PREFACE

The purpose of this report is to help the Board of Education of the San Francisco Unified School District (the Board) monitor its student assignment policy. In March 2010 the Board unanimously approved a new student assignment policy (Policy P5101), and this policy calls on SFUSD staff to present the Board with an annual report on the student assignment system.

Since this is the first annual report we have analyzed a great deal of data and explored many different questions. It may not be possible to include this level of analysis in future years given the time and resources required to generate this report. Future reports will narrow the scope of analysis and focus on questions specifically identified as most critical to evaluating the Board’s student assignment policy.

This report is respectfully submitted to Carlos Garcia, Superintendent of Schools, San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD), by the following SFUSD staff who worked together to develop the report:

- Tomas Beccar Varela, Education Integration Specialist, Educational Placement Center
- Arcadio Fokin, Director, Educational Placement Center
- Chris Frazier, Senior Programmer, ITD
- Hans Gong, Education Integration Specialist, Educational Placement Center
- Jack Huang, Senior Business Analyst, ITD
- Darlene Lim, Executive Director, Educational Placement Center
- Orla O’Keeffe, Special Assistant to the Superintendent
- Alana Ramirez, Operations Manager, Educational Placement Center
- Kevin Rocap, Executive Director, School Improvement Grant

The Superintendent convened a group of advisors to help monitor the Board’s student assignment policy:

- Prudence L. Carter, Associate Professor of Education & (by courtesy) Sociology at Stanford University;
- Michal Kurlaender, Associate Professor of Education at UC Davis; and
- Sean F. Reardon, Professor of Education at Stanford University.

The Superintendent and his staff are very grateful for the time and effort the advisors are voluntarily donating to this work. The advisors will review this annual report and they will share their thoughts about key findings in this report with the Superintendent.
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

In March 2010 the Board approved a new student assignment policy (P5101) designed to be flexible so it can be monitored and adjusted if it is not facilitating the Board’s priorities for student assignment. Student assignment is intended to work in alignment with other District initiatives designed to:

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

2011-12 is the first school year students were enrolled under the new student assignment policy, and this report is intended to help the Board evaluate how well the policy is achieving its intended goals by exploring a number of different questions.

Questions Explored

1. School Improvement - What progress have we made towards placing high quality academic opportunities at schools with high concentrations of underserved students?

Superintendent Carlos Garcia created the Superintendent’s Zone as a call to action in 2010. Although the San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD) is the highest achieving urban school district in California we have not been able to achieve equitable results for ALL of our students, echoing the national failure to adequately serve historically-identified underserved groups of children. The formation of the Superintendent’s Zone seeks to disrupt this predictive power of demographics, to promote success regardless of race, language, ethnicity, economic status, special education status or neighborhood.

The Superintendent’s Zone is a reorganization of services and supports for fourteen chronically underserved schools mostly concentrated in the Mission and Bayview Districts under Area Teams to better coordinate between district departments.

The litmus test of Superintendent’s Zone success are demonstrable improvements in school climates, instructional rigor, student/family engagement, provision of comprehensive services, effective and focused district and community partnerships, and, most importantly, improved child academic outcomes leading to higher graduation rates of students who are fully college- and career-ready.

Based on the administration of California Achievement Tests (including STAR and CAHSEE) at the end of the 2010-11 year, SFUSD identified seven schools for “notable growth” in their Academic Performance Index (API). Five of those seven schools were Superintendent’s Zone schools: John Muir ES, Everett MS, Horace Mann MS, Thurgood Marshall HS and Mission HS, with double-digit growth in API scores ranging from 15 points to a high of 54 points of growth.

Many other Superintendent Zone schools made significant improvement in standardized tests scores. It is the purpose of the Superintendent’s Zone to support and grow those reforms that support such a trajectory of success, and not only with regard to test scores, but as well with regard to a range of indicators of academic proficiency and success and of child, family and community health, wellness and well-being.
2. Racial Isolation - To what degree is the new student assignment system reversing the trend of racial isolation and the concentration of underserved students in the same school?

While SFUSD’s overall applicant pool is diverse, requests for schools vary by racial/ethnic group, and as a result many schools have segregated applicant pools. There is also great variation in demand for our schools, which means some schools have very large applicant pools and others have small applicant pools. This constrains the student assignment system's ability to facilitate diverse enrollments.

To get a better understanding of what is important to families when choosing schools, we have included a family survey on the 2012-13 application form. We hope the information we gather from families via this survey will shed light on why there are differences in demand and what might be involved in changing current choice patterns to create more diverse applicant pools for schools.

There were some changes to the racial/ethnic diversity of last year’s entering grade (K/6/9) compared with this year’s entering grade at schools with more than 60% of a single racial/ethnic group:

- Galileo decreased the percent of the majority group below 60%; in 2010-11 60% of 9th graders were Chinese, and in 2011-12 55% were Chinese.
- Malcolm X and Serra increased the percent of the majority group above 60%. Malcolm X’s kindergarten class increased from 54% African American to 71% African American in 2011-12. Its kindergarten enrollment also grew – from 13 to 31 students. Serra’s kindergarten class increased from 59% Latino to 78% Latino in 2011-12.
- The largest racial/ethnic group for entering grades increased at 14 schools and decreased at eight schools.

There are geographically distinct patterns for the racial/ethnic composition of students enrolled in and applying to schools. In some cases the racial/ethnic composition of a school’s attendance areas is more diverse than its enrollment, and in other cases the reverse is true - the racial/ethnic composition of a school’s enrollment is more diverse than its attendance area. While the diversity of kindergartner students enrolled in a school is generally similar to the diversity of the students who requested the school, there are instances where this is not the case.

- Harte, El Dorado, Carver, Rooftop, Alvarado, and Muir’s kindergarten enrollments are more diverse than the students who requested the school.
- Marshall, Stevenson, Lawton, and Sutro’s applicant pools are more diverse than their enrollment.

The number of schools with more than 60% of a single racial/ethnic group declined from 28 to 24 between the 2008-09 and 2011-12. However, between 2010-11 and 2011-12 the number increased from 23 to 24, with three schools surpassing 60% and one falling below 60%. In 2011-12:

- Brown middle school was closed;
- Buena Vista ES and Mann MS were merged into Buena Vista/Mann K8;
- O’Connell’s enrollment dropped below 60% Latino (high school);
- Francisco’s enrollment grew to more than 60% Chinese (middle school);
- Lawton’s enrollment grew to more than 60% Chinese (K8 school); and
- Moscone’s enrollment grew to more than 60% Latino (K5 schools).
The majority of schools with an enrollment of more than 60% of a single racial/ethnic group are elementary schools, and 75% of the schools (18 out of 24) offer a language pathway that reserves seats for students who speak the target language.

Overall, the percent of students enrolled in schools with more than 60% of a single racial/ethnic group decreased from 23% to 20% between 2008 and 2011. However, between 2010-11 and 2011-12 the overall percent rose from 18% to 20% of students.

- The percent of African American students enrolled in a school with more than 60% of a single racial/ethnic group decreased 7% between 2008-09 and 2011-12 (from 24% to 17%); this downward trend continued through the 2011-12 school year.
- The percent of Latino students enrolled in a school with more than 60% of a single racial/ethnic group decreased 5% (from 32% to 27%); this downward trend flattened out in 2011-12, remaining at 27%.
- The percent of Chinese students enrolled in a school with more than 60% of a single racial/ethnic group decreased 3% between 2008-09 and 2011-12 (from 27% to 24%); however it increased 5% between 2010-11 and 2011-12 (from 18% to 24%).

Note: Achievement data for the first cohort of students assigned to schools under the Board Policy P5101 will not be available until next year. Therefore this report cannot explore how the distribution of students among schools and programs under the new student assignment system affects academic outcomes.

3. Tie-Breakers - How would placing the attendance area tie-breaker before the low test score area tie-breaker have changed the March 2011 kindergarten assignments?

The current student assignment system places students in their highest ranked request as long as there is space. If there are more requests for a school than openings, the student assignment system sorts all requests using a series of preferences, called tie-breakers, to assign applicants to schools.

For elementary schools there is a tie-breaker for students who live in areas of the city with the lowest average test scores (CTIP1), and there is also a tie-breaker that gives preference to requests from students who live in the attendance area of the requested school. Board policy P5101 places the attendance area tie-breaker immediately after the tie-breaker for students who live in areas of the city with the lowest average test scores. SFUSD staff simulated a run that changed the order of these tie-breakers for kindergarten to evaluate the impact it would have had on the March 2011 run.

In general, the number of students living in CTIP1 assigned to schools with an API of 1, 2, or 3 and more than 60% of a single race/ethnicity increased in the simulation. Otherwise, the outcome of the simulation was similar to the March 2011 run:

- 22% of students were assigned to a school with more than 60% of a single race/ethnicity in both the actual run and the simulation;
- 57% got their first choice in the actual run in March, and 56% received their first choice in the simulation;
- 81% got assigned to one of their choices in the actual run in March, and 82% got a choice in the simulation that placed the attendance area before the low-test score area.
4. Areas of the City with the Lowest Average Test Scores (CTIP1) - What are the demographics, choice patterns, and enrollment patterns for students who live in areas of the city with the lowest average test scores (CTIP1)?

In December 2010, Lapkoff & Gobalet Demographic Research Inc. identified areas of the city with the lowest average test scores. They computed the average 2006-2009 CST English Language Arts score for each combined Census Tract, using records for 144,830 K-12 students. They adjusted the quintiles slightly to spread numbers of K-12 students across the quintiles fairly evenly (approximately 20 percent of students per quintile). They then gave students in the lowest quintile a CTIP score of 1.

An exploration of requests patterns for students living in CTIP1 revealed that:

- schools for which applicant pools have the greatest percent of CTIP1 residents are located in or near CTIP1 areas - a small percent of the applicant pools for schools on the west side are from CTIP1 residents; and
- the racial/ethnic diversity of requests from CTIP1 residents varies by geography.

The findings are similar for the enrollment patterns of students living in CTIP1 areas; schools with the greatest percent of CTIP1 residents enrolled in them are located in or near CTIP1 areas.

SFUSD will review assessment data and refresh CTIP1 at intervals to be determined. This review will be done in consultation with the Superintendent’s advisors, and based on feedback received from the Board once they have reviewed the information provided in this report.

5. Designations, Waiting Pools, Inter-District Assignments - To what extent do designations, waiting pools, and inter-district assignments affect enrollment?

91% of K/6/9 students enrolled in an SFUSD school in October 2011 are enrolled in a school they requested. This means the diversity of enrollment can be attributed in large part to choice patterns.

6. Demographics of Enrollment - To what extent did the demographics of enrollment change between the March 2011 offers and October 2011 enrollment?

The demographics of enrollment changed between the March 2011 offers and October 2011 enrollment. The number of K/6/9 students enrolled in a school in October 2011 was 15% smaller than the number who received an offer in March 2011.

While all racial/ethnic groups decreased, the largest was a 32% decrease in the number of Whites who received an offer in March 2011 compared with the number enrolled in October 2011.

For many schools with more than 60% of a single racial/ethnic group and an API of 1, 2, or 3, kindergarten enrollment in October 2011 was smaller with a greater concentration of a single racial/ethnic group compared with the March 2011 offers.
7. Participation Rate: On-Time and Late Applicants - What percent of K/6/9 applicants submitted an application on-time? How does this vary by student demographics and by geography?

92% of all K/6/9 applicants submitted their enrollment application by the first deadline and 8% submitted their application late. Participation in our choice process varies by racial/ethnic group; on-time participation rates for African American and Latino applicants is low compared with Chinese and White applicants.

The participation rates for African Americans and Latinos increased in 2011: 80% of African American and 90% of Latino applicants submitted their application on-time in 2011 compared with 76% and 87% in 2010. Despite this improvement, the percent of African Americans submitting their application late is significantly higher than all other racial/ethnic groups; it is twice as high as the rate for Latinos, five times the rate for White, and almost seven times the rate for Chinese applicants.

Using choice as a tactic to achieve diversity and equitable access requires families from all racial/ethnic groups to have the same opportunity to understand which schools they like and to submit their choices on-time for the assignment process. Creating these conditions is challenging; it requires significant effort from families, and it also requires districts and communities to invest resources (people, time, money) to develop and support effective outreach and recruitment efforts.

8. Choice Assignments – How many K/6/9 applicants got assigned to a school of their choice? How does this vary by race/ethnicity and by geography?

Overall 85% of K/6/9 applicants got assigned to one of their choices, and 15% got assigned to a school they did not request (i.e., a designated assignment). 63% got their first choice, and 80% got their first, second, or third choice.

Students who request high demand schools are less likely to receive one of their choices than students who request schools with smaller applicant pools, and students living in areas of the city with the lowest average test scores are more likely to get assigned to one of their choices than students in other areas of the city.

9. Attendance Area Boundaries - Do we need to make any modifications to the elementary attendance area boundaries?

In September 2010, the Board of Education approved the district’s elementary attendance areas after more than a year of demographic analysis and a public engagement process that included an evaluation of suggestions from the community.

During the development of the boundaries approved by the Board in September 2010, the demographers identified a mismatch between where students live and where schools are located, and discovered that given the size and distribution of schools throughout the city it’s not possible to create attendance areas that can accommodate all students living in them. The residential patterns of kindergarten applicants for the 2011-12 school year are consistent with those findings. In addition, the number of students who applied for kindergarten in 2011-12 exceeded SFUSD’s kindergarten seats; all kindergarten applicants represented 107% of kindergarten seats.
Following the March 2011 assignment offers, community members recommended changes to the elementary attendance area boundaries (see page 56). When reviewing the recommendations received from the community SFUSD staff considered the following factors: neighborhood demographics; where students live now and where enrollment changes are expected in the future; availability of school facilities; traffic patterns; location of programs; and coherence of preK-to-K and elementary-to-middle school pathways.

**Recommendation:** Based on an analysis of the recommendations submitted by the community, SFUSD staff plans to explore the possibility of reducing the size of Miraloma’s attendance area and increasing the size of Sunnyside’s attendance area by moving Sunnyside’s boundary north to encompass Sunnyside Playground and Sunnyside Conservatory. SFUSD staff will explore this recommendation with the Board at a public meeting. Any changes would begin with the enrollment period for the 2013-14 school year.

10. **Attendance Areas and Enrollment - What percent of kindergarteners are enrolled in their attendance area school? How does this vary by geography and by student demographics?**

52% of kindergarteners did not request their attendance area school anywhere among their choices. 25% requested their attendance area school as a first choice, 14% requested it as a second or third choice, and 10% ranked it fourth or lower.

- Attendance area requests varied by school. Grattan (center of city) had the greatest percent of residents requesting their attendance area school: 89% of all applicants living in Grattan’s attendance area listed Grattan among their requests. Drew (south east) and Cobb (north central) had the lowest percent of requests from kindergarten applicants living in the attendance area.
- The percent of African American and Latino applicants who did not request their attendance area school anywhere among their choices was higher than the overall average - 60% and 59% respectively.

30% of all kindergarteners in October 2011 were enrolled in their attendance area school. 63% of kindergarteners were not enrolled in their attendance area school because they were enrolled in a school they prefer more than their attendance area school. The percent of African Americans and Latinos enrolled in a school they prefer to their attendance area school is greater than the overall percent – 70% and 67% respectively.

11. **Proximity and Enrollment - What percent of kindergarteners are enrolled in the school closest to where they live? How does this vary by geography and by student demographics?**

55% of kindergarteners did not request the school closest to where they live. 23% of kindergarteners listed their closest school as a first choice, 12% listed it as a second or third choice, and 10% listed it as a fourth choice or lower.

- Kindergarteners living in attendance areas on the west side of the city were more likely to request their closest school than kindergarteners living in other areas of the city.
- The percent of African American and Latino applicants who did not request the school closest to where they live is greater than the overall percent – 67% and 61% respectively.
26% of kindergarteners in October 2011 were enrolled in their closest school. 64% of kindergarteners were not enrolled in the school closest to where they live because they were enrolled in a school they prefer more than their closest school. The percent of African Americans and Latino’s enrolled in a school they prefer more than their closest school is greater than the overall percent – 68% and 67% respectively.

12. Applicants and Enrollment - To what extent are K/6/9 applicants enrolling in SFUSD? How does this vary by student demographics and by geography? What are the placement outcomes for K/6/9 applicants who do not enroll?

