Tonight’s Agenda

1. Staff Presentation (40 minutes)
   - Context: Theory of Action and prior meetings
   - Interconnected strands of work & team structure
   - Lapkoff & Gobalet Demographic Research, Inc.
   - Potential Policy Changes for 2019-20

2. Public Comment (20 minutes)

3. Board Discussion (40 minutes)

4. Action Items (20 minutes)
   - Board Policy 5111, Admissions; Board Policy 5111.1 District Residency; and Board Policy 5117 Interdistrict Attendance
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<thead>
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</tr>
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<td>Rosina Tong</td>
<td>Executive Director, EPC</td>
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<td>Henry O’Connell</td>
<td>Management Assistant, P&amp;O</td>
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<tr>
<td>Tammi Wong</td>
<td>Sr. Deputy General Counsel &amp; Equity Specialist, Legal Department &amp; Office of Equity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moonhawk Kim</td>
<td>Supervisor of Analytics, RPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norma Ming</td>
<td>Supervisor of Research &amp; Evaluation, RPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karissa Yee Findley</td>
<td>Director, School Portfolio Planning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONTEXT

Theory of Action
Prior Discussions
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.
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 over time.
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.
## Recap of 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. Successful March 2018 assignment runs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the <strong>skills and knowledge needed to complete runs.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore leveraging district SIS <strong>online registration</strong> functionality with</td>
<td>Continues to be a high priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a potential online application pilot for 18-19</td>
<td>Not ready to pilot for 18-19; planning pilot for 2019-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner with <strong>Communications</strong> to strengthen how we communicate with</td>
<td>Redesigned Enrollment Guide; Reduced number of enrollment rounds; EPC &amp; AAPAC partnership; Marketing specialist supporting school marketing;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>families, students, and staff.</td>
<td>EPC counselor to support African American engagement strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shift to a <strong>centralized capacity</strong> setting process that considers enrollment</td>
<td>Cross departmental collaboration: EPC, MPD, SpEd, LEAD, Budget. Budget, HR timelines, and enrollment projections factored into process and discussions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>projections and that’s aligned with Budget and HR practices and timelines.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinate with <strong>transportation</strong> to strengthen how it supports choice as a</td>
<td>Hired Executive Director – starting July 2018. Partnering with Sustainability on Transportation Plan. PAC will provide update at future meeting on discussions with families in Treasure Island.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tactic for reversing the trend of racial isolation.</td>
<td><em>Will discuss further tonight.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Recap 2016-17 Continued

**May 15, 2017**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>The Why Questions</strong></th>
<th><strong>Update</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Why Questions</strong></td>
<td><strong>Update</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 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 <em>residential demographics</em> change over the next 10 years?</td>
<td>Will discuss further tonight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Our choice system increases inequity. <em>Language programs are a specific example of choice distribution.</em> 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?</td>
<td>Will discuss further tonight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Many schools in the Bayview are heavily under-selected. For choice to increase diversity, families need to want those choices. <em>How does the pattern of demand for quality, diversity, and distance vary across different demographic groups in the district?</em></td>
<td>Will discuss further tonight</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Explore the possibility of turning off the **transfer mechanism** for the 2019-20 school year.  
- **Re-envision CTIP1** along with some balancing measures to prevent racial isolation.  
- Will discuss further tonight.
DISCUSSIONS IN 2017-18 SCHOOL YEAR

December 7

❖ 2017-18 Enrollment Data
   • Decrease in # schools with more than 60% of single race/ethnicity;
   • 51% don’t request attendance area school
❖ Enrollment Projections – preliminary findings
❖ Potential Policy Changes for 2019-20 (5 ideas)

February 8

❖ Enrollment Projections – refreshed with 2017-18 data
   • 3,000-8,000 more ES, 1,400-3,000 more MS, and 3,000-5,000 more HS students by 2030
❖ Potential Policy Changes for 2019-20 (5 ideas)
❖ Transportation Plan
❖ Broader Policy Changes
   • Human capital, effective programs, culturally and linguistically responsive instruction, equitable distribution of resources are foundation, and ultimate goal is equity
❖ Asked by Board to explore neighborhood models
Interconnected Strands of Work and Team Structure
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Interconnected Work Streams</th>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Portfolio Planning</td>
<td>Launching</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Schools: Determine Where and When</td>
<td>Launching</td>
<td>SPP + LGDR + SF Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model Neighborhood ES Attendance Areas</td>
<td>Launching</td>
<td>RPA + LGDR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore geographical building blocks with socioeconomic characteristics (CTIP1)</td>
<td>Launching</td>
<td>RPA + LGDR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition of Diversity</td>
<td>Defining</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choice Analysis</td>
<td>Defining</td>
<td>RPA + Stanford, UC Davis, UC Irvine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Defining</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Placement Center</td>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>EPC + Communications</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SFUSD is a **dynamic, vibrant portfolio of diverse learning experiences** that attract all families living in San Francisco by inspiring and equipping **each and every student** with the skills and dispositions needed to define a brighter future for themselves and our community, finding their spark and their voice.

