
**RECOMMENDATIONS FOR STUDENT ASSIGNMENT
IN THE SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT**

Prepared by the
**COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE
ON STUDENT ASSIGNMENT**

Submitted to
Arlene Ackerman, Superintendent
February 22, 2005

This report is respectfully submitted to Arlene Ackerman, Superintendent of Schools, by the members of the Community Advisory Committee on Student Assignment.

Members of the Community Advisory Committee on Student Assignment:

Kermit Boston

Diana Ming Chan

Manika Clay

Chris Daniels

Sandra Fewer

Sandra Halladey

Bill Jackson

Edmund Jew

Henry Louie

Helen Lum

Jaime Ramirez

Victor Seeto

Michael Smith

Christina Wong

The following SFUSD staff members facilitated the work of the Committee:

Kimberly Cobb

Myong Leigh

Teresita Manalo

Orla O’Keeffe

Ky Vu

Table of Contents

Preface.....	4
Executive Summary	5
Historical Context	10
Consent Decree	10
Current Student Assignment Process.....	10
Program Placement	11
Outreach and Recruitment	11
Diversity Index Lottery Process.....	11
Concerns About the Current Student Assignment Process.....	13
Superintendent’s Proposal to Establish the Community Advisory Committee	14
Committee Members.....	15
Committee Meetings.....	19
Schedule, Agenda, and Information Reviewed.....	19
Ground Rules	23
Guiding Principles	25
Community Conversations.....	27
Questions.....	27
Profile of Participants	27
Data from Community Conversations	29
Recommendations.....	30
Overview.....	30
Options For Determining Assignments to Oversubscribed Schools.....	30
Option 1	32
Option 2	33
Option 3	33
Other Recommendations.....	33
Related Topics Discussed by the Committee.....	37
Conclusion	39
Appendix A: Superintendent’s Proposal 312-9Sp1	40
Appendix B: Community Conversations	44
Appendix C: Data from Community Conversations.....	50
Appendix D: “Five Families” Exercise.....	52
Appendix E: Simulation Data	56

Preface

Recognizing the importance of excellent public schools to the future of San Francisco's children, the Community Advisory Committee on Student Assignment (the "Committee") has faithfully undertaken and completed its charge as directed by the San Francisco Unified School District ("SFUSD" or the "District") Board of Education. The Committee has met for two to three hours nearly every week since April 2004, logging to date a total of over eighty (80) hours of deliberations in meetings alone, not including significant time spent reviewing documents or otherwise preparing between meetings.

In the course of these meetings, extensive research, thoughtful discussions, and vigorous debates, the Committee has gained many insights regarding the complicated issue of student assignment. The considerable challenges facing the District in developing student assignment policies that simultaneously are family-friendly, provide choices, and support academic achievement for all students have become clearer for all Committee members. Developing recommendations that reasonably address the numerous and often conflicting interests in this area was an extremely difficult task. Nevertheless, the Committee accomplished its duties, as reflected in this report.

Three specific options for how to assign students to schools, particularly in cases in which demand for seats exceed available spaces, are included in this report. Additionally, the report also includes several other observations and recommendations that are not exclusively associated with any of the three options but could be important parts of any overall District strategy for student assignment.

In general, the Committee wishes to underscore its unanimous view that the academic and program quality of all of SFUSD's schools is the single most important factor influencing the effectiveness, popularity, and success of any method of student assignment. Improving and achieving excellence in schools across the city will be far more helpful to San Francisco's children and families than the implementation of any particular technique of allocating over-demanded seats. Indeed, dramatic progress in offering a variety of rigorous academic and co-curricular programs delivered in safe and attractive schools in all areas of the city by highly effective and motivated educators would greatly reduce the types of student assignment-related conflicts that have beset the District and thousands of families for more than two decades. The Committee acknowledges and supports the District's current efforts to improve all of its schools and only hopes that these reforms will be enhanced, refined and accelerated.¹

Each member of the Committee sincerely appreciates the opportunity to provide advice to the SFUSD Superintendent and Board of Education on behalf of all the current and future students in San Francisco's public schools.

¹ For example, the Committee reviewed information regarding SFUSD's Students and Teachers Achieving Results (STAR) intervention program for underperforming schools, Dream Schools program for dramatic intervention and accelerated improvement, Secondary School Redesign Initiative, and new School of the Arts Academy.