Kindergarten
19% of all students who applied for kindergarten in the 2011-12 school year did not enroll in SFUSD; 18% of the applicants who didn’t enroll submitted their application by the February 2011 deadline (on-time) and 1% submitted their application late.

- 90% of kindergarten applicants who did not enroll received one of their choices or received a non-choice offer to a school within two miles of where they live.
- 25% got their first choice, 41% got one of their top three choices, and 54% received one of their choices. 36% got a non-choice offer to a school within two miles of where they live. 10% received a non-choice offer to a school more than two miles from where they live.

6th Grade
14% of all students who applied for 6th grade in the 2011-12 school year did not enroll in SFUSD; 12% of the applicants who didn’t enroll submitted their application by the February 2011 deadline (on-time) and 2% submitted their application late.

- 74% of 6th grade applicants who did not enroll received one of their choices or received a non-choice offer to a school within two miles of where they live.
- 46% got their first choice, 59% got one of their top three choices, and 62% got one of their choices. 26% got a non-choice offer to a school more than two miles from where they live.

9th Grade
21% of all students who applied for 9th grade in the 2011-12 school year did not enroll in SFUSD; 20% of the applicants who didn’t enroll submitted their application by the February 2011 deadline (on-time) and 1% submitted their application late.

- 80% of 9th grade applicants who did not enroll received one of their choices or received a non-choice offer to a school within two miles of where they live.
- 51% got their first choice, 69% got one of their top three choices, and 72% got one of their choices. 20% got a non-choice offer to a school more than two miles from where they live.
13. School Transfers - To what extent are students transferring between schools, and when do they transfer? What are the demographics of students transferring between schools?

There was a lot of movement at the beginning of the school year, and some of this was due to over 1,000 openings created when registered students did not attend school when it started in August 2011. 1,800 students, across grades K through 12th grade, changed their school assignment at least once between the first day of school and October 2011.

- 66% of the students who changed schools transferred between the first and the third day of school, and one-third of these were in the transitional grades - kindergarten, 6th grade, 9th grade.
- 31% transferred between the third day of school and October 2011, and 62% of these were at the high school level.

Transportation

In December 2010, following the adoption of Student Assignment Policy P5101 and prior to its implementation, the Board approved a new policy for general education transportation services (see Appendix 2). This new policy is guiding the redesign of general education transportation services. The first round of changes to general education transportation services took effect in August 2011.

Next Steps

Additional Research
Through our partnership with Stanford, and under the supervision of Sean Reardon, Professor of Education, Stanford will explore research questions related to SFUSD’s student assignment system over the next few years (see page 79). This research involves the analysis of all K12 assignments made through the Educational Placement Center (EPC) beginning with the 2004-05 school year through the 2012-13 school year.

Discussion with the Board
SFUSD staff plans to discuss this report with the Board at an Ad Hoc Committee on Student Assignment in the spring of 2012, and this public forum will provide an opportunity for the Board to give feedback to staff, and for the Board and staff to gather feedback from all stakeholders.
HISTORICAL CONTEXT

Consent Decree

In 1978, the San Francisco NAACP brought a case against SFUSD and the State of California. The NAACP argued that the SFUSD and the State engaged in discriminatory practices and maintained a segregated school system in violation of the U.S. Constitution, federal statues, and the State of California Constitution.

In 1983, the U.S. District Court approved a type of agreement between the parties called a “Consent Decree” which had two primary goals for the SFUSD:

- continued and accelerated efforts to achieve academic excellence for all students with a particular focus on African American and Latino students; and
- elimination of racial/ethnic segregation or identifiability in any school, program, or classroom to the extent practicable.

In implementing the 1983 Consent Decree, SFUSD created a student assignment plan and a transportation system designed to support SFUSD’s efforts to desegregate its schools. The student assignment plan used a combination of schools with both contiguous and noncontiguous attendance areas, alternative schools (without attendance areas), and optional enrollment requests which allowed students to transfer to schools outside of their attendance area school. In addition, no school could have fewer than four racial/ethnic groups, and no racial/ethnic group could constitute more than 45% of the students at attendance area schools or 40% at alternative schools.

In 1994, a group of San Francisco parents sued the SFUSD for using race as a factor in school assignment, and as part of a 1999 settlement, SFUSD was prohibited from using race or ethnicity as a consideration in student assignment. In attempting to comply with that agreement, SFUSD initially proposed an assignment plan that used a lottery process in which race/ethnicity was one factor, but the Court rejected that plan.

In 2001, the Court approved a settlement agreement that included a new student assignment method called the Diversity Index, which was implemented for the 2002-03 school year and was used through the 2010-11 school year. The Diversity Index was designed to:

- give families choice;
- ensure equitable access; and
- promote diversity without using race/ethnicity.

On December 31, 2005, the Consent Decree expired, and for the first time in 22 years the SFUSD student assignment process was not regulated by the courts.

Diversity Index

The Board had many concerns about the diversity index, not least of which was that it was not meeting the Board’s longtime goal of reducing racial isolation and improving educational opportunities and outcomes for all students. The number of schools with high concentrations of a single racial/ethnic group increased over the years under the diversity index. In 2008, a quarter of SFUSD’s schools had more than 60% of a single racial/ethnic group, even though SFUSD’s overall enrollment was racially/ethnically diverse and did not have a majority group.
In addition, although SFUSD had opened, closed, merged, and redesigned schools, the attendance area boundaries had not been revised since the 1980s. The Board was also concerned that some schools were over enrolled while others were under enrolled, and that the participation rates in the choice process varied greatly by race/ethnicity. Finally, many families reported finding the system time consuming, unpredictable, and difficult to understand.

Hearing from the Community

SFUSD partnered with different community members and organizations over the years to gather feedback on the student assignment system. SFUSD has heard from thousands of families and other community members regarding their experience, concerns, and suggestions for student assignment. Families consistently report wanting quality schools and a fair and equitable system that is easy to understand.

While families consistently report wanting quality schools, there are many divergent perspectives on what student assignment should prioritize and support. For example, some families want a school close to home, while others feel that choosing a school with particular programmatic features is more important than having a school close to home.

Here is a high-level summary of key findings from the community reports. For the purposes of the summary, we have pulled out findings that relate only to the student assignment system.

- Most families want their school communities to reflect San Francisco’s socioeconomic and cultural diversity. But for families across the city, diversity is often trumped by a school’s location, academic quality, and their own feeling of belonging.
- Even families who are happy with their children’s schools want more predictability in the enrollment process and are uncomfortable with a process that feels excessively complicated or random.
- Families want SFUSD to provide clear and accessible information that will help them choose a school that is a good fit for their child.
- Families want to participate fully in the enrollment process, but many encounter significant language, time, and information barriers.

Current Policy

In December 2008, the Board convened an Ad Hoc Committee on Student Assignment to provide a regular and public way for the Board to conduct public policy discussions with staff about the redesign of student assignment. Between December 2008 and January 2010, the Board held monthly Ad Hoc Committee meetings, and staff, with assistance from local and national partners and guidance from the Board, analyzed current conditions, explored different student assignment options, and gathered additional feedback from the community.

Key findings from the research and analysis captured the complexity of designing a student assignment system that could meet the Board’s goal of reversing the trend of racial isolation and the concentration of underserved students in the same school.

- Neighborhood schools are limited in their ability to reverse the trend of racial isolation and the concentration of underserved students in the same school, although under a neighborhood system some
schools might be less racially concentrated than they are today, and many schools might have a more robust enrollment.

- Different choice systems are limited in their ability to reverse the trend of racial isolation and the concentration of underserved students in the same school because the applicant pools for individual schools are racially isolated, and all families do not have the same opportunity to understand which schools they like and to submit their choices on-time for the assignment process.

- To reverse the trend of racial isolation and the concentration of underserved students in the same school through student assignment alone, the Board would need to assign students to schools they have not historically requested and to schools far from where they live. For example, some students living on the west side of the city and in the north of the city would need to be assigned to schools on the east side of the city and the southeast side of the city, and vice-versa.

SFUSD staff concluded that a new student assignment system is one part of creating educational environments in which all students can flourish. School quality is the paramount concern, and a student assignment system alone cannot ensure school quality, although it does have a role to play in creating diverse learning environments and robust enrollments in all SFUSD schools.

In March 2010, the Board unanimously approved a new student assignment system that maintained choice as a tactic for achieving its goals, but that simplified the system and differentiated it for elementary, middle, and high school. The new system places students in their highest ranked requests as long as there is space. If there are more requests for a school than openings, the student assignment system sorts all requests using a series of preferences, called tie-breakers, to assign applicants to schools. The tie-breakers can be adjusted if they are not accomplishing the Board’s priorities.

In June, 2011, the Board modified the student assignment policy to include elementary to middle school feeder patterns, to improve the assignment process for language pathways, and to eliminate the density tiebreaker since it was not working as originally intended.

An overview of the student assignment system used in the 2011-12 school year is provided in the appendix, and additional information is available on the web at www.sfusd.edu/enroll.
QUESTIONS EXPLORED

1. School Improvement

What progress have we made towards placing high quality academic opportunities at schools with high concentrations of underserved students?

The Superintendent’s Zone: Overview

Superintendent Carlos Garcia created the Superintendent’s Zone as a call to action in 2010. Although San Francisco is the highest achieving urban school district in California we have not been able to achieve equitable results for ALL of our students, echoing the national failure to adequately serve historically-identified underserved groups of children. The formation of the Superintendent’s Zone seeks to disrupt this predictive power of demographics, to promote success regardless of race, language, ethnicity, economic status, special education status or neighborhood.

Fourteen chronically underserved schools mostly concentrated in the Mission and Bayview Districts were placed under the supervision of two Assistant Superintendents, Guadalupe Guerrero in the Mission and Dr. Patricia Gray in the Bayview.

- The Mission District has 4 elementary schools: Bryant, Cesar Chavez, Leonard Flynn, and John Muir (located in the Western Addition); a middle school: Everett; two high Schools: Mission and John O’Connell; and, in the 2010-11 year a newly merged K-8 school: Buena Vista Horace Mann.
- In 2010-11 the Bayview had seven schools; five elementary schools: Drew, Malcolm X, Bret Harte, G.W. Carver, and Willie Brown; one K-8 school: Revere; and one high school: Thurgood Marshall. Willie Brown was closed in the 2010-11 year with a new redesigned campus tentatively scheduled to be re-built by 2015-16.

Reorganizing to Support the Superintendent’s Zone and SIG

SFUSD reorganized its services and supports to schools under Area Teams to better coordinate between district departments. The Superintendent’s Zone intentionally serves a smaller number of schools than the other SFUSD Area Teams, and is served by two neighborhood offices, to reflect the special care and attention of the Superintendent. This allows content specialists and leaders to build close working relationships with school leaders and teachers and provide more intensive support. Additionally, SFUSD’s central office departments are giving schools in the Superintendent’s Zone top priority for their transformation work.

In the Spring of 2010, SFUSD successfully applied through the California Department of Education for Federal School Improvement Grant funding and was awarded three-year funding of 45 million dollars for nine eligible schools in the Mission and the Bayview: 4 elementary schools in the Mission and the Bayview: 4 elementary schools: Bryant, Chavez, Muir, and G.W. Carver; one middle school: Everett; two K-8 schools: Revere and Buena Vista Horace Mann (awarded as Horace Mann, with funding retained after the merger); and two high schools: Mission and O’Connell.

Area Teams: The Superintendent’s Zone has a dedicated team of content specialists and support staff who are collectively responsible for providing and coordinating resources, coaching and assistance necessary to help schools focus on improvement. The Superintendent’s Zone –Mission and Bayview Area teams meet
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regularly to discuss the academic and non-academic support needs of each school. The Mission team consists of the following personnel: Assistant Superintendent, Mission; Executive Director, School Improvement Grant (also working with SIG-funded Bayview schools); Supervisor, Professional Learning (shared position of SIG and SFUSD’s Academics and Professional Development department); Director for Family & Community Outreach (SIG); Content/PD Specialists in Literacy, Math and Special Education; an Attendance Liaison; an Area Secretary; a Senior Fiscal Analyst (SIG – also working with SIG-funded Bayview schools) and a SIG Secretary (also working with Bayview SIG-funded schools). The Bayview Team consists of: Assistant Superintendent, Bayview; Supervisor, Business and Operations; Content/PD Specialists in Literacy, Math, Health and Special Education; an Attendance Liaison; Executive Director, School Improvement Grant (also working with Mission SIG schools); SIG Senior Fiscal Analyst (also working with Mission SIG schools); Area Secretary; and a SIG Secretary (also working with the Mission SIG schools).

**Dedicated Central Office Support:** Central office departments have made the Superintendent’s Zone a priority and actively engage with Zone leadership to support specific projects. For example, the Human Resources Department and Labor Relations Department have made the Superintendent’s Zone a routine priority of central Human Capital Team meetings to support Turn-Around and Transformation reform model schools and the meeting of SIG requirements through support and guidance for teacher and administrator Superintendent Zone job descriptions; effective performance evaluation; communication and collaboration with labor partners; staffing, including recruitment, placement and retention of effective teachers; appropriate hiring of SIG-funded positions; and future-focused planning for sustainability of successful reforms from a Human Capital perspective.

**Grounded in Research of School Turn-Around & Transformation:** While the formation of the Superintendent’s Zone and the focus on underserved schools preceded the Request for Application of the Federal School Improvement Grant funding through the California Department of Education (CDE), the preparation of that application in Spring/Summer 2010 by district leaders in collaboration with eligible school communities provided an opportunity to document specific needs, strengths and strategies of the targeted, eligible schools and to further elaborate upon and refine the research-based turn-around/transformation commitment of SFUSD to all Superintendent Zone schools (not only those SIG-eligible).

The Superintendent Zone Team draws significantly upon the recent and oft-cited Chicago school turn-around/transformation research of Tony Bryk, et al, regarding Essential Elements described in their recent study: “Organizing Schools for Improvement: Lessons from Chicago” (2010). Researchers Tony Bryk and colleagues looked longitudinally at the improvement efforts in Chicago public schools and identified specific factors in place at the schools that made dramatic improvements in reading and mathematics as compared to schools that languished or performed worse over time.

These schools shared five characteristics:
- 1. Clear Instructional Guidance and Coherence
- 2. Building Professional Capacity
- 3. Student-Centered Learning Environments
- 4. Parent-Community Ties
- 5. School Leadership

The School Improvement Grant (SIG) provided an additional framework, requiring investments in the following areas:
- External Partnerships for Organizational Reform & Coherence
- External Partnerships for Professional Development
- Extended Learning Programs
• Coaching & Academic Interventions
• Resources for Improved Instructional Planning & Delivery
• Community-Oriented Schools

The Superintendent’s Zone Team has been working to assure that the alignment of the Essential Elements, and the SIG investment framework provides a useful blueprint for effectively serving all schools in the Superintendent’s Zone (while some Zone schools are not eligible for SIG funding this blueprint can and does also help guide investments at those sites).

Evidence/Research Base, Targeted Investments and a Data/Results-Orientation: By operationalizing this blueprint for potential success it has been the intention of the Superintendent and the Superintendent’s Zone Team members to work with departments throughout SFUSD as well as with school, labor and community leaders to forge an effective and results-oriented repertoire of policies and practices that promote positive student and family opportunities and outcomes. This occurs in a context in which the Superintendent’s Zone Team also seeks to learn from other promising practices across SFUSD as well as to share lessons learned and to transfer knowledge, ideas, policies and practices, as appropriate, throughout SFUSD for the primary purpose of addressing the needs of underserved children and families and ensuring success for all of SFUSD’s diverse learners. Highlights of new policies, practices and investments include:

• Creation of new Superintendent’s Zone Teacher and Administrator job descriptions that emphasize the goals and commitments for transforming our formerly persistently low-performing schools.
• Per SIG requirements, have replaced or confirmed a recently hired (within two years) Principal to serve as a turn-around/transformation leader at SIG schools, as well as providing leadership support and development for ALL Superintendent Zone Principals via leadership networks and cross-school common planning opportunities facilitated by district leaders and key partners, such as Marzano and Associates or Partners in School Innovation.
• Replaced no less than 50% of teachers in SIG-funded Turn-Around schools, per SIG requirements, through a process predominantly of voluntary transfers carried out in concert with our labor partners, to help ensure best-fit of teachers to transformation practices.
• Creation of regular, weekly Common Planning Time and Professional Learning Communities among teachers, administrators and other key school-based personnel, both within schools and across schools.
• Implementation of a Results-Oriented Cycle of Inquiry that includes effective use of interim Common Learning Assessments as well as a range of other core curricula-specific assessments and a range of both quantitative and qualitative data analysis for customizing teaching and learning to student needs and strengths, and effectively building tiered Responses to Intervention (RtI).
• The Results-Oriented Cycle of Inquiry is also employed at the level of the Zone and of district systems to examine data around what’s working, what’s not and how best to stay on a course of continuous improvement.
• Strengthening the core curriculum in Math, English Language Arts and English Language Development across SIG/Supt Zone sites by identifying and putting in place evidence/research-based frameworks, curricula, materials and practices, coupled with extensive professional development and professional capacity-building through local, state and national partnerships with such organizations/curricula providers as: the Literacy Collaborative – Lesley University, Carnegie Learning, Scholastic (e.g., Read 180), English Now, EL Achieve, Do the Math, Swun Math, Treasures/Tesoros, etc.
• Focused attention to the needs and strengths of English Language Learners and the development of high-expectations, high-quality academics and Language Pathways that value and support linguistic and cultural diversity and success for all students, through partnerships and programs that include:
English Now, Two-Way Bilingual Immersion, El Achieve-Constructing Meaning (Academic Language Development across the curriculum), English 3D, Read 180 and others.