Our mission is to **apply a strategic framework** for planning, problem solving, and decision making around innovative schools, programs and spaces designed to remove inequities and to help bring Vision 2025 to fruition.

**VISION**  Where we want to go/our north star

**MISSION**  Why we exist and what we do

**GOALS**  What we aim to achieve

- A. Prepare for increased enrollment and provide a built environment that allows our students, staff and community to thrive
- B. Create innovative and exciting opportunities for our families that will increase demand across all schools
- C. Codify and apply a coherent planning framework to bring Vision 2025 to fruition
SPP Year 1 Deliverables

1. Create a process for new school development
   a. Internal needs assessment and external community engagement
   b. Implement process for identified Mission Bay site

2. Develop shared vision of School Portfolio Planning

3. Build deeper understanding of current facilities utilization

4. Utilize program placement protocol, as needed
   a. Communicate to LEAD and principals
   b. Adapt for partner programs

5. Build relationship with SF Planning and related parties
1. Determine approximately **where and when the District might need to build new schools** to accommodate enrollment growth.

2. Explore how using **geographical building blocks** with known student and socioeconomic characteristics can help create attendance area boundaries that support the Board’s goal of reversing the trend of racial isolation and the concentration of underserved students in the same schools.

3. Model options for **elementary attendance area boundaries** to support the Board’s exploration of what a local/neighborhood student assignment model might look like:
   - How will **residential demographics** change over the next 10 years?
Definition of Diversity

P5101 Definition of Racial Isolation:
Although the SFUSD enrollment is diverse and does not have a majority group, in CBEDS 2008 twenty five schools had more than 60% of a single racial/ethnic group, ten schools had more than 70% of a single racial/ethnic group, three schools had more than 80% of a single racial/ethnic group, and fifteen schools had more than 60% of a single racial/ethnic group coupled with an Academic Performance of 1, 2, or 3.

This definition is outdated

- No longer use API
- Gone from 25 to 17 schools with more than 60% of a single racial/ethnic group

Staff will develop and recommend new definition for the Board’s consideration
Research Partnerships: Choice Analysis

- **Goal:** To better understand families/students’ preferences, so that we can design schools, programs, staff allocation, and student assignment appropriately.

- **Retrospective (What *have* families/students *chosen*?)**
  - When (which rounds) did families/students participate in the process?
  - Which schools did they rank and in what order?
  - In which schools did they choose to (if any) enroll?

- **Prospective (What *might* families/students *choose*?)**
  - What trade-offs might they make among distance, school quality, programs, demographic composition, and other characteristics?
  - How might their choices change when they receive more information?
Transportation

**Working together, how might we improve services for students and reduce costs?**
SLT Priority 1

*How will Transportation prioritize African American students?*

- Explore the impact current transportation routes and schedules are having on PITCH schools’ ability to create robust, diverse enrollment
- Analyze who currently has access to transportation services, and redesign services as needed to ensure we are providing equitable access to the range of opportunities available

*What does Transportation plan to track to see if this is being implemented with fidelity and having an impact?*

- % of students at PITCH schools receiving transportation services
- % of African American students receiving transportation services

SLT Priority 2

*What systems changes will Transportation implement to achieve/progress/promote organizational clarity?*

- Improve communication with families and schools (e.g., Web, Principals’ Online HB, multilingual guides etc.)
- Upgrade/outsource the technical infrastructure so we can design more efficient routes and schedule
- Partner with SpEd to improve services and reduce costs
- Partner with LEAD + Labor to develop aligned early release + standardize bell schedules
- Strengthen partnership with EPC and Sustainability (align policies)
- Streamline the Field Trip process (in partnership with SNS & LEAD)
SLT Priority 1

How will EPC prioritize African American students?

❖ Market PITCH schools to increase enrollment
❖ Strengthen efforts to inform and engage African American families earlier in the enrollment cycle
❖ Develop and implement strategies that will help create more robust, diverse enrollment and reduce racial isolation

What does EPC plan to track to see if this is being implemented with fidelity and having an impact?

❖ The number of students who request and enroll in PITCH schools
❖ The percent of African American Students who participate in the first round of assignments
❖ The number of racially isolated schools

SLT Priority 2

What systems changes will EPC implement to achieve/progress/promote organizational clarity?

❖ Integrate DES into Synergy (in partnership with DoT)
❖ Pilot an online application form (in partnership with DoT)
❖ Reimagine EPC’s web page (in partnership with Communications)
❖ Maintain content for Principals Online Handbook
❖ Strengthen team’s cultural competency and customer service
❖ Explore new student assignment policy (in partnership with Legal, RPA, Transportation, Sustainability, SPP, Board….)
Team Structure (current)

Strengths
Collaborative Cross Departmental Team
LGDR Inc.
Stanford Partnership
Marketing Specialist, Communications
AAPAC + PAC Partnership

Challenges
With exception of School Portfolio Planning, workstreams do not have dedicated project manager

- Need to reconfigure team structure – membership; % of time dedicated to support work; project leads; charters; project plans; community engagement strategies
Lapkoff & Gobalet
Demographic Research, Inc.
What are the methodologies for drawing neighborhood school boundaries?