Executive Summary

SFUSD has been a party to a desegregation Consent Decree since 1983. The Board of Education has adopted and the Federal Court has approved a student assignment plan to serve the goals of that Consent Decree, including racially and ethnically diverse school enrollments, and educational equity and improved student achievement. This student assignment system is based on program placement, outreach and recruitment, and a race-neutral lottery process. SFUSD's obligations under the Consent Decree, including the duty to use a Court-approved student assignment plan, are scheduled to end during the 2005-06 school year.

Several concerns have been raised by community members and District stakeholders regarding the current student assignment process. One concern is that both the number of schools with high concentrations of a single racial or ethnic group and the magnitude of such concentrations have increased since 1999. Additionally, numerous families have complained that the current system does not allow their children to attend schools close to their homes. Finally, many families have also voiced frustration at aspects of the current system that they find confusing, particularly the use of the Diversity Index.

In December, 2003 Superintendent Ackerman proposed to the Board of Education the creation of "a broad-based committee – made up of diverse members of the San Francisco community who represent its various interests – to study and to make recommendations regarding the student assignment process in the District." The proposal was adopted by the Board in March 2004.

The Community Advisory Committee on Student Assignment was charged with:

1. Reviewing and studying the current student assignment process used by the District and student assignment processes used by other school districts to provide students with the opportunity to attend schools with diverse enrollments and to facilitate improved student achievement;
2. Holding focus groups to hear what the San Francisco community thinks about the current student assignment process;
3. Consulting with District staff, community, representatives, and any appropriate experts;
4. Considering any relevant policies and plans, including the Consent Decree, Excellence for All, and the Facilities Master Plan; and
5. Recommending three student-assignment options for the 2006-2007 school year as well suggestions with respect to any incremental changes needed during the interim.

The Committee held meetings beginning in April 2004 and concluding in January 2005. Its first meetings were focused on establishing ground rules and guiding principles and gathering data relevant to the District's student assignment policies. In September and October, the Committee focused on planning for, conducting and debriefing the first series of community meetings. Each

of these meetings primarily featured a series of interactive questions, using hand-held devices through which community participants provided instant feedback. Shortly after these meetings, the Committee progressed to developing and evaluating options and identifying recommendations.

The Committee decided to distinguish between two groups of recommendations. The first set of recommendations comprises three mutually exclusive approaches to allocating seats to oversubscribed schools. The second set includes “cross-cutting” recommendations that could be applicable to any method of allocating oversubscribed seats.

In developing the first set of recommendations, Committee members proposed, discussed, and revised numerous options and reviewed simulations, prepared by District staff using actual enrollment requests for School Year 2004-05 assignment outcomes that would have resulted under six different options. The Committee agreed to recommend three options for assigning seats to schools in cases in which requests for seats outnumber available seats. These options primarily vary with respect to the following issues:

- Preference, if any, provided on the basis of the geographic relationship between an applicant’s residence and the location of the requested school; and
- When and whether a random lottery and/or index of factors linked to academic achievement is used to determine assignments.

The simulations indicated that more families would receive assignments to requested schools under all three options recommended by the Committee than they would under the current system, as indicated in the table below.

Simulation Results: Percent of Applicants Receiving Requested Schools

Outcome	Current System	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Received 1 st Choice	58%	59%	60%	60%
Received Any Choice	78%	84%	84%	84%
Received No Choice	21%	16%	16%	16%

The simulations indicated that more students would receive assignments to their attendance area schools in Option 1 and Option 2 than under the current system, but slightly fewer students would receive assignments to their attendance area schools using Option 3. These results are summarized in the table below.

**Simulation Results: Percent of Applicants
Receiving Attendance Area Schools vs. Other Schools**

Outcome	Current System	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Requested and received student's own Attendance Area school	29%	32%	33%	28%
Requested and received any other school	50%	53%	51%	56%
Received no choice	21%	16%	16%	16%

The simulations suggested that the number of schools with high racial concentrations would be slightly increased under Options 1 and 3 and slightly reduced under Option 2, as indicated in the following table.

**Simulation Results: Number of Schools with > 45% of Assignments
to a Single Racial / Ethnic Group**

Current System	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
42	45	40	48

In all three options, the Committee recommends that the District continue to offer placement priorities to students on the basis of sibling status and programmatic needs of certain special education and English Learner students.