- Balanced Literacy focus for improving reading and writing across the curriculum that include heavy SIG investments in rich classroom libraries as well as leveled-readers and bilingual language arts curricula to ensure well-resourced, language-rich classrooms organized around balanced literacy frameworks.

- A focus on higher order thinking and complex thinking in Math through the roll-out of the SFUSD Common Core curriculum in math and through diverse, high-quality curricula, interventions and partnerships that include: Everyday Math, Carnegie Learning, Do the Math, Complex Math, Silicon Valley Mathematics Initiative, etc.

- Development of a strong cadre of Coaches and Academic Acceleration teachers with ELA, Math, ELD and Media/Tech expertise as appropriate in support of school-based Balanced Scorecards/SPSA/SIG Requirements, and further supported (1) by external partnerships for strategic planning around school-based human and material resources and (2) professional development approaches designed to strengthen Coach and Academic Acceleration Teacher expertise in data use and analysis and effective coaching strategies (e.g., Partners in School Innovation, Pivot Learning, SFCESS, Adria Klein).

- An evidence- and research-based focus on high school strategies that include the development of Smaller Learning Communities, effective Advisories, credit recovery opportunities, advanced course-taking opportunities (including virtual school AP courses) and project/portfolio-based learning.

- Extended Learning opportunities that include before-school, after-school and rich academic and enrichment summer session opportunities funded through a variety of sources, including ExCEL, DCYF and SIG and involving strategic neighborhood and city partners such as Jamestown, Mission Graduates, BACR, San Francisco Beacon Programs, Urban Services, AIM HIGH, California Alliance of African American Educators, and others.

- A focus on 21st century teaching and learning through extensive investments in classroom learning technologies and computer-enhanced interventions, including investments in ELMOs, Promethean Boards, Laptops for Educators (for data-use, communications and instructional purposes), New Media course offerings, online AP classes, online credit recovery, Read 180, Carnegie Learning for math instruction, etc.

- Creation and hiring of a new Community Schools Coordinator position at SIG-funded schools to work with school leadership to coordinate and optimize community partnerships, strategies and resources to address whole child-family-community needs and strengths through needs/strengths-based identification of, provision of, referral to and alignment of both academic (e.g., after-school programs) and non-academic services (e.g., Wellness, mental health, case management services), working in concert with Instructional Leadership Teams at school sites as well as with other district-funded personnel such as Social Workers, Counselors, Family Liaisons and relevant others.

The examples of policies, practices and investments above is meant to be suggestive rather than exhaustive of the kinds of intentional focus the formation of the Superintendent’s Zone has permitted for the critical work of supporting our “rising high-performing schools” (formerly known as low-performing).

Though the start-up time to get the Superintendent’s Zone staffing and systems in place and the late funding of the School Improvement Grant (SIG) gave the Zone Team less than a full-year of a fully-implemented focus on improvement, results are already promising.
Results-Oriented

The litmus test of Superintendent’s Zone success are demonstrable improvements in school climates, instructional rigor, student/family engagement, provision of comprehensive services, effective and focused district and community partnerships, and, most importantly, improved child academic outcomes leading to higher graduation rates of students who are fully college- and career-ready.

Based on the administration of California Achievement Tests (including STAR and CAHSEE) at the end of the 2010-11 year, SFUSD identified 7 schools in SFUSD for “notable growth” in their Academic Performance Index (API). Five of those seven schools were Superintendent’s Zone schools: John Muir ES, Everett MS, Horace Mann MS, Thurgood Marshall HS and Mission HS, with double-digit growth in API scores ranging from 15 points to a high of 54 points of growth.

Many other Superintendent Zone schools made significant improvement in standardized tests scores. It is the purpose of the Superintendent’s Zone to support and grow those reforms that support such a trajectory of success, and not only with regard to test scores, but as well with regard to a range of indicators of academic proficiency and success and of child, family and community health, wellness and well-being.
2. Racial Isolation

To what degree is the new student assignment system reversing the trend of racial isolation and the concentration of underserved students in the same school?

For the purposes of this report we organized all racial/ethnic categories reported by families and subsequently captured in our Student Information System (SIS) into six categories:

1. African American
2. Latino
3. Chinese
4. Other Asian
   (Filipino, Japanese, Korean, South East Asian)
5. Other
   (anything not captured in the other five categories)
6. White

The following definitions for racial isolation and underserved students are from Board policy P5101.

- **Racial Isolation**: Although SFUSD’s enrollment is racially/ethnically diverse and does not have a majority group, many of our schools have more than 60% of a single racial/ethnic group, more than 70% of a single racial/ethnic group, and more than 80% of a single racial/ethnic group. Some schools with more than 60% of a single racial/ethnic group also have an Academic Performance Index (API) of 1, 2, or 3. The Board considers these schools racially isolated.

- **Underserved Students**: Students performing Below Basic or Far Below Basic on the California Standards Test or other equivalent assessments administered by SFUSD.

Achievement data for the first cohort of students assigned to schools under the Board Policy P5101 will not be available until next year. Therefore this report cannot explore how the distribution of students among schools and programs under the new student assignment system affects academic outcomes.

The next few pages explore the following questions:

- What was the racial/ethnic diversity of the K/6/9 applicants for the 2011-12 school year?
- How does the racial/ethnic diversity of last year’s entering grade (K/6/9) compare to this year’s entering grade at schools that in October 2011 had more than 60% of a single racial/ethnic group?
- How does the diversity of kindergarten, 6th grade, and 9th grade enrollment compare with the diversity of the applicant pool, and for kindergarten how does it compare with all kindergarten applicants living in the attendance area?
- How many schools have an enrollment of more than 60% of a single race/ethnicity?
- What percent of students are enrolled in a school with more than 60% of a single racial/ethnic group, how does it vary by racial/ethnic group, and how has it changed over time?
What was the racial/ethnic diversity of the K/6/9 applicants for the 2011-12 school year?
To answer this question we analyzed all applicants for the 2011-12 school year, not just the on-time applicants. The charts below include on-time and late applicants.

**Kindergarten Applicants: 2011-12 School Year**

Overall, the kindergarten applicant pool for 2011-12 was diverse with no majority group. The three largest racial/ethnic groups were White (26%), Latino (24%), and Chinese (24%).

The school most frequently listed as a first choice varied by race/ethnicity. Drew was listed most frequently as a first choice by African Americans, for Chinese it was Alice Fong Yu, for Latinos it was Buena Vista/Mann, and for Whites it was Clarendon.

The chart below illustrates how the size and diversity of first choice requests for these four schools varied greatly.
Half of all kindergarten applicants requested one of 16 elementary schools as a first choice. Although the overall applicant pool for kindergarten did not have a majority group, more than 50% of first choice requests for 11 of these 16 schools were from a single racial/ethnic group.

The table below lists the schools, the total number of first choice requests, and the racial/ethnic breakdown of those requests.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>1st Choice Requests</th>
<th>African American</th>
<th>Chinese</th>
<th>Latino</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Other Asian</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clarendon</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fong Yu K8</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lillenthal K8</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alvarado</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Portal</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rooftop K8</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherman</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BV/Mann K8</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawton K8</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miraloma</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monroe</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alamo</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairmount</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feinstein</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grattan</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,728</strong></td>
<td><strong>5%</strong></td>
<td><strong>25%</strong></td>
<td><strong>18%</strong></td>
<td><strong>8%</strong></td>
<td><strong>9%</strong></td>
<td><strong>34%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6th Grade Applicants: 2011-12 School Year

Overall, the 6th grade applicant pool for 2011-12 was diverse with no majority group. The three largest racial/ethnic groups were Chinese (33%), Latino (24%), and White (12%).

59% of all 6th grade applicants requested Presidio, Giannini, Aptos, or Hoover as a first choice.

The school most frequently requested as a first choice varied by race/ethnicity.

- 18% of all African American applicants and 21% of all Latino applicants requested Aptos as a first choice.
- 26% of all Chinese applicants requested Giannini as a first choice.
- 27% of all White applicants requested Presidio as a first choice.

9th Grade Applicants: 2011-12 School Year

Overall, the 9th grade applicant pool for 2011-12 was diverse with no majority group. The three largest racial/ethnic groups were Chinese (34%), Latino (21%), and White (13%).

61% of all 9th grade applicants requested Lowell, Lincoln, or Washington as a first choice.

Lowell was most frequently requested as a first choice by all racial/ethnic groups.

- 17% of all African American applicants requested Lowell as a first choice.
- 35% of all Chinese applicants requested Lowell as a first choice.
- 21% of all Latino applicants requested Lowell as a first choice.
- 47% of all White applicants requested Lowell as a first choice.
Observations

The size and diversity of applicant pools affect our student assignment system's ability to facilitate diversity. Diverse applicant pools are critical to achieving diverse enrollment in a choice based system.

While SFUSD's overall applicant pool is diverse, requests for schools vary by racial/ethnic group, and as a result many schools have segregated applicant pools. In addition, there is great variation in demand for our schools, which means some schools have very large applicant pools and others have small applicant pools.

The majority of schools with an enrollment of more than 60% of a single racial/ethnic group are elementary schools. We have a lot more elementary schools than middle or high schools, and many of them have a relatively small enrollment.

To get a better understanding of what is important to families when choosing schools, we have included a family survey on the 2012-13 application form.

The survey asks families to rate, on a scale of 1 to 5, how important each of the following factors are when requesting schools (1=not important, and 5= very important):

- Attend school with sibling
- Attend after school program at school
- Language pathway
- Special education services
- School bus transportation
- Near home
- Near childcare
- Near work
- School hours
- Diversity of students
- Neighborhood safety
- School's academic reputation
- Teachers and principal
- Parent community
- Recommended by family/friends

The information we gather from families via this survey may shed light on why there are differences in demand and what might be involved in changing current choice patterns to create more diverse applicant pools for schools.
How does the racial/ethnic diversity of last year’s entering grade (K/6/9) compare to this year’s entering grade at schools that in October 2011 had more than 60% of a single racial/ethnic group?

The table below compares the racial/ethnic diversity of K/6/9 enrollment in October 2011 with enrollment in October 2010 at schools with more than 60% of a single racial/ethnic group.

Schools with an API of 1, 2, or 3 in October 2011 have an * before their name.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th># Enroll</th>
<th>African American</th>
<th>Chinese</th>
<th>Latino</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Other Asian</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* BRYANT</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Decrease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K</td>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* BV/MANN</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>Decrease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K</td>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* CARVER</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>Increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K</td>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* CHAVEZ</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Decrease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K</td>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHIN</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Decrease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K</td>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEC</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K</td>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* CLEVELAND</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Decrease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K</td>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* DREW</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>Decrease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K</td>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAIRMOUNT</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>Increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K</td>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRANCISCO</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>Decrease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>06</td>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GALILEO</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>Decrease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>09</td>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAU</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>Increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K</td>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAWTON</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>Increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K</td>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LICK</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>06</td>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALCOLM X</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K</td>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BV/MANN</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>Increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>06</td>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* MARSHALL</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>Increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K</td>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEC</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Newcomer school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K</td>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOSCONÉ</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>Increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K</td>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(green indicates a decrease and orange indicates an increase)

**Observations**

- In October 2011, nine schools had an API of 1, 2, or 3 coupled with an enrollment of more than 60% of a single racial/ethnic group (these schools have an * before their name in the table above).
  - Seven of the schools were more than 60% Latino. Of these seven, five decreased the percent Latino, and two schools (Serra and Marshall) increased the percent Latino.
  - Two of the schools were more than 60% African American. One of these schools (Drew) decreased the percent African American, and the other school (Carver) increased the percent African American.

- In October 2011, 15 schools had an enrollment of more than 60% of a single racial/ethnic group and an API greater than 3.
  - 10 of these schools were more than 60% Chinese. Six of them increased the percent Chinese between 2010 and 2011, three decreased the percent, and one remained the same (CEC).
  - Four of these schools were more than 60% Latino. Three of them increased the percent Latino between 2010 and 2011, and one remained the same (MEC).
  - One school, Malcolm X, had an enrollment of more than 60% African American. The percent increased significantly between 2010 and 2011, as did their kindergarten enrollment (from 13 to 31 students).

- One school, Galileo, decreased the percent of the majority group below 60%; in 2010-11 60% of 9th graders were Chinese, and in 2011-12 55% were Chinese.

- In two schools, Malcolm X and Serra, the percent of the majority group increased above 60%.
  - Malcolm X’s kindergarten class increased from 54% African American to 71% African American in 2011-12. Its kindergarten enrollment also grew – from 13 to 31 students.
  - Serra’s kindergarten class increased from 59% Latino to 78% Latino in 2011-12.

- The remaining schools maintained their majority group in the incoming grades; the percent of the majority group increased at 14 schools and decreased at eight schools.
How does the diversity of kindergarten, 6th grade, and 9th grade enrollment compare with the diversity of the applicant pool, and for kindergarten how does it compare with all kindergarten applicants living in the attendance area?

The maps on the next few pages use 100% stacked columns for each school to show the racial/ethnic diversity of the students who applied to each school compared with the students enrolled in each school. For kindergarten, there is a third stacked column showing the racial/ethnic breakdown of all children who live in the attendance area regardless of the choices they made.

The stacked columns are intentionally the same size; they are not relative in size to the number of students. Each racial/ethnic group is represented by a different color - the color key is provided in a box on the right side of each map. Having 100% stacked columns makes it possible to compare the diversity of the applicants with the diversity of enrollment, and for kindergarten with the diversity of attendance area residents.

Kindergarten

Observations (Map 1, page 26)

- There are geographically distinct patterns for the racial/ethnic composition of students enrolled in and applying to schools. Kindergarteners enrolled in and applying to schools in the north east are primarily Chinese; in the south east they are primarily African American; in the Mission, near Moscone and Chavez, they are primarily Latino; on west side they are primarily Chinese and White; and in the center of the city, near Grattan and McKinley, they are primarily White.

- The racial/ethnic composition of a school’s attendance areas is sometimes more diverse than its enrollment.
  - Three of the four elementary schools located in the southeast (Drew, Carver, and Harte) have significantly more diverse attendance areas than their enrollment. For example, there is no majority group living in Drew’s attendance area: it is 17% African American, 28% Chinese, 37% Latino, 10% Other Asian, 2% Other, and 6% White. However, 74% of all kindergarteners enrolled in Drew in October 2011 were African American, and 74% of all students who requested Drew were African American.
  - Garfield and Chin’s attendance areas (north east) are more diverse than their enrollment: 89% of Chin’s kindergarten enrollment is Chinese compared with 43% of attendance area residents.
  - Webster and Starr King’s attendance areas (central east) are more diverse than their enrollment: 21% of Webster’s attendance area residents are Chinese and 19% area Latino, whereas 4% of their enrollment is Chinese and 37% is Latino.
  - Kindergarteners living in Sunnyside and Guadalupe’s attendance areas (south central) are more diverse than their kindergarten enrollment.