Goal = each attendance area’s residents match schools’ capacities

When drawing boundaries, we take into account:

- Students’ residences (current and perhaps past)
- School facilities, with their capacities
- Forecasted students from future housing growth
- Freeways, roads, railroads, and other impediments to access
- Neighborhoods or other geographical areas that can be used as building blocks for attendance areas
- (optional) current elementary attendance areas
Will it be challenging to create diverse attendance areas in SFUSD?

Challenges:

- Current neighborhood ethnic patterns
- Current student transfers reduce diversity
- Identifying which facilities are suitable to be regular, neighborhood schools, as well as capacities; what about city-wide schools?
- Actual or perceived variation in desirability of District’s schools
- New, mixed-income, housing may reduce these challenges
Bayview Hunters Point became more Hispanic and less African American. As in all the neighborhoods, the “Not Known” ethnic category grew substantially.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>2010 Shares</th>
<th>2017 Shares</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>1,179</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Known</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>887</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>-357</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>-105</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2,639</td>
<td>2,997</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Have areas of the City become more/less diverse?

Western SF, 2010-2017

Western SF = Inner & Outer Richmond + GG Park + Sunset + Inner Sunset + Lakeshore + West of Twin Peaks

Hispanic resident counts increased.

The largest “ethnic group” consists of those who declined to state or multiple race (“Not Known”). This makes conclusions about ethnic change difficult.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>2010 Shares</th>
<th>2017 Shares</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Known</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>2,272</td>
<td>1,754</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>3,186</td>
<td>2,207</td>
<td>-979</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-Hispanic White</td>
<td>1,738</td>
<td>1,620</td>
<td>-118</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>731</td>
<td>1,045</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Others</td>
<td>1,519</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>-652</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>-198</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8,042</td>
<td>8,163</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Have areas of the City become more/less diverse?

South Central SF, 2010-2017

South Central SF = Outer Mission + Excelsior + Portola + McLaren Park + Visitacion Valley

Hispanic resident counts increased.

It’s unclear if other ethnic enrollments changed, due to the “Not Known” category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>2010 Shares</th>
<th>2017 Shares</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>1,881</td>
<td>2,070</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>1,689</td>
<td>1,317</td>
<td>-372</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Known</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>939</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>-255</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>-186</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>-242</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-Hispanic White</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>-55</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>5,377</td>
<td>5,206</td>
<td>-171</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Have areas of the City become more/less diverse?

The Mission, 2010-2017

Hispanic resident counts increased.

Not much change in the ethnic composition of the students living in the Mission.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>2010 Shares</th>
<th>2017 Shares</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>1,365</td>
<td>1,367</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Known</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-Hispanic White</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>-117</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>-71</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,030</td>
<td>2,093</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Compared to 2017 enrollment patterns, a neighborhood model (residents) would have:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neutral impact on diversity</th>
<th>Increased Diversity</th>
<th>Mixed impact on diversity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Western SF</strong>*</td>
<td><strong>Bayview Hunters Point</strong></td>
<td><strong>South Central SF</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enrollments</strong></td>
<td><strong>Residents</strong></td>
<td><strong>Enrollments</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacks</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanics</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Others</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Inner & Outer Richmond + GG Park + Sunset + Inner Sunset + Lakeshore + West of Twin Peaks
** Outer Mission + Excelsior + Portola + McLaren Park + Visitacion Valley

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mission</th>
<th><strong>Enrollments</strong></th>
<th><strong>Residents</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blacks</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanics</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Others</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Capacity to Support Local Model

In 2017, not enough space to accommodate all students close to home, particularly in South and East

• Review school capacities?
• Repurpose other facilities?
• Build new schools?
Next Steps

- Continue areas of research suggested here
- Develop priorities for criteria to use when drawing boundary scenarios
- Draft neighborhood boundary scenarios
- Re-examine CTIP1 classification system
Potential Policy Changes for 2019-20 School Year
General Feedback From Staff

- It is not clear any of the proposed changes would bring us closer to the Board’s policy goals
- Even small changes can increase the degree of complexity and amount of time families have to invest understanding the system
- Policy has been modified a number of times since 2010
- Recommend holding off on minor modifications and focusing efforts on workstreams noted above so we can develop a well-articulated policy recommendation
### Specific Feedback From Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher/staff preference for their children</td>
<td>Permanent site-based certificated staff who live in San Francisco and who wish to have their child attend the school where they currently work and have worked full time for at least three years receive a priority in the student assignment system appeals process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTIP1 Update</td>
<td>RPA + LGDR Inc. continue work and report back to the Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBMS preference for Lowell and RASOTA</td>
<td>Hold off on making changes, and fold concepts into larger policy discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay View ES preference for middle schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Mechanism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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
- Confirm Changes by May 2019
- Modify Infrastructure by Oct 2020
- Launch Enrollment October 2020
- Application Deadline January 2021
- Start of School Year August 2021
Next Steps
Next Steps

- Establish schedule for Ad Hoc Committee meetings in 2018-19 SY
- Build the teams needed to support work
- Continue to move strands of work outlined in presentation forward, and report back to Ad Hoc Committee in the fall
Questions and Discussion