,219</td>
<td>17,555</td>
<td>57,531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forecast Using Low Yields</td>
<td>27,698</td>
<td>12,454</td>
<td>18,125</td>
<td>58,277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forecast Using High Yields</td>
<td>28,031</td>
<td>12,620</td>
<td>18,348</td>
<td>58,999</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Difference between Actuals and Forecast

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low Yd Forecast</th>
<th>High Yd Forecast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actual Enrollment</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>-274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Yd Forecast</td>
<td>-235</td>
<td>-401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Yd Forecast</td>
<td>-570</td>
<td>-793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-746</td>
<td>-1,468</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Next Steps

- Continue to monitor housing growth
- Continue to track the number of students living in the new housing, by type of unit, and by neighborhood
- Monitor birth trends
- Monitor migration patterns
- Continue to update and adjust enrollment forecasts
- Monitor any large changes in private school enrollment
- Consider impact of District policies that could positively or negatively affect enrollments
- Others?
Next Steps
Next Steps

- **January 9th Regular Board Meeting**
  - Seek Board approval for contract to engage LGDR to complete CTIP analysis and update projections with 2017-18 data

- **February 8th Ad Hoc Committee on Student Assignment**
  - Share Demographic Analyses and Enrollment Forecasts Report (with 2016-17 data; last updated with 2014-15 SY data)
  - Discuss and gather additional input on modifications for 2019-20 school year
  - Review and discuss staff’s thoughts about broader policy changes and transportation plan

- **May 3rd Ad Hoc Committee on Student Assignment**
  - Share updated Demographic Analyses and Enrollment Forecasts Report with 2017-18 SY data
  - Review and discuss findings and recommendations from CTIP analysis
  - Finalize modifications for the 2019-20 school year that should be forwarded to full Board for approval
  - Discuss and gather input on staff’s recommendations for broader policy changes and transportation plan

- **June 12th and 26th Regular Board Meeting**
  - First and Second Reading of any modifications for the 2019-20 school year forwarded by the Ad Hoc Committee
Questions and Discussion