- The reverse is also true – the racial/ethnic composition of a school’s enrollment is sometimes more diverse than its attendance area.
  - On the north side, Spring Valley, Tenderloin, Parks, McCoppin, and Cobb’s kindergarten enrollments are more diverse than the kindergarteners living in the attendance areas.
  - In the center of the city, Alvarado’s enrollment is more diverse than its attendance area’s residents.
  - In the south, Ortega and Sheridan’s enrollments are more diverse than their attendance areas.

- While the diversity of kindergartner students enrolled in a school is generally similar to the diversity of the students who requested the school, there are many instances where this is not the case.
  - Harte, El Dorado, Carver, Rooftop, Alvarado, and Muir’s kindergarten enrollments are more diverse than the students who requested the school.
  - Marshall, Stevenson, Lawton, and Sutro’s applicant pools are more diverse than their enrollment.
Q.2.2. Race/ethnicity of enrollment, all students who applied to kindergarten, and all kindergarten applicants who reside in the attendance area (CBEDS 2011).
$6^{th}$ Grade

**Observations**

- Aside from the K8 schools, the diversity of each school’s $6^{th}$ grade applicant pool is remarkably similar to the diversity of the $6^{th}$ graders enrolled in the schools.
  - The variance at K8 schools is because there are very few openings for new students. For example, only one student was assigned to Alice Fong Yu, and that one student is represented by the column on the left.
  - Rooftop just has one column (applicant pool) because there were no students assigned to Rooftop for $6^{th}$ grade in 2011; all the $5^{th}$ graders promoted to $6^{th}$ grade leaving no room for new assignments.
- Aptos, Denman, Visitacion Valley, and King have diverse applicant pools and diverse enrollment.
- Everett and Lick’s applicant pools and enrollment are predominantly Latino.
- Francisco, Marina, Roosevelt, Presidio, Giannini, and Hoover's applicant pools and enrollment are predominantly Chinese.
Observations

- The applicant pools for Galileo, Wallenberg, SF International, Jordan, Balboa, and the Academy of Arts and Sciences are slightly more diverse than the 9th graders enrolled in the schools.

- The applicant pools for Washington, Lincoln, Burton, Marshall, ISA, O'Connell, and Mission are similar to the 9th graders enrolled in the schools.
How many schools have an enrollment of more than 60% of a single race/ethnicity?

The table below lists schools that between 2008 and 2011 had an enrollment of more than 60% of a single racial/ethnic group, and it indicates the race/ethnicity and the percent of enrollment each year. Schools with an Academic Performance Index (API) of 1, 2, or 3 in October 2011 have an * before their name. Schools offering a language pathway have the name of the language pathway listed in the right column.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>2008-09</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>2011-12</th>
<th>Language Pathway</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>70-79%</td>
<td>70-79%</td>
<td>60-69%</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Bryant ES</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>&gt;80%</td>
<td>&gt;80%</td>
<td>&gt;80%</td>
<td>&gt;80%</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Buena Vista ES</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>60-69%</td>
<td>60-69%</td>
<td>60-69%</td>
<td>Merged</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* BV/ Mann KB</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>70-79%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Carver ES</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>60-69%</td>
<td>70-79%</td>
<td>70-79%</td>
<td>70-79%</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEC ES</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>&gt;80%</td>
<td>&gt;80%</td>
<td>&gt;80%</td>
<td>&gt;80%</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Chavez ES</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>&gt;80%</td>
<td>&gt;80%</td>
<td>&gt;80%</td>
<td>&gt;80%</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chin ES</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>70-79%</td>
<td>70-79%</td>
<td>&gt;80%</td>
<td>&gt;80%</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Cleveland ES</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>60-69%</td>
<td>70-79%</td>
<td>70-79%</td>
<td>70-79%</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cobb ES</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>60-69%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Drew ES</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>70-79%</td>
<td>70-79%</td>
<td>70-79%</td>
<td>70-79%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairmount ES</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>60-69%</td>
<td>60-69%</td>
<td>60-69%</td>
<td>60-69%</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francisco MS</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>60-69%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galileo HS</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>60-69%</td>
<td>60-69%</td>
<td>60-69%</td>
<td>60-69%</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garfield ES</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>60-69%</td>
<td>60-69%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lau ES</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>&gt;80%</td>
<td>&gt;80%</td>
<td>&gt;80%</td>
<td>&gt;80%</td>
<td>Chin. &amp; Sp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawton KB</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>60-69%</td>
<td>60-69%</td>
<td>60-69%</td>
<td>60-69%</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lick MS</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>60-69%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60-69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malcolm X ES</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>60-69%</td>
<td>60-69%</td>
<td>70-79%</td>
<td>Merged</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mann MS</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>60-69%</td>
<td>60-69%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marina MS</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>70-79%</td>
<td>70-79%</td>
<td>&gt;80%</td>
<td>&gt;80%</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Marshall ES</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>&gt;80%</td>
<td>&gt;80%</td>
<td>&gt;80%</td>
<td>&gt;80%</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEC ES</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>60-69%</td>
<td>60-69%</td>
<td>60-69%</td>
<td>60-69%</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moscone ES</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O’Connell HS</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>60-69%</td>
<td>60-69%</td>
<td>60-69%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parker ES</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>70-79%</td>
<td>&gt;80%</td>
<td>&gt;80%</td>
<td>&gt;80%</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roosevelt MS</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>60-69%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Sanchez ES</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>70-79%</td>
<td>&gt;80%</td>
<td>&gt;80%</td>
<td>&gt;80%</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Serra ES</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>60-69%</td>
<td>60-69%</td>
<td>60-69%</td>
<td>60-69%</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevenson ES</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>60-69%</td>
<td>60-69%</td>
<td>70-79%</td>
<td>70-79%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutro ES</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>60-69%</td>
<td>60-69%</td>
<td>60-69%</td>
<td>60-69%</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulloa ES</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>60-69%</td>
<td>60-69%</td>
<td>60-69%</td>
<td>70-79%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data source: CBEDS
The chart below shows the number of schools with an enrollment of more than 60% of a single racial/ethnic group for each of the past four years: 2008-09 through 2011-12.

**Observations**

- The number of schools with more than 60% of a single racial/ethnic group declined from 28 to 24 between the 2008-09 and 2011-12. However, between 2010-11 and 2011-12 the number increased from 23 to 24, with two schools surpassing 60% and one falling below 60%. In 2011-12:
  - Brown middle school was closed;
  - Buena Vista ES and Mann MS were merged into Buena Vista/Mann K8;
  - O’Connell’s enrollment dropped below 60% Latino (high school);
  - Francisco’s enrollment grew to more than 60% Chinese (middle school);
  - Lawton’s enrollment grew to more than 60% Chinese (K8 school); and
  - Moscone’s enrollment grew to more than 60% Latino (K5 schools)

- 75% of the schools in 2011 (18 out of 24) with more than 60% of a single racial/ethnic group offer a language pathway that reserves seats for students who speak the target language.

- Carver and Drew are the only schools that do not offer a language pathway, have more than 60% of a single racial/ethnic group, and an API of 1, 2, or 3.

Given the changing configurations of schools (for example, Brown was closed in 2011 and Buena Vista elementary school and Horace Mann middle school were merged into a K8 school), it may be helpful to also consider the percent of students enrolled in a school with more than 60% of a single racial/ethnic group.
What percent of students are enrolled in a school with more than 60% of a single racial/ethnic group, how does it vary by racial/ethnic group, and how has it changed over time?

The chart below indicates the percent of students by racial/ethnic group over the past four school years enrolled in a school where the school’s enrollment is more than 60% of a single racial/ethnic group.

Observations

- Overall, the percent of students enrolled in schools with more than 60% of a single racial/ethnic group decreased from 23% to 20% between 2008 and 2011. However, between 2010-11 and 2011-12 the overall percent rose from 18% to 20% of students.

- The percent of African American students enrolled in a school with more than 60% of a single racial/ethnic group decreased 7% between 2008-09 and 2011-12 (from 24% to 17%); this downward trend continued through the 2011-12 school year.

- The percent of Latino students decreased 5% (from 32% to 27%); this downward trend flattened out in 2011-12, remaining at 27%.

- The percent of Chinese students decreased 3% between 2008-09 and 2011-12 (from 27% to 24%); however it increased 5% between 2010-11 and 2011-12 (from 18% to 24%).
3. Student Assignment Tie-breakers

How would placing the attendance area tie-breaker before the low test score area tie-breaker have changed the March 2011 kindergarten assignments?

The current student assignment system places students in their highest ranked request as long as there is space. If there are more requests for a school than openings, the student assignment system sorts all requests using a series of preferences, called tie-breakers, to assign applicants to schools.

For elementary schools there is a tie-breaker for students who live in areas of the city with the lowest average test scores (CTIP1), and there is also a tie-breaker that gives preference to requests from students who live in the attendance area of the requested school. Board policy P5101 places the attendance area tie-breaker immediately after the tie-breaker for students who live in areas of the city with the lowest average test scores.

We conducted a kindergarten simulation to explore the impact changing the order of tie-breakers might have had in the March 2011 run.

It’s important to note that although enrollment patterns change between the March run and the first day of school, this simulation only explores the outcome of the March 2011 run. It does not explore what might have happened in all runs through the beginning of the school year because it is difficult to predict how families may have changed their choices in subsequent runs if they received a different outcome in the March run.

The simulation results described below used all the kindergarten requests from the March 2011 run, but placed the attendance area tie-breaker before (instead of after) the low test score area tie-breaker.

Would the percent of students assigned to a school with more than 60% of a single race/ethnicity have changed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2011 Actual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2011 Simulation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observations

- The results are very similar; 22% of students were assigned to a school with more than 60% of a single race/ethnicity in the actual run and in the simulation that placed the attendance area before the low-test score area.
- In the simulation, a higher percent of Chinese students (31% compared with 28%) and a lower percent of White students (16% compared with 18%) were assigned to a school with more than 60% of a single race/ethnicity.
Would offers at schools with an API of 1/2/3 and more than 60% of a single race/ethnicity have changed?

The table below illustrates the impact placing the attendance area tie-breaker above the low test score area tie-breaker would have had in March 2011 for schools that in October 2011 had an enrollment of more than 60% of a single racial/ethnic group and an API of 1, 2, or 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>March 2011 Actual</th>
<th>% African American</th>
<th>% Chinese</th>
<th>% Other</th>
<th>% Other Asian</th>
<th>% White</th>
<th>% Latino</th>
<th>% CTIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bryant (K)</td>
<td>March 2011</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Simulation</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BV/Mann (K)</td>
<td>March 2011</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Simulation</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carver (K)</td>
<td>March 2011</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Simulation</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chavez (K)</td>
<td>March 2011</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Simulation</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland (K)</td>
<td>March 2011</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Simulation</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drew (K)</td>
<td>March 2011</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Simulation</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall (K)</td>
<td>March 2011</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Simulation</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanchez (K)</td>
<td>March 2011</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Simulation</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serra (K)</td>
<td>March 2011</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Simulation</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observations

- The results are mixed. The percent of a single racial/ethnic group assigned to kindergarten in March 2011 would have remained the same at Bryant and Marshall, would have increased at Cleveland and Serra, and would have decreased at BV/Mann and Drew.
- In general, the number of students living in low-test score areas assigned to these schools would have increased if the attendance area tie-breaker was placed above the low-test score area tie-breaker.
Would the percent of students assigned to one of their choices have changed?
The table below illustrates how the percent of students assigned to one of their choices would have changed if the attendance area tie-breaker was placed before the low-test score area tie-breaker in March 2011.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6</th>
<th>% First Choice</th>
<th>% Top 3 Choices</th>
<th>% Any Choice</th>
<th>% No Choice</th>
<th>% CTIP1 First Choice</th>
<th>% CTIP1 Any Choice</th>
<th>% Non-CTIP1 First Choice</th>
<th>% Non-CTIP1 Any Choice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 2011 Actual</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2011 Simulation</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observation
- The results are very similar:
  - 57% got their first choice in the actual run in March, and 56% received their first choice in the simulation that placed the attendance area before the low-test score area.
  - 81% got assigned to one of their choices in the actual run in March, and 82% got a choice in the simulation that placed the attendance area before the low-test score area.
4. Areas of the City with the Lowest Average Test Scores

What are the demographics, choice patterns, and enrollment patterns for students who live in areas of the city with the lowest average test scores (CTIP1)?

In December 2010, Lapkoff & Gobalet Demographic Research Inc. identified areas of the city with the lowest average test scores. They computed the average 2006-2009 CST English Language Arts score for each combined Census Tract, using records for 144,830 K-12 students. They adjusted the quintiles slightly to spread numbers of K-12 students across the quintiles fairly evenly (approximately 20 percent of students per quintile). They then gave students in the lowest quintile a CTIP score of 1. Residents of the highest quintile received a CTIP score of 5.

The average test scores for each of the CTIP regions ranged from 297 to 407. Table 7 shows the average score of residents of each type of CTIP region as well as the ranges of scores in each. CTIP 1 regions had average scores between 297 and 331; CTIP 2 regions had average scores between 332 and 345, etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CTIP region</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Shading on map</th>
<th>Lowest average CST-ELA score of tracts in CTIP region</th>
<th>Highest average CST-ELA score of tracts in CTIP region</th>
<th>Number of 2006-2009 K-12 student residents with CST scores</th>
<th>Percent of K-12 test-taking students who were in CTIP region</th>
<th>Percent of all K-12 students who were in CTIP region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CTIP 1</td>
<td>lowest quintile</td>
<td>darkest green</td>
<td>296.7</td>
<td>331.4</td>
<td>29,783</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTIP 2</td>
<td>next-to-lowest</td>
<td>medium green</td>
<td>331.5</td>
<td>345.0</td>
<td>29,105</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTIP 3</td>
<td>middle quintile</td>
<td>lightest green</td>
<td>345.2</td>
<td>357.4</td>
<td>28,700</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTIP 4</td>
<td>next-to-highest</td>
<td>lighter purple</td>
<td>358.1</td>
<td>376.4</td>
<td>28,770</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTIP 5</td>
<td>highest quintile</td>
<td>darkest purple</td>
<td>376.4</td>
<td>407.0</td>
<td>28,472</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>296.7</td>
<td>407.0</td>
<td>144,830</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lapkoff & Gobalet Demographic Research, Inc., computations. % may seem not to total 100 percent because of rounding.

Map 4: All CTIP Regions (1-5)

Map 4 (left) shows the geographic patterns of these CTIP regions. Most CTIP 1 regions are located in the city’s southeastern and east central areas as well as Yerba Buena/Treasure Island. Most CTIP 5 regions are found in the western and central portions of the city.
What is a Census Tract?
Census Tracts are geographic areas of San Francisco that are defined by the US Census Bureau.

Why Use Census Tracts?
Census Tracts were chosen as the geographical unit for each CTIP region rather than another geographical unit because they are large enough to have substantial numbers of students living in them, thus minimizing the effects of random variation. Yet they are small enough to permit a range of values to occur across geographical units.

Although 2011-12 is the first year we used the low test score area (CTIP1) tie-breaker we were able to use historical applicant data to explore how the size and racial/ethnic composition of students living in CTIP1 areas changed over time.

18% of all kindergarten, 6th grade, and 9th grade applicants in the March 2011 assignment run lived in CTIP1 areas. Since 2005 the number of applicants living in CTIP1 areas has ranged between 16% and 18%. The chart below describes the racial/ethnic composition of K/6/9 applicants living in CTIP1 areas of the city over the past 7 years (first round).

SFUSD will review assessment data and refresh the low test score areas at intervals to be determined. This review will be done in consultation with the Superintendent’s advisors, and based on feedback received from the Board once they have reviewed the information provided in this report.
Which schools did K/6/9 applicants living in low test score areas request?

The three maps on the next few pages illustrate the schools K/6/9 applicants living in low test score areas (CTIP1) requested for the 2011-12 school year. Each school has a pie chart with a stacked bar chart placed on top of the pie. The school name, total number of requests from applicants living in CTIP1 areas of the city, and the percent of all requests this represents are printed beside each pie chart. For example, Garfield elementary (in the north east of the city) received 27 requests from CTIP1 residents, and these 27 requests represent 12% of all requests for Garfield.

- The pie chart for each school indicates the percent of all requests for the school from applicants living in CTIP1 areas of the city; the larger the shaded area of the pie the greater the percent of requests from applicants living in CTIP1, and the smaller the shaded area the smaller the percent of requests from CTIP1 residents. For example, 66% of requests for Harte elementary (in the south east of the city) are from residents of CTIP1 so a large part of the pie is shaded, whereas 12% of requests for Garfield elementary (in the north east) are from residents of CTIP so a smaller part of the pie is shaded.

- The stacked bar on top of each pie illustrates the racial/ethnic breakdown of CTIP1 residents who requested the school. The size of the stacked bar is not proportional to the number of students it represents; all stacked bars are the same size so you can compare the race/ethnicity of CTIP1 applicants across all schools including those with very few requests from CTIP1 residents. The greater the spread of colors in the stacked bar chart the more racially/ethnically diverse the CTIP1 residents who requested the school. For example, CTIP1 residents who requested Sunset elementary are more racially/ethnically diverse than CTIP1 residents who requested Ulloa (both schools are located on the west side).

Kindergarten Requests (2011-12 school year)

Observations (Map 6, page 38)

- The applicant pools with the greatest percent of CTIP1 residents are located in or near CTIP1 areas.
  - More than 66% of all applicants for Drew, Carver, Malcolm X, and Harte (located in the south east) live in CTIP1 areas of the city.
  - More than 40% of all applicants for schools in the Mission (except Flynn) and Tenderloin live in CTIP1 areas.
  - 11%-23% of all applicants for Milk, Alvarado, and Rooftop, which are not located in CTIP1 areas but are relatively close to CTIP1 areas, live in CTIP1 areas.
  - Less than 5% of all applicants for schools on the west side of the city, such as Alamo, Lafayette, Key, Sunset, and Ulloa, live in CTIP1 areas of the city.

- The racial/ethnic diversity of requests from CTIP1 residents varies by school.
  - White students living in CTIP1 areas tend to request schools located in the center of the city and on the north west side. For example, a significant number of requests from CTIP1 residents for Miraloma, Clarendon, Grattan, and McKinley in the center of the city, and Lafayette, Argonne, and Peabody in the north west are from White applicants.
  - African American students living in CTIP1 areas request schools throughout the city, but the majority of requests from CTIP1 residents for schools in the south east (Drew, Carver, Malcolm X, Harte), the Western Addition (Parks, Cobb), and the south west (Lakeshore, Ortega, Sheridan) are from African American applicants.
  - The majority of requests from CTIP1 residents for schools in the Mission (Sanchez, Marshall, Moscone, Chavez, Buena Vista) are from Latino students.
  - Chinese students living in CTIP1 areas tend to request schools in the north east and the west side; not many of the requests from CTIP1 residents for schools in the south east and the Mission are from Chinese applicants.

Map 6

Ethnic breakdown of CTIP1 Applicants
- African American 24%
- Chinese 7%
- Latino 30%
- Other Asian 6%
- Other 7%
- White 17%
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Produced by the Educational Placement Center
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Observations

- The two schools with the largest percent of requests from students who live in CTIP1 areas of the city are located on the east side in the center of the city: 50% of all requests for 6th grade at Buena Vista/Horace Mann and 46% of all requests for ISA were from students who live in CTIP1 areas of the city. The majority of CTIP1 residents requesting Buena Vista/Horace Mann were Latino, and the majority of CTIP1 residents requesting ISA were African American.
- Aside from K8 schools, the two schools with the smallest percent of requests from students who live in CTIP1 areas of the city are located on the west side: 11% of all requests for 6th grade at Presidio and 9% of all requests for Giannini were from students who live in CTIP1 areas of the city.
- 70% of 6th grade applicants living in CTIP1 areas are African American or Latino, 29% are Chinese, and 5% are White.
Observations

- ISA received very few requests for 9th grade: there were 16 requests from students who live in CTIP1 areas of the city and that represented 94% of all requests for ISA.

- Jordan and Marshall in the south east had the second largest percent of requests from students who live in CTIP1 areas of the city: 37% of all requests for 9th grade at Jordan and 32% of all requests for Marshall were from students who live in CTIP1 areas of the city.

- The three high schools located on the west side of the city had the smallest percent of requests from students who live in CTIP1 areas of the city: 12% of all requests for Washington and Lowell, and 13% of all requests for Lincoln were from students who live in CTIP1 areas of the city.

- 68% of 9th grade applicants living in CTIP1 areas are African American or Latino, 13% are Chinese, and 3% are White.
How do 2011 enrollment patterns vary by low test score area?

Having explored request patterns for students living in areas of the city with the lowest average test scores, this question explores actual enrollment patterns as of October 2011. To facilitate this exploration we subdivided areas of the city with the lowest average test score into six geographic regions and color coded each area for ease of identification.

1. Western Addition – dark green
2. Mission – yellow
3. Potrero Hill – purple
4. Bayview – Red
5. Visitacion Valley – light green
6. Treasure Island - gray

The three maps on the next few pages use these color schemes. Each school has a pie chart with a stacked bar chart placed on top of the pie. The school name and the percent of all students enrolled who live in CTIP1 areas of the city are printed beside each pie chart. For example, 7% of students enrolled in Garfield elementary (in the north east of the city) live in CTIP1 areas of the city.

- The pie chart for each school indicates the percent of all students enrolled who live in CTIP1; the larger the shaded area of the pie the greater the percent of CTIP1 residents, and the smaller the shaded area the smaller the percent of CTIP1 residents. For example, 58% of kindergarteners enrolled in Harte elementary (in the south east of the city) live in CTIP1 so a large part of the pie is shaded, whereas 7% of kindergarteners enrolled in Garfield (in the north east) live in CTIP so a smaller part of the pie is shaded.

- The stacked bar on top of each pie illustrates which CTIP1 area students live. For example, kindergarteners enrolled in Garfield (north east) live in the Western Addition, Mission, and Treasure Island.

  The size of the stacked bar is not proportional to the number of students it represents; all stacked bars are the same size so you can compare across all schools including those with very few CTIP1 residents.

Kindergarten Enrollment (October 2011)

Observations (Map 9, page 42)

- None of the kindergarteners enrolled in four schools in the north east (Wo, Garfield, Parker, and CEC), two schools on the west side (Lafayette, and Sunset), and MEC in the center of the city, live in CTIP1 areas.
- The schools with the greatest percent of CTIP1 residents are located in or near CTIP1 areas. Schools in the Bayview Hunters Point, the Mission, and the Western Addition have the greatest percent of CTIP1 residents. 32% to 41% of students enrolled in Clarendon, Rooftop, and Alvarado (center) live in CTIP1 areas, and the percent of students enrolled in schools on the west side who live in CTIP1 is very low.
- For each CTIP1 area residents tend to enroll in schools located relatively near that CTIP1 area:
  - **Western Addition**: Tenderloin, Muir, Parks, Lilienthal, Carmichael, Redding, Spring Valley, Clarendon, Alvarado, Lau.
  - **Mission**: Chavez, Moscone, Marshall, BV/Mann, Bryant, Alvarado, Flynn, Clarendon, Rooftop, Sanchez
  - **Bayview**: Taylor, Carver, Malclm X, Drew, Hillcrest, Harte, Revere, Fairmount, Rooftop, BV/Mann.
  - **Visitacion Valley**: Visitacion Valley, Guadalupe, Revere, El Dorado, Monroe, Drew, Taylor, Fairmount, Chavez, Longfellow.
Q.4.15. Where CTIP1 students living in different areas of the city are enrolled. CBEDS 2011. Kindergarten.
Observations

- The schools with the greatest percent of CTIP1 residents are located in or near CTIP1 areas. 70% of ISA's 6th grade enrollment, 57% of BV/Mann's 6th grade enrollment, and 51% of Lick's 6th grade enrollment live in CTIP1 areas.
- The three schools with the lowest percent of enrollment living in CTIP1 areas are Giannini and Presidio on the west side, and Marina on the north side.
- For each CTIP1 area, residents tend to enroll in schools located relatively near that CTIP1 area:
  - Bayview: King, Aptos, Giannini, Lick, Hoover
  - Mission: Lick, Aptos, BV/Mann, Hoover, Everett
  - Visitacion Valley: Visitacion Valley, Aptos, Denman, Hoover, King
  - Western Addition: Roosevelt, Presidio, Marina, Francisco, Everett
Observations

- The percent of 9th graders enrollment living in CTIP1 ranges from a high of 38% (Academy of Arts and Sciences) to a low of 9% (Asawa SOTA and Lowell).
- The percent of 9th graders living in CTIP1 areas and attending schools on the west side of the city is proportional to the percent of all 9th graders living in CTIP1 areas: Washington 19% and Lincoln 18%.
- Students living in the Western Addition subdivision of CTIP1 tend to enroll in schools in the center and north side of the city (Washington, Wallenberg, and Galileo), and students living in the Bayview subdivision of CTIP1 tend to enroll on the south side of the city (Lincoln, Balboa, Jordan, Burton, Marshall).
5. Designations, Waiting Pools, Inter-District Assignments

To what extent do designations, waiting pools, and inter-district assignments affect enrollment?

To explore this question we sorted all K/6/9 students enrolled in October 2011 into three applicant categories: (1) students assigned to one of their choices; (2) designated students (assigned to a school they did not request); and (3) inter-district students (students who live outside San Francisco). Within these categories we created subcategories to differentiate when students submitted their application form.

1. Choice assignments
   - On-time
   - Late: Spring
   - Late: Summer
   - Multiple runs

2. Designated assignments
   - On-Time
   - Late

3. Inter-District assignment

What percent of students are enrolled in a school they requested?

The table below indicates, by race/ethnicity, the percent of K/6/9 enrollment in October 2011 for each of applicant categories and subcategories described above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>African American</th>
<th>Chinese</th>
<th>Latino</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Other Asian</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Choice: On-Time</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choice: Late Spring</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choice: Late Summer</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choice: Multiple Runs</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Choice</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designated: On-Time</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designated: Late</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Designated</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter District</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observations
- 91% of all K/6/9 students enrolled in an SFUSD school in October 2011 were enrolled in a school they requested; this ranged from 90% to 92% across the different racial/ethnic categories.
- 8% were enrolled in a school they did not request; this ranged from 7% to 9% across the different racial/ethnic categories.
- 86% submitted their application by the first deadline (on-time), 6% participated in multiple runs, and 8% submitted their application late.
- More than 99% of K/6/9 students enrolled in an SFSUD school in October 2011 live in San Francisco; less than one percent of live outside San Francisco and are enrolled with an inter-district permit to attend school in San Francisco.
What is the racial/ethnic breakdown of K/6/9 enrollment by applicant category?

The table below illustrates the racial/ethnic breakdown of K/6/9 enrollment in October 2011 for on-time applicants, late applicants (spring and summer), applicants who participated in multiple runs, and inter-district applicants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>African American</th>
<th>Chinese</th>
<th>Latino</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Other Asian</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On-Time</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Runs</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-districts</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The chart below illustrates the racial/ethnic breakdown of students enrolled in a school they requested (choice), students enrolled in a school they did not request (designated), and students who live outside San Francisco (inter district).

Observations

- The percent of the pool that is African American and Latino varies by applicant category: 31% of on-time applicants, 43% of applicants in multiple runs, 56% late applicants (spring and summer), and 67% of students on inter-district permits are African American or Latino.

Note: Inter-district students get assigned to schools at the end of the enrollment cycle (during the summer before the school year starts), and they can only get assigned to schools with openings and without pending requests from residents of San Francisco.
6. Demographics of Enrollment

The chart on the right illustrates the number of K/6/9 students for each racial/ethnic group who received an offer in March 2011 with the number of students enrolled in October 2011.

**Observations**
- The number of K/6/9 students enrolled in a school in October 2011 was 15% smaller than the number who received an offer in March 2011.
- While all racial/ethnic groups decreased, the largest was a 32% decrease in the number of Whites who received an offer in March 2011 compared with the number enrolled in October 2011.

For schools with more than 60% of a single racial/ethnic group and an API of 1, 2, or 3, how does kindergarten enrollment in October 2011 compare with March 2011 offers?

The tables below compare March 2011 offers with October 2011 enrollment at schools with more than 60% of a single racial/ethnic group and an API of 1, 2, or 3 in October 2011. The first table shows the number of students, and the second table shows the percent of total for each racial/ethnic group.

**Number of Students**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>African American</th>
<th>Chinese</th>
<th>Latino</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Other Asian</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BRYANT</td>
<td>March Offers</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRYANT</td>
<td>October Enrollment</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BV/MANN K-8</td>
<td>March Offers</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BV/MANN K-8</td>
<td>October Enrollment</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARVER</td>
<td>March Offers</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARVER</td>
<td>October Enrollment</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAVEZ</td>
<td>March Offers</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAVEZ</td>
<td>October Enrollment</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEVELAND</td>
<td>March Offers</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEVELAND</td>
<td>October Enrollment</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DREW</td>
<td>March Offers</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DREW</td>
<td>October Enrollment</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Percent of Total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>African American</th>
<th>Chinese</th>
<th>Latino</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Other Asian</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BRYANT</td>
<td>March Offers</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRYANT</td>
<td>October</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BV/MANN K-8</td>
<td>March Offers</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BV/MANN K-8</td>
<td>October</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARVER</td>
<td>March Offers</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARVER</td>
<td>October</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAVEZ</td>
<td>March Offers</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAVEZ</td>
<td>October</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEVELAND</td>
<td>March Offers</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEVELAND</td>
<td>October</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DREW</td>
<td>March Offers</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DREW</td>
<td>October</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARSHALL</td>
<td>March Offers</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARSHALL</td>
<td>October</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANCHEZ</td>
<td>March Offers</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANCHEZ</td>
<td>October</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERRA</td>
<td>March Offers</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERRA</td>
<td>October</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Observations
- Bryant, Chavez, Cleveland, Sanchez, and Serra's enrollment in October 2011 was smaller than the number of assignments made in March 2011.
- The size and diversity of Buena Vista/Mann's October 2011 enrollment is similar to March 2011 assignments.
- The percent of African Americans enrolled in Drew in October 2011 is greater than the percent assigned in March 2011 (71% compared with 78%).
- Bryant, Carver, Chavez, Cleveland, Marshall, Sanchez, and Serra's October 2011 enrollment had a greater concentration of a single racial/ethnic group compared with their March 2011 offers.
7. Participation Rates: On-Time and Late Applicants

What percent of K/6/9 applicants submitted an application on-time? How does this vary by student demographics and by geography?

Applications received by the first enrollment deadline are considered on-time, and applications received after the first enrollment deadline through mid-August are considered late.

The Educational Placement Center (EPC), with the support of the Office of Public Outreach and Communications, employed various strategies to share information about the new student assignment system with all stakeholders, and to develop and implement an outreach and recruitment campaign that would engage families in the enrollment process for the 2011-12 school year. One of the goals of the outreach and recruitment campaign was to increase on-time participation rates for African American and Latino students.

The following is a summary of some of the key outreach and recruitment strategies implemented by the EPC.

- With the financial assistance of a grant from the US Department of Education, EPC developed new user-friendly outreach and recruitment resources designed to meet the needs of our multi-cultural, multi-lingual community. These resources included a newly designed enrollment guide, policy and school guides, presentation materials, fliers, posters, banners, and a new enrollment web site with an interactive school selector to help families identify schools that meet criteria important to them, such as hours, after school programs, language pathways, and special education services.

- The EPC held over 100 multilingual outreach and recruitment events throughout the city and partnered with community based organizations (such as Parents for Public Schools) to help get the word out to all families. Most of the multi-lingual workshops were held in the evenings and on weekends and they were located in densely populated areas of the city. Particular attention was paid to Early Education Schools, Head Start, and prekindergarten sites. Satellite application pick-up/drop-off sites were opened in the areas of the city that historically have low participation rates.

- EPC launched a new Mobile Enrollment Center, using a yellow school bus to host enrollment counseling sessions and collect enrollment applications in communities that historically apply late in the enrollment cycle. The Mobile Enrollment Center distributed school supplies along with enrollment materials for families.

- Through a new Walk-the-Beat outreach initiative, EPC placement counselors walked through high-traffic areas in the Mission, Western Edition, Bayview and Chinatown to raise awareness about the enrollment deadline and promote enrollment workshops.

- The deadline for submitting applications was extended from mid-January to February 18, providing an additional four weeks for outreach and recruitment.

In addition to EPC’s outreach and recruitment efforts, school communities invested significant time and energy promoting their schools. School tours, for example, are a key element of SFUSD’s outreach and recruitment efforts. In addition, every school participates in a school fair to kick off the enrollment cycle, and over 10,000 people attend this annual event.
What percent of K/6/9 applicants submitted an application on time for March offers, and does it vary by race/ethnicity?

The chart below illustrates when families submitted their application for the 2011-12 school year, and it shows how it varies by race/ethnicity.

**Observations**
- 92% of applicants submitted their application by the February 18, 2011 deadline.
- More than 1,000 new applications for kindergarten, 6th grade, and 9th grade were submitted after the first deadline and before August 15th.
- The participation rates for African Americans and Latinos increased in 2011: 80% of African American and 90% of Latino applicants submitted their application on-time in 2011 compared with 76% and 87% in 2010.
- Despite this improvement, the percent of African Americans submitting their application late is significantly higher than all other racial/ethnic groups; it is twice as high as the rate for Latinos, five times the rate for White, and almost seven times the rate for Chinese applicants.
How do on-time/late applicants vary by geography?

The maps on the next three pages show how on-time and late applicants vary by geography. Kindergarten, 6th grade, and 9th grade applicants are represented on three different maps. Each map groups the applicants based on the elementary attendance area they live in to facilitate an analysis of how on-time and late applicants vary by geography.

A pie in each attendance area indicates the percent of on-time and late applicants living in the attendance area. Green represents the on-time applicants and red represents late applicants. The larger the red slice the greater the percent of residents who submitted their application late.

The size of the pie is relative to the number of applicants living in the attendance area; the larger the pie the greater the number of applicants living in the attendance area.

Observations

- Overall, 91% of kindergarten applicants applied by the first deadline (were on-time), and 9% were late.
- Late applicants live all over the city; every attendance area had late applicants.
- Most attendance areas where more than 9% of the residents were late are located in the southeast of the city (for example, Malcolm X, Carver, Harte, and Visitacion Valley).
Observations

- Overall, 94% of 6th grade applicants applied by the first deadline (were on-time), and 6% were late.

- Nearly 100% of 6th grade applicants living in Argonne, Garfield, Lau, Peabody, Spring Valley, Sutro, and West Portal’s attendance areas submitted their applications on time.

- Most attendance areas in which more than 6% of the 6th grade applicants living in the attendance area were late are located in the northeast and southeast areas of the city. For example, Tenderloin and Redding’s attendance area in the north east, Webster’s attendance area in the center, and Starr King and Carver’s attendance area in the south east.
9th Grade Applicants for the 2011-12 School Year (on-time and late)

**Observations**

- Overall, 95% of 9th grade applicants applied by the first deadline (were on-time), and 5% were late.

- Nearly 100% of 9th grade applicants living in Cobb, Peabody, and Sutro’s attendance areas submitted their applications on time.

- Most attendance areas where more than 5% of the 9th grade residents were late are located in the northeast and southwest areas of the city.
8. Choice Assignments

How many K/6/9 applicants got assigned to a school of their choice?

The charts and table below shows the percent of K/6/9 students who got assigned to their first choice, second or third choice, choice ranked lower than their third choice, or a school they did not request (i.e., designated assignment) in March 2011.

### Table 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>1st Choice</th>
<th>2nd or 3rd</th>
<th>Other Asian</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Asian</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Observations

- 85% got assigned to one of their choices
  - 80% got assigned to their first, second, or third choice.
  - 63% of kindergarten, 6th grade, and 9th grade applicants got assigned to their first choice.
- 15% got assigned to a school they had not requested (i.e., a designated assignment).
- The percent of African Americans who got their first choice is higher than the overall percent (72% compared with 63%). There are fewer African American applicants than any other racial/ethnic group and they listed Drew most frequently as a first choice. Since Drew doesn’t have a large applicant pool (see page 18) students who request it are more likely to get an offer than students who request schools with a large applicant pool.
- The percent of Whites who got their first choice is lower than the overall percent (55% compared with 63%). Whites are the third largest racial/ethnic group and they listed Clarendon most frequently as a first choice. Since Clarendon has an enormous applicant pool (it’s the most requested) most students who apply cannot get assigned.
How does the percent of K/6/9 applicants who got a choice vary by geography?

The map below shows how choice outcomes for K/6/9 applicants in March 2011 varied by geography. All K/6/9 applicants in the March 2011 run are grouped into the attendance area boundaries they live in, and each attendance area boundary has a pie indicating the percent of applicants who live in that geographic boundary who got their first choice (red), their second or third choice (green), a choice they ranked four or lower (blue), or no choice (i.e., a designated offer). The larger the red area of the pie, the greater the percent of residents who got their first choice, and the larger the orange area of the pie the greater the percent who didn’t get any of their choices. The different sizes of the pies indicate the number of residents; the larger the pie the greater the number of K/6/9 applicants living in the attendance area.

Observations

- Overall, 63% of K/6/9 applicants got their first choice in March 2011 – these applicants are indicated by the red slice of the attendance area pies.
  - Carver, Tenderloin, Moscone, Malcolm X, Harte, Vis Valley, and Muir had the highest percent of residents assigned to whatever school they listed as a first choice.
- Overall, 15% of applicants got an offer to a school they did not request – these applicants are indicated by the orange slice of the pie.
  - McCoppin, Cobb, Sutro, Clarendon, Flynn, Alvarado, and Lakeshore had the highest percent of residents assigned to a school they did not request.
9. Attendance Area Boundaries

Do we need to make any modifications to the attendance area boundaries?

In September 2010, the Board of Education approved the district’s elementary attendance areas after more than a year of demographic analysis and a public engagement process that included an evaluation of suggestions from the community. Throughout this development process, the following factors were taken into account: neighborhood demographics, where students live now and where enrollment changes are expected in the future; availability of school facilities; traffic patterns; location of programs; and coherence of preK-to-K and elementary-to-middle school pathways.

Recommendations from the Community

Following the March 2011 assignment offers, community members recommended the following changes to the elementary attendance area boundaries approved by the Board in September 2010:

1. Alvarado (Glen Park) - move boundary south from 29th to 30th street;
2. Alvarado (Milk) - move boundary north nearer crest of hill;
3. Grattan (McKinley) - move boundary east to include Upper Haight;
4. Sloat (Miraloma) - move boundary north to include St. Francis Wood;
5. Sunnyside (Miraloma) – move boundary north to include Sunnyside Playground and Sunnyside Conservatory; and
6. Parks (Sherman) – move boundary north of Geary Boulevard.

The red lines on the map below are the elementary attendance area boundaries approved by the Board in September 2010, and the blue lines are the six suggestions received from the community.
When reviewing the six recommendations received from the community in spring 2011, SFUSD staff considered the same factors taken into account when developing the attendance area boundaries approved by the Board in September 2010 (e.g., neighborhood demographics, where students live now and where enrollment changes are expected in the future, etc.).

The map below shows how many kindergarten applicants for the 2011-12 school year live in each attendance area (on-time and late applicants, including those who did not request their attendance area school), and how that compares to all kindergarten seats available in the attendance area — including kindergarten seats for citywide schools and programs in the attendance area.

Did each attendance area have enough seats in 2011-12 to accommodate all the kindergarten students living in the attendance area?

Each attendance area has a circle relatively sized according to the ratio of kindergarten applicants living in each attendance area to kindergarten seats in the attendance area. Red circles indicate there are more kindergarten residents than seats, and yellow circles indicate there are fewer kindergarten residents than seats. The larger the circle the greater the ratio of residents to students to seats.
Observations

• Overall, the number of students who applied for kindergarten in 2011-12 exceeded SFUSD’s kindergarten seats; 5,566 students applied for kindergarten and there were 5,186 kindergarten seats, which means the demand for kindergarten was 107% of seats. [See page 68 for information regarding the percent of applicants enrolled; by October 2011, kindergarten was enrolled at 87% of capacity.]

• During the development of the boundaries approved by the Board in September 2010, we identified a mismatch between where students live and where schools are located, and discovered that given the size and distribution of schools throughout the city it’s not possible to create attendance areas that can accommodate all students living in them. The residential patterns of kindergarten applicants for the 2011-12 school year are consistent with those findings. At the same time, data on page 60 illustrates that more than half of the applicants do not list their attendance area school anywhere among their choices.
  
  o Technically, 38% (22 out of 58) of attendance areas have the capacity to accommodate all kindergarten applicants for the 2011-12 school year who live in the attendance area (yellow circles), and the remainder of attendance areas have more residents than seats (red circles).

  o Many attendance areas in the west, northeast, and central areas of the city with more kindergarten residents than kindergarten seats (red circles) are located near attendance areas that have more seats than residents (yellow circles). For example, on the west side, Key and Jefferson have more residents than seats but they are located near Stevenson and Sunset which have fewer residents than seats.

  o The same is not true for attendance areas in the southeast. Carver’s attendance area has the biggest circle (301% - 450%), which means the number of kindergarten applicants living in Carver’s attendance area (regardless of their requests) is about four times the number of kindergarten seats in Carver’s attendance area. The schools near Carver (Harte, Malcolm X, and Drew) also have more residents than kindergarten seats. This means the southeast has significantly more residents than seats.

• There are thirteen attendance areas that have citywide schools, and the kindergarten seats for each citywide school are added to the total number of seats for that attendance area. While most of the attendance areas with a citywide school have kindergarten seats to accommodate the kindergarten applicants who reside in the attendance area, Monroe, Moscone, and Webster do not have enough seats to accommodate the number of kindergarten applicants who live in these attendance areas

Note: Seats at Lilienthal’s Divisadero campus were not included in the number of seats in Cobb’s attendance area because it only serves students in grades 3 to 8.

• Some attendance areas that technically have the capacity to accommodate all kindergarten residents have seats in the attendance area that are dedicated to city-wide programs which means they do not give a preference to attendance area residents. For example, technically Clarendon’s attendance area has enough seats to accommodate all kindergarteners living in the area, but these seats include the city-wide seats for the JBBP at Clarendon and all the seats at Rooftop and Alice Fong Yu.
Response to Recommendations from the Community

Based on staff’s analysis of the recommendations submitted by the community in the spring of 2011 to modify six attendance areas, staff reached the following conclusions.

- Alvarado’s attendance area should not be enlarged because the number of kindergarten applicants in 2011-12 exceeded the number of kindergarten seats in the attendance area. In addition, 50% of the seats at Alvarado are for the Spanish Immersion pathway and therefore the attendance area tie-breaker only applies to 50% of Alvarado’s seats.

- Grattan’s attendance area should not be enlarged to encompass some of McKinley’s attendance area because Grattan’s attendance area has more residents than seats; and McKinley’s attendance area should not be made smaller because it has fewer residents than seats.

- Both Sloat and Miraloma have more kindergarten residents than seats; therefore neither attendance area should be enlarged.

- Sherman’s attendance area should not be reduced to increase Parks’ attendance area because both attendance areas have fewer residents than seats. In addition, there are concerns about moving the Parks attendance area north of Geary since the high traffic patterns are considered a topographical barrier.

- Sunnyside has fewer residents than seats, and Miraloma has more residents than seats. Therefore it may be a good idea to reduce the size of Miraloma’s attendance area and increase the size of Sunnyside’s attendance area by moving Sunnyside’s boundary north to encompass Sunnyside Playground and Sunnyside Conservatory.

SFUSD staff will explore this recommendation with the Board and the community; any changes would begin with the enrollment period for the 2013-14 school year which is schedule to launch in the fall of 2012.
10. Attendance Areas and Enrollment

What percent of kindergarteners are enrolled in their attendance area school? How does this vary by geography and by student demographics?

Since 85% of applicants get assigned to a school they requested, before looking at enrollment by attendance the next few pages explore requests for attendance area seats.

What percent of applicants request their attendance area school? Does it vary by race/ethnicity?

Chart 15 shows the percent of kindergarteners by race/ethnicity who requested their attendance area school and where among their choices they ranked their request for their attendance area school.

Observations
- 48% of kindergarteners requested their attendance area school and 52% did not rank their attendance area school anywhere among their choices.
  - 25% requested their attendance area school as a first choice, 14% requested it as a second or third choice, and 10% ranked it fourth or lower.
- The percent of African American and Latino applicants who did not request their attendance area school was higher than the overall average - 60% and 59% respectively.

Did requests for attendance area schools vary by geography?

Map 18 on page 61 has a color coded pie in each attendance area to illustrate request patterns for all kindergarten applicants for the 2011-12 school year (both on-time and late) living in the attendance area regardless of the school they enrolled in. The larger the pie the greater the number of kindergarten applicants living in the attendance area.

Red indicates the percent of kindergarten applicants living in the attendance area who requested their attendance area school as a first choice; green indicates the percent who requested their attendance area as a second or third choice; blue indicates the percent who requested their attendance area as a fourth or lower choice; and orange indicates the percent of kindergarten applicants who did not request their attendance area school.
Observations

- **52%** of applicants did not request their attendance area school.
  - **55%** of attendance areas (32 of 58) have more than half of their residents not requesting their attendance area school among their choices (i.e., the orange slice is at least 50% of the pie).
  - Drew and Cobb had the lowest percent of requests from kindergarten applicants living in the attendance area.
  - Less than a quarter of residents in Cobb, Drew, El Dorado, Harte, Carver, and McCoppin’s attendance areas requested their attendance area school as one of their choices.

- **25%** of applicants listed their attendance area school as their first choice.
  - Lau had the greatest percent of residents requesting their attendance area school as a first choice; **60%** of all kindergarten residents of Lau’s attendance area listed Lau as a first choice.
  - More than half of the residents in Sherman, Lau, Spring Valley, Grattan, Clarendon, and West Portal requested their attendance area school as a first choice (i.e., the red slice is at least 50% of the pie).

- More than **75%** of residents in **nine** attendance areas listed their attendance area school among their choices: Grattan, Spring Valley, West Portal, Alamo, Lafayette, Lau, Clarendon, Alvarado, and Sherman.
  - Grattan had the greatest percent of residents requesting their attendance area school; **89%** of all applicants living in Grattan’s attendance area listed Grattan among their requests.
What percent of kindergarteners are enrolled in their attendance area school? Does it vary by race/ethnicity?

Chart 16 shows the percent of kindergartens by race/ethnicity enrolled in their attendance area school.

Chart 16

What % of kindergartners are enrolled in their attendance area school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>No, enrolled in non-requested school</th>
<th>No, enrolled in choice ranked lower</th>
<th>No, by choice</th>
<th>Yes, by designation</th>
<th>Yes, by choice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Asian</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observations

- 63% of kindergarteners are not enrolled in their attendance area school because they are enrolled in a school they prefer more than their attendance area school (red).
  - The percent of African Americans and Latinos enrolled in a school they prefer to their attendance area school is greater than the overall percent – 70% and 67% respectively.
- 30% of kindergarteners are enrolled in their attendance area school (orange and blue). 1% did not request their attendance area school – they received a designated offer to their attendance area school.
- 3% are enrolled in a school ranked lower than their attendance area school (green).
- 4% are enrolled in a non-requested school that is not their attendance area school (yellow).

Does the percent of kindergarteners enrolled in their attendance area school vary by geography?

Map 19 on page 63 has a color coded pie in each attendance area to illustrate whether kindergarteners living in the attendance area are enrolled in:

- a school of their choice ranked higher than their attendance area school – including students who did not request their attendance area school (red);
- their attendance area school because they requested it (blue);
- their attendance area school because they did not get any of their choices and were offered their attendance area school (orange);
- a choice ranked lower than their attendance area request (green); or
- a school other than their attendance area that they did not request (yellow).

The larger the pie the greater the number of kindergarten residents. The larger the blue and orange areas of the pie the greater the percent of residents enrolled in their attendance area school.
Observations

- 30% of all kindergarteners in October 2011 were enrolled in their attendance area school.
  - 29% were enrolled by choice (blue).
  - Ten schools have more than 50% of enrollment from attendance area residents who chose the school. Three schools are contiguous located in the north west (Lafayette, Argonne, and Alamo); three are contiguously located in the north east (Lau, Spring Valley, and Wo); two schools are located in the center for the city (Grattan and McKinley); and two schools are located on the west side (West Portal, Ulloa).
  - Very few residents in Sutro, Cobb, and Malcolm X’s attendance areas are enrolled in their attendance area school.
  - 1% are enrolled because they didn’t get any of their choices so they were designated to their attendance area school (orange). The majority of these students live in the east and south (e.g., Longfellow, Guadalupe, El Dorado, Vis Valley, Harte, Sheridan).

- 63% of kindergarteners were enrolled in a school listed higher than their attendance area school – this includes students who did not request their attendance area school and got assigned a requested school (red).

- 3% of kindergarteners requested their attendance area school but were offered a school ranked lower than their attendance area school (green).
  - Residents of Clarendon’s attendance area had the greatest percent of students enrolled in a school they ranked lower than their attendance area (30%).
  - More than 15% of residents in Miraloma, Taylor, and Alvarado’s attendance areas were enrolled in a school they ranked lower.

- 4% of kindergarteners were enrolled in a non-requested school (yellow).
11. Proximity and Enrollment

What percent of kindergarteners are enrolled in the school closest to where they live? How does this vary by geography and student demographics?

Did kindergarteners request the school closest to where they live? For those who did, where did they rank it as a choice? Did it vary by race/ethnicity?

Chart 17 illustrates by race/ethnicity whether kindergarteners in 2011-12 requested the school closest to where they live.

Observations
• 55% of kindergarteners did not request the school closest to where they live.
  ○ The percent of African American and Latino applicants who did not request the school closest to where they live is greater than the overall percent – 67% and 61% respectively.
• 23% of kindergarteners listed their closest school as a first choice, 12% listed it as a second or third choice, and 10% listed it as a fourth choice or lower.

Did the percent of kindergarteners who requested the school closest to where they live vary by geography?

Map 20 uses attendance areas as the geographic boundaries to show where kindergarteners who requested the school closest to where a student live. Each attendance area has a color coded pie to illustrate the request patterns for all kindergarten applicants for the 2011-12 school year (on-time and late) who live in the attendance area. The larger the pie the greater the number of applicants living in the attendance area.

Red indicates the percent of applicants living in the attendance area who requested the school closest to where they live as a first choice (the closest school might not be their attendance area school). Green indicates the percent who requested the school closest to where they live as a second or third choice; blue indicates the percent who requested the school closest to where they live as a fourth or lower choice; and orange indicates the percent who did not request the school closest to where they live.
Kindergarten Requests

Observations

- 23% of applicants listed their closest school as a first choice (red)
  - Grattan’s attendance area had the greatest percent of residents who listed the school closest to where they live as a first choice – 46% of residents.
  - West Portal and Spring Valley were the only other attendance areas where more than 40% of the residents listed their closest school as a first choice (45% and 43% respectively).

- 45% of applicants listed their closest school as one of their choices (red, green, blue)
  - Kindergarteners living in attendance areas on the west side of the city were more likely to request their closest school. For example, more than two-thirds of kindergarteners living in Alamo, Argonne, Lafayette, Stevenson, Sunset, West Portal, and Ulloa’s attendance areas requested the school closest to where they live.

- 55% of applicants did not request the school closest to where they live among their requests (yellow)
  - Cobb’s attendance area has the greatest percent of residents who did not request the school closest to where they live among their requests - 91% of kindergarteners living in Cobb’s attendance area didn’t request the school closest to where they live.
  - More than 80% of kindergarteners living in Monroe, Sunnyside, Carver, Muir, and Drew’s attendance areas did not request the school closest to where they live.
What percent of kindergarteners are enrolled in the school closest to where they live, and how does it vary by race/ethnicity?

Chart 18 shows the percent of kindergarteners by race/ethnicity enrolled in the school closest to their home.

**Observations**
- **64%** of kindergarteners are not enrolled in the school closest to where they live because they are enrolled in a school they prefer more than their closest (red).
  - The percent of African Americans and Latinos enrolled in a school they prefer more than their closest school is greater than the overall percent — 68% and 67% respectively.
- **26%** of kindergarteners are enrolled in their closest school (orange and blue). 1% did not request their closest school — they received a designated offer to their closest school.
- **4%** are enrolled in a school ranked lower than their closest school (green).
- **5%** are enrolled in a non-requested school that is not their closest school (yellow).

**How does the percent of kindergarteners enrolled in their closest school vary by geography?**

Map 21 illustrates enrollment and proximity patterns for kindergarteners; the maps use attendance areas as the geographic boundaries to capture how enrollment in the school closest to where an applicant lives varies geographically.

Each attendance area has a color coded pie to illustrate whether kindergarteners living in the attendance area are enrolled in:
- **their closest school** because they requested it as a choice (blue);
- **their closest school** because they did not get any of their choices and therefore got assigned to their closest school (orange);
- a school of their choice that was listed higher than their closest school (red);
- a school other than their closest school that was ranked lower than their closest school (green); or
- a school other than their closest school that they did not request (yellow).

The larger the pie the greater the number of students living in the attendance area. The larger the blue and orange section of the pie the larger the percent enrolled in the school closest to where they live (which may or may not be their attendance area school).
Kindergarten Enrollment, October 2011

Observations (Kindergarten)

- 64% are enrolled in a school of their choice that was ranked higher than their closest school (red).
  - More than 80% of kindergarteners living in Carver, Monroe, Malcolm X, and Cobb’s attendance areas are enrolled in a school ranked higher than their closest school.
- 26% of kindergarteners are enrolled in the school closest to where they live (blue & orange).
  - More than 50% of kindergarteners living in Lafayette, Grattan, Spring Valley, and Wa’s attendance area are enrolled in the school closest to where they live.
  - Carver and Drew’s attendance areas have the smallest percent enrolled in the closest school.
- 5% are enrolled in a school they did not request that is not their closest school (yellow).
  - Harte, Ortega, Serra, Taylor, and Flynn’s attendance areas have the largest percent of kindergarteners enrolled in a school they did not request that is not their closest school.
- 4% requested their closest school among their choices and are enrolled in a school ranked lower than their closest school (green).
  - Stevenson, Sutro, Clarendon, Miraloma, Taylor, and Jefferson’s attendance areas have the largest percent of kindergarteners who requested their closest school and are enrolled in a school ranked lower than their closest school.
12. Applicants and Enrollment

To what extent are K/6/9 applicants enrolling in SFUSD? How does this vary by student demographics and by geography? What are the placement outcomes for K/6/9 applicants who do not enroll?

What percent of all K/6/9 applicants enroll in an SFUSD school, and how does this vary by race/ethnicity?

Observations

- Overall the percent of sixth grade applicants who enroll (86%) is greater than the percent of 9th graders (79%) and the percent of kindergarteners (81%).

- A higher percent of Chinese applicants enroll than any other racial/ethnic group.

- At kindergarten, 25% of White applicants and 35% of Other applicants do not enroll.

- At 6th grade 21% of African Americans and 29% of Other applicants do not enroll.

- At 9th grade, Chinese and Other Asian applicants are the only racial/ethnic groups where the percent who enroll is greater than the overall percent of 21%.

Data Ref EPC/ITD: q11_43_demo

Chart 19
What percent of kindergarten applicants for the 2011-12 school year enrolled in SFUSD?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Enrolled</th>
<th>Not Enrolled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Asian</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chart 20
What percent of 6th grade applicants for the 2011-12 school year enrolled in SFUSD?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Enrolled</th>
<th>Not Enrolled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Asian</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chart 21
What percent of 9th grade applicants for the 2011-12 school year enrolled in SFUSD?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Enrolled</th>
<th>Not Enrolled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Asian</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What are the residential patterns for applicants who enroll / do not enroll?

Kindergarten Applicants, 2011-12 SY

**Observations**

- 19% of all students who applied for kindergarten in the 2011-12 school year did not enroll in SFUSD; 18% of the applicants who didn’t enroll submitted their application by the February 2011 deadline (on-time) and 1% submitted their application late. [5,566 students applied; 1,064 did not enroll; 4,502 enrolled, there is capacity for 5,186, therefore we are enrolled at 87% of capacity.]

- Nearly 100% of the kindergarten applicants living in Parker’s attendance area (north east) enrolled, and more than 96% of applicants living in two adjacent attendance areas (Spring Valley and Lau) enrolled.

- More than 90% of kindergarten applicants living in five attendance areas in the south east enrolled: Malcolm X, Carver, Harte, Visitacion Valley, and El Dorado.

- More than 50% of kindergarten applicants living in Sutro (north) did not enroll, and more than 40% of residents in two adjacent attendance areas (Cobb and Sherman) did not enroll.
6th Grade Applicants, 2011-12 SY

Observations

- 14% of all students who applied for 6th grade in the 2011-12 school year did not enroll in SFUSD; 12% of the applicants who didn’t enroll submitted their application by the February 2011 deadline (on-time) and 2% submitted their application late.

- Nearly 100% of the 6th grade applicants living in Spring Valley and Parker’s attendance areas and 98% of applicants living in Lau’s attendance area enrolled in SFUSD; these three attendance areas are adjacent to each other in the northeast of the city.

- Three adjacent attendance areas in the center of the city (McKinley, Clarendon, and Grattan) had the largest percent of residents who did not enroll in an SFUSD school – 37%, 32%, and 30% respectively.
Observations

- 21% of all students who applied for 9th grade in the 2011-12 school year did not enroll in SFUSD; 20% of the applicants who didn’t enroll submitted their application by the February 2011 deadline (on-time) and 1% submitted their application late.

- Attendance areas in the center / north side of the city had the highest percent of 9th grade residents who did not enroll in SFUSD.
  - 65% of 9th grade applicants living in Grattan’s attendance area and 52% of 9th graders living in Cobb’s attendance area did not enroll in an SFUSD school.
  - More than 40% of 9th grade applicants living in Alvarado, McKinley, Moscone, and West Portal’s attendance area did not enroll.
  - Attendance areas in the north east had the highest percent of 9th grade residents who enrolled. More than 92% of 9th grade applicants living in Lau, Spring Valley, Parker, Chin, and Redding’s attendance areas enrolled in SFUSD.
What are the placement outcomes for applicants who enroll / do not enroll?
Chart 22 illustrates the placement outcomes for kindergarten, 6th grade, and 9th grade applicants who did not enroll in SFUSD.

Observations

• 90% of kindergarten applicants who did not enroll received one of their choices or received a non-choice offer to a school within two miles of where they live.
  o 25% got their first choice, 41% got one of their top three choices, and 54% received one of their choices.
  o 36% got a non-choice offer to a school within two miles of where they live.
  o 10% received a non-choice offer to a school more than two miles from where they live.

• 74% of 6th grade applicants who did not enroll received one of their choices or received a non-choice offer to a school within two miles of where they live.
  o 46% got their first choice, 59% got one of their top three choices, and 62% got one of their choices.
  o 26% got a non-choice offer to a school more than two miles from where they live.

• 80% of 9th grade applicants who did not enroll received one of their choices or received a non-choice offer to a school within two miles of where they live.
  o 51% of got their first choice, 69% got one of their top three choices, and 72% got one of their choices.
  o 20% got a non-choice offer to a school more than two miles from where they live.
Tables 13, 14, and 15 describe the percent of all K/6/9 applicants who did not enroll in an SFSUD school, and whether those who enrolled / did not enroll received their first choice, second or third choice, fourth or lower choice, a non-choice offer less than two miles from their home, or a non-choice offer more than two miles from their home.

### Kindergarten

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Received first choice</th>
<th>Received 2nd or 3rd choice</th>
<th>Offered non-choice school less than 2 miles from home</th>
<th>Offered non-choice school more than 2 miles from home</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Enrolled</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6th Grade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Received first choice</th>
<th>Received 2nd or 3rd choice</th>
<th>Offered non-choice school less than 2 miles from home</th>
<th>Offered non-choice school more than 2 miles from home</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Enrolled</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 9th Grade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Received first choice</th>
<th>Received 2nd or 3rd choice</th>
<th>Offered non-choice school less than 2 miles from home</th>
<th>Offered non-choice school more than 2 miles from home</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Enrolled</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Observations**

- A larger percent of 6th grade applicants enroll than kindergarten or 9th grade applicants: 86% compared with 81% and 79%.
- 8% of all kindergarten and 6th grade applicants and 16% of all 9th grade applicants who got their first choice did not enroll in an SFUSD school.
- More than 50% of kindergarten, 6th grade, and 9th grade applicants who got a non-choice school did not enroll.
Which schools held seats for applicants who accepted their assignment but do not attend once school started in the fall?

**Kindergarten**
For the 2011-12 school year, 369 kindergarten applicants accepted their offer by registering at their assigned school but did not attend school when it started in August 2012. The 369 seats were distributed across 69 different schools and ranged from 1 seat to 16 seats at each school.

- 19% of students who registered but did not enroll were registered at Rosa Parks, McKinley, Lakeshore, Flynn, Sanchez, or Sheridan.
- 40% of the students who registered but did not enroll were White.

**6th Grade**
For the 2011-12 school year, 190 6th grade applicants accepted their offer by registering at their assigned middle school/K8 school but did not attend school when it started in August 2012. The 190 seats were distributed across 15 different schools (middle and K8).

- 56% of students who registered but did not enroll were registered at: Visitacion Valley, Aptos, Denman, or Presidio.

**9th Grade**
For the 2011-12 school year, 461 9th grade applicants accepted their offer by registering at their assigned high school but did not attend school when it started in August 2012. The 461 seats were distributed across 15 different high schools.

- 52% of students who registered but did not enroll were registered at: Lowell, Mission, or Washington.
13. School Transfers

To what extent are students transferring between schools, and when do they transfer? What are the demographics of students transferring between schools?

There was a lot of movement at the beginning of the school year, and some of this was due to openings created when registered students did not attend school. 1,800 students, across grades K through 12th grade, changed their school assignment at least once between the first day of school and October 2011.

Table 16 shows a grade level breakdown of the 1,800 students who changed school at least once between the first day of school and October 2011.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Grade</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Grade</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Grade</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Grade</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Grade</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th Grade</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th Grade</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th Grade</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th Grade</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th Grade</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th Grade</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th Grade</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chart 26 illustrates the racial/ethnic breakdown of the 1,800 students who changed schools at least once between the first day of school and October 2011.

- 43% of the movement occurred at the high school level, with 14% of all movement happening in 11th grade.
- 41% of the movement occurred at the elementary level, 12% of which was in kindergarten.
- 7th and 8th grade had the lowest movement (4% of all moves).

- 56% of students who changed schools were African American or Latino.
53% of the students who changed schools live in one of four zip codes:
- 94124, Bayview – 17%
- 94112, Ingelside-Excelsior – 16%
- 94110, Mission, Bernal Heights – 11%
- 94134, Visitacion Valley – 9%

45 of the 1,800 students who changed school between the first day of school and the third day of school were not enrolled by October 2011.
- 19 elementary students
- 8 middle school students
- 18 high school students

Chart 17 is the racial/ethnic breakdown of these 45 students.

Table 17 gives a grade level breakdown of the number of students who changed school and the timeframe in which they transferred.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th># who changed schools between 1st and 3rd day of school</th>
<th># who changed schools between 3rd day of school and October 2011</th>
<th># who changed schools more than once between 1st day of school and October 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Grade</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Grade</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Grade</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Grade</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Grade</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th Grade</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th Grade</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th Grade</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th Grade</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th Grade</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th Grade</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th Grade</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

66% | 31% | 3%

66% of the students who changed schools transferred between the first and the third day of school, and one-third of these were in the transitional grades - kindergarten, 6th grade, 9th grade.

31% transferred between the third day of school and October 2011, and 62% of these were at the high school level.

3% transferred more than once between the first day of school and October 2011, and 65% of these were at the high school level.
TRANSPORTATION

In December 2010, following the adoption of Student Assignment Policy P5101 and prior to its implementation, the Board approved a new policy for general education transportation services (see Appendix 2). This new policy is guiding the redesign of general education transportation services.

In February 2011, SFUSD staff presented the Board with a proposal to change general education transportation routes over a three year period to bring services in alignment with the Board’s strategic plan commitments and to minimize the use of general fund contributions for transportation.

The proposal shared with the Board in February 2011 included a recommendation to phase out transportation services to the following elementary schools by 2013-14:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Phase out Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Alamo</td>
<td>2012 or 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Argonne</td>
<td>2012 or 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Buena Vista</td>
<td>2012 or 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Chavez</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Cleveland</td>
<td>2012 or 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. El Dorado</td>
<td>2012 or 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Garfield</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Glen Park</td>
<td>2012 or 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Grattan</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Hillcrest</td>
<td>2012 or 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Key</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Lafayette</td>
<td>2012 or 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. McKinley</td>
<td>2012 or 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Miraloma</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. New Traditions</td>
<td>2012 or 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Phase out Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17. Ortega</td>
<td>2012 or 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Parker</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Parks</td>
<td>2012 or 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Peabody</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Redding</td>
<td>2012 or 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Sheridan</td>
<td>2012 or 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Starr King</td>
<td>2012 or 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Stevenson</td>
<td>2012 or 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Sunset</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Sutro</td>
<td>2012 or 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Taylor</td>
<td>2012 or 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Tenderloin</td>
<td>2012 or 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Ulloa</td>
<td>2012 or 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Vis Valley</td>
<td>2012 or 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Yick Wo</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, the recommendation included redesigning general education transportation services for the following schools by 2013-14:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Alice Fong Yu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Alvarado</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Bryant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Carmichael</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Carver</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. CEC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Chin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. CIS@DeAvila</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Clarendon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Cobb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Drew</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Fairmount</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Flynn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Harte</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Lakeshore</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Lau</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Lawton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Lilenthal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Malcolm X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. MEC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Milk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Moscone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Monroe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Muir</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Revere</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Rooftop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Sanchez</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. SF Community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. SF Montessori</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Sherman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Spring Valley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Webster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. West Portal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These recommendations were developed to support the Board’s transportation policy guidelines:

- support choice in student assignment as a tactic for creating diversity;
- provide reasonable access:
  - to English Learner pathways;
  - from areas of the city with the lowest average test scores (CTIP1) to city-wide schools and programs;
  - to attendance area schools; and
- minimize the use of general fund budget contributions for transportation.

The first round of changes to general education transportation services took effect in August 2011.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>11 schools lost general education transportation services in August 2011.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Chavez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Garfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Grattan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Key</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Marshall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Miraloma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Parker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Peabody</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sunset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sutro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Yick Wo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Four schools experienced a reduction in general education transportation services, but kept transportation from areas of the city with the lowest average test score and stops to after school providers.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Alice Fong Yu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Clarendon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lilienthal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rooftop</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since changes to general education transportation services were announced after the first enrollment application deadline, it is not possible to make connections between changes to transportation services and changes in demand and enrollment patterns for the 2011-12 school year.

SFUSD staff is currently developing a proposal for the 2012-13 school year, and plans to share information with the Board and public by March 2012.

- While the entire plan will not be finalized until March 2012, SFUSD staff recommended providing the following transportation services in the fall of 2012 to support the elementary to middle school feeder patterns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TO</th>
<th>FROM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aptos</td>
<td>Carver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aptos</td>
<td>Starr King</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francisco</td>
<td>Treasure Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giannini</td>
<td>Drew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoover</td>
<td>Monroe, Moscone, Serra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lick</td>
<td>Harte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marina</td>
<td>Treasure Island</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- It is unclear at this time whether additional middle school services will be available; current middle school services in other areas may be reduced in the fall of 2012.
NEXT STEPS

Additional Research Questions
Through our partnership with Stanford, and under the supervision of Sean Reardon, Professor of Education, Stanford will explore research questions related to SFUSD’s student assignment system over the next few years. This research involves the analysis of all K-12 assignments made through the Educational Placement Center (EPC) beginning with the 2004-05 school year through the 2012-13 school year.

The research will investigate how district policies shape the distribution of students among K12 schools in SFUSD, with a specific focus on three types of district policy:

a. location of programs (e.g., dual immersion) and attendance area boundaries;

b. information provided to families about schools and programs; and

c. the student assignment system.

The research will also explore how the distribution of students among schools affects academic outcomes.

To accomplish the purpose described above, Stanford Research Organization will seek to answer the following research questions:

1. How school preferences/rankings are affected by the location of programs, characteristics of programs, information available, and the student assignment system. This will involve looking at what schools/programs families list on their forms, how it has changed over time as the location of programs have changed, program characteristics have changed, information has changed, and the assignment system has changed.

2. How choice patterns affect the size and diversity of school enrollment. This will involve looking at how the size and diversity of the student population in schools changed over time, and how the diversity of students assigned to schools and ultimately attending those schools compares to the diversity of students who requested schools.

3. How the student assignment system affects the distribution of students among schools and programs, and how this distribution of students among schools and programs affects academic outcomes. This will involve looking at how school and program assignments affect families’ decisions about enrolling their students in SFUSD, how well the student assignment system produces equitable distributions of students among schools and programs, and how changes in policy might affect both the distributions of students among schools and programs and achievement patterns/gaps.

Discussion with the Board
The Board plans to discuss this report in the spring of 2012, and this public forum will provide an opportunity for the Board to give feedback to staff, and for the Board and staff to gather feedback from all stakeholders.
APPENDIX
1. Student Assignment System: 2011-12 School Year

SFUSD’s student assignment system is a school choice system designed to place students in schools within SFUSD in adherence to Board of Education Policy P5101. This summary provides a high-level overview of the technical aspects of the student assignment system used to make school assignments for the 2011-12 school year. For more information about other aspects of SFUSD’s student assignment system, including details about the 2012-13 school year, please visit our website at www.sfusd.edu

Tie-Breakers

Students were placed in their highest ranked choice as long as there were openings. If there were more requests for a school than openings, the student assignment system sorted requests using a series of preferences, known as tie-breakers, to place applicants in schools.

The following tie-breakers were request level tie-breakers, which means they applied to specific requests.

- **AA & PreK.** Requests from students who lived in the attendance area of the school and were also enrolled in an SFUSD preK in the same attendance area.
- **AA.** Requests from students who lived in the attendance area of the school requested.
- **CL.** Requests from students who were enrolled in and wished to continue in the language program.
- **CLS.** Request from students who were enrolled in and wished to continue in the language program AND who were the younger siblings of students who were enrolled in and would be enrolled in the language program at the school at issue during the 2011-12 school year.
- **LS.** Requests from younger siblings of students who were enrolled in and would be enrolled in the program at the school at issue during the 2011-12 school year.
- **PreK.** Requests from students who attended an SFUSD preK program at the city-wide school they are applying to.
- **Sibling.** Requests from younger siblings of students who were enrolled in and would be attending the school in 2011-12.

The following tie-breakers were student level tie-breakers, which means they applied to all requests submitted by a student who meet the parameters for the tie-breakers in question.

1. **CTIP1.** Students who lived in areas of the city with the lowest quintile of average test scores.
2. **Density.** Students who lived in attendance areas where the number of students who submitted an application form was greater than the number of seats available in the attendance area.
3. **NCLB/OE.** Students who attended a Program Improvement school or an Open Enrollment School.

Cohorts Sets

To determine the order in which requests were sorted, each request was assigned to one or more “cohorts”. A cohort was a group of students or requests that shared a tie-breaker. For example, requests submitted to a school by students who had siblings attending the school were part of the ‘sibling’ cohort.

For each type (citywide or attendance area) and level (elementary, middle, high) of school and program, a different list of cohort orders was used – these were called “Cohort Sets.”
The following is a list of the 15 different Cohort Sets used in the March 2011 student assignment run.

1. Kindergarten, non-citywide
   a. Sibling
   b. AA & PreK
   c. CTIP1
   d. AA
   e. Density
2. Kindergarten, citywide
   a. Sibling
   b. PreK
   c. CTIP1
   d. Density
3. Kindergarten, citywide language pathway
   a. CLS
   b. CL
   c. LS
   d. CTIP1
   e. Density
4. Non-transitional elementary grades, non-citywide
   a. NCLB
   b. Sibling
   c. CTIP1
   d. AA
   e. Density
5. Non-transitional elementary grades, citywide
   a. NCLB
   b. Sibling
   c. CTIP1
   d. Density
6. Non-transitional elementary grades, citywide language pathway
   a. NCLB
   b. CLS
   c. CL
   d. LS
   e. CTIP1
   f. Density
7. Middle transitional grade
   a. Sibling
   b. CTIP1
8. Middle transitional grade, citywide language pathway
   a. CLS
   b. CL
   c. LS
   d. CTIP1
   e. Density
9. Middle non-transitional grades
   a. NCLB
   b. Sibling
   c. CTIP1
10. Middle non-transitional grade, citywide language pathway
    a. NCLB
    b. CLS
    c. CL
    d. LS
    e. CTIP1
    f. Density
11. High transitional grade
    a. Sibling
    b. CTIP1 (non-CTIP1 80% ceiling)
12. High transitional grade, citywide language pathway
    a. CLS
    b. CL
    c. LS
    d. CTIP1
    e. Density
13. High non-transitional grades
    a. NCLB
    b. Sibling
    c. CTIP1
14. High non-transitional grade, citywide language pathway
    a. NCLB
    b. CLS
    c. CL
    d. LS
    e. CTIP1
    f. Density
15. Designation
    a. NCLB
    b. CTIP1
    c. Density

Each school looked at all the requests it received, and it sorted the requests by looking at the combinations of tie-breaker cohorts in order of preference based on the cohort set that matched the type and level of school and program requested. For example, a request for a kindergarten non-citywide school that had a combination of Sibling, AA & PreK, and CTIP1 tie-breakers was ranked higher than a request that only had a Sibling tie-breaker. Higher ranked tie-breakers always trumped combinations of lower ranked tie-breakers.
After the tie-breaker process and before placements were finalized, the student assignment system looked for potential transfer sets that would result in placements to higher ranked requests.

Students who did not receive a placement to a requested school were assigned to a school through a process of designation which considered geographical distance from their home.
2. General Education Transportation Policy

(108-24Sp1, Adopted by the Board on 12/14/2010)

The Superintendent, or his/her designee, shall have the discretion to construe all terms in this General Education Transportation Policy and to approve specific transportation plans that he or she deems necessary to meet the requirements of the Board’s strategic plan, student assignment policy (P5101), and vision for after school services, and to comply with transfer and transportation obligations under No Child Left Behind or similar state or federal laws.

As school bus transportation service is not a mandate under California law, the goals and objectives set forth below will guide the strategic use of resources for limited general education school bus transportation services.

- Support choice in school assignment as a tactic for creating diverse learning environments.
  - Maintain school bus transportation services that help create diverse enrollments.
  - Provide school bus transportation to racially isolated schools that have historically been under enrolled.

- Support equitable access to the range of opportunities offered to students.
  - Provide English Learners with reasonable access to language programs.
  - Provide newcomers with reasonable access to newcomer programs.
  - Provide low-income students living in areas of the city with the lowest average test scores (e.g., CTIP1 for the 2011-12 school year) with reasonable access to city-wide schools and programs.
  - Provide students living in densely populated attendance areas with reasonable access to schools in less densely populated areas of the city.

- Provide limited school bus transportation to support reasonable access for attendance area residents to their attendance areas school.

- To support the middle school assignment process outlined in P5101, provide limited transportation for middle school students in cases where a middle school attendance area is not reasonably accessible to the middle school, taking into account factors including the availability of reasonable MUNI routes.

- Transportation is not contemplated for general education high school students, and/or will only be considered when the Superintendent determines it is necessary to provide equitable access and reverse the trend of racial isolation and the concentration of underserved students in the same school.

- Support SFUSD’s vision for after school services.
  - Provide limited school bus transportation to after school programs if feasible and necessary to support SFUSD’s vision for after school services.

- Minimize the use of unrestricted general fund budget contributions for general education school bus transportation.

This transportation policy overrides all terms in Board policies and administrative regulations that are inconsistent with any of its provisions, including but not limited to 5117.1
3. Glossary of Terms

**Academic Performance Index (API)**: The Academic Performance Index (API) is a single number, ranging from a low of 200 to a high of 1000, which reflects a school’s performance level, based on the results of statewide testing. Its purpose is to measure the academic performance and growth of schools. The API is calculated by converting a student’s performance on statewide assessments across multiple content areas into points on the API scale. These points are averaged across all students and all tests and are calculated for schools and for each numerically significant subgroup of students at a school.

**API Rank**: The API rank of a school is established by deciles, ranking schools from the lowest of 1 to the highest of 10. Two types of API ranks are reported, a statewide rank and a similar schools rank. A school’s base API is used to determine its rank and is used to compare to all other schools in the state of the same type (elementary, middle or high school) to determine statewide ranking. The similar schools rank is determined by comparing the school’s API to 100 other schools of the same type with a mix of similar demographic characteristics. For the purposes of this report, the API ranking refers to the statewide rank.

**Attendance Areas**: Boundaries drawn around individual schools.

**Census Tract Integration Preference (‘CTIP’)**: A preference in program or school assignment based on a demographic value that is assigned to each combined census tract. This preference is designed to facilitate attendance at the same schools by students who live in demographically different areas of the city. Currently, the CTIP value is based on average K-12 California Standards Test (‘CST’) scores of students who reside in the combined census tract. An average K-12 CST score was computed for each combined census tract, and those combined census tracts were divided into quintiles based on average CST scores so that approximately 20% of all SFUSD students live within each quintile.

**Combined Census Tracts**: Geographic areas containing one or more adjacent census tracts from the federal decennial Census.

**CTIP1**: CTIP1 tracts are the combined census tracts with the lowest average CST scores.

**Designated assignments**: Students who do not receive an assignment offer a school listed as one of their choices receive an assignment offer to the school closest to their home that has openings after choice assignments are made. These assignment offers are called designated assignments.

**Elementary City-Wide Schools**: Elementary schools (K-5 and K-8 schools) that do not have an attendance area and therefore do not offer any local preference to students. The purpose of the city-wide school designation is to facilitate equitable access to the range of opportunities offered by SFUSD.

**Elementary City-Wide Programs**: Programs that are (a) clearly defined and listed on the SFUSD application form as a discrete choice, (b) are available at a limited number of elementary attendance area schools, and (c) have a separate enrollment capacity with seats reserved specifically for students enrolled in the program (for example, the Cantonese Immersion program at West Portal), are designated city-wide programs, and they do not offer any local preference to students. The purpose of the city-wide program designation is to facilitate equitable access to the range of opportunities offered by SFUSD.

**English Learner (‘EL’)**: Students who are in the process of acquiring English as a second language and have not yet reached Fully English Proficient (‘FEP’) status.

**Enrolled**: Students are enrolled in a school or program if they have accepted an assignment to and actually begun attending that school or program.
Feeder Patterns: Beginning with the assignment of students for the 2017-2018 school year, SFUSD fifth graders will receive an initial assignment to middle school based on the feeder pattern for the elementary school they attend, regardless of their residence.

Middle School Feeder Tie-breaker: A preference category used in student assignment until the 2017-2018 school year, based on designated elementary-to-middle school feeder patterns.

On Time Applicants: All applicants who submitted an enrollment application during the first placement period (November 15th, 2010 through February 18th, 2011) and received an assignment offer in March 2011.

Program Pathway: A program that is listed as a discrete choice on the SFUSD enrollment form and continues from pre-K to kindergarten, elementary to middle school, and/or middle school to high school. Spanish Immersion is an example of a program pathway. General Education is not considered a program pathway.

Racial/Ethnic Group: For the purposes of this report, the 20 racial/ethnic groups identified by the California Department of Education have been condensed to these six categories – African American, Chinese, Latino, White, Other Asians, and Other.

Racial Isolation: Although SFUSD’s enrollment is racially/ethnically diverse and does not have a majority group, many of our schools have more than 60% of a single racial/ethnic group, more than 70% of a single racial/ethnic group, and more than 80% of a single racial/ethnic group. Some schools with more than 60% of a single racial/ethnic group also have an Academic Performance Index (API) of 1, 2, or 3. The Board considers these schools racially isolated.

School Improvement Grant (SIG): The School Improvement Grant (SIG) provides funding to help school districts address the needs of schools in improvement, corrective action, and restructuring to improve student achievement. SIG funds are to be used to leverage change and improve technical assistance targeting activities towards measurable outcomes. Expected results from the use of these funds include improving student proficiency, increasing the numbers of schools that make adequate yearly progress, using data to inform decisions, and creating a system of continuous feedback and improvement.

Tie-breakers: A set of preferences used to assign students when there are more requests than available seats. Tie-breakers work in hierarchical order depending on the school, grade, or program requested.

Transitional Grades: The first grade of enrollment at any particular school. For example, in middle school, sixth grade is a transitional grade.

Underserved Students: Students performing Below Basic or Far Below Basic on the California Standards Test or other equivalent assessments administered by SFUSD.