Option 1 – For every school with an attendance area (also see “Attendance Areas” below), this option would reserve 50% of available seats for students residing within the attendance area and 50% for students outside of the attendance area. Attendance area students would be selected by pure random lottery, while an index of factors linked to academic achievement (also see discussion of “Diversity Index” below) would be used to assign seats to non-attendance area students.

Option 2 – For every school with an attendance area (also see “Attendance Areas” below), this option would reserve sixty percent (60%) of available seats for students residing within the attendance area and forty percent (40%) for students outside of the attendance area. Students in both groups would be selected by pure random lottery for the respective sets of seats. With the exception of program placements and pre-assignments, no other factors would be used to assign seats.

Option 3 – Under this option, all offers to all schools would be determined through a random lottery. No attendance areas would exist, and no preference would be provided to any applicant to any school based on geographic residence, any characteristic linked to academic achievement, or any other factor. The District would work with individual schools in outreach and program

development to provide information to prospective families and achieve diverse school enrollments.

In addition to the three options outlined above, the Committee offers additional recommendations that could accompany any of the three options, or variations thereof. These include the following:

Attendance Areas – The Committee believes that the District’s attendance areas are out-of-date and urges the District to reexamine and revise them.

Program Placement – The Committee recommends that the District provide one or more ways in which the San Francisco community can provide input into program placement decisions.

Dream Schools – The Committee supports the District’s attempt to improve underperforming schools through the Dream Schools. In establishing additional Dream Schools, the Committee encourages the District to promote diversity, expand outreach to all potential families, and align promotion policies across grade spans with assignment policies for other schools.

Teacher and Staff Quality – The Committee encourages the District to maintain high standards in the evaluation of teachers and principals. Also, exceptional teachers and school administrators who perform above and beyond the typical expectations of their roles should be recognized and rewarded.

School Safety – The Committee recommends that the District constantly place a high priority on efforts to maintain and improve the security and climate of all schools, particularly schools that families may currently avoid due to concerns related to safety.

Sharing Effective Practices Across Schools – The Committee recommends that the District actively foster sharing of knowledge regarding effective practices across schools. A variety of school community members should be involved in this exchange of knowledge, including the principal, teachers, parents, and students.

Outreach and Recruitment – The Committee recommends that the District, in partnership with community organizations, continue to inform the public about high-quality school options.

Student Assignment Interventions for Under-Requested and/or Underperforming Schools – Building on efforts including the STAR schools intervention program for underperforming schools, the Committee recommends that the District develop targeted interventions for under-requested or under-enrolled schools beginning with academic intervention and support and community input and progressing to steps such as not permitting additional students to enroll or school closure.

Assistance for Schools with High Racial / Ethnic Concentrations – The Committee recommends that the District work with schools to identify ways to achieve greater racial diversity, particularly through outreach and program development, in cases in which more than 50% of

students represent a single racial / ethnic group. The District should also examine practices across schools to work with students in small racial / ethnic minorities within their schools.

Transportation – The Committee recommends that the District modify its transportation services so they are aligned with the student assignment policies that are ultimately approved by the Board. The Committee also recommends that, to the greatest extent possible, the District offer transportation for students who do not receive assignments to requested schools.

Modification of Capacity – The Committee supports the idea of modifying school enrollment capacities to better satisfy parent demand as well as to promote greater diversity, as long as such modifications are fiscally responsible.

Designated Assignments – For students who do not receive assignments to requested schools, the Committee recommends that the District continue to consider the student’s home address and SFUSD’s available transportation routes when selecting a school placement. When possible, the District should continue to offer assignments within one mile of elementary students’ homes and within two miles of middle school students’ homes if requested by parents / guardians.

The Committee also discussed several other important issues, but did not reach consensus on specific recommendations. These included the following questions:

- Should race be a factor in determining assignments to schools?
- Should the Diversity Index be maintained, modified, or eliminated?
- Should schools be grouped into geographic clusters with students receiving preference to attend schools within their respective cluster?
- Should children of teachers and staff be given priority in the student assignment process?

The members of the Committee hope the recommendations and observations outlined in this report will help advance the community-wide conversation that must be held regarding school options for San Francisco’s families. The Committee does not view these recommendations as a menu of options within which the Superintendent, Board of Education, or community should limit their thinking. Instead, this report is submitted with the goal of generating additional dialogue and ideas. As the District moves forward in its deliberations regarding student assignment, the Committee is prepared to reconvene and provide additional advice or otherwise assist as requested in this extremely important discussion.

Historical Context

Consent Decree

San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD) has been a party to a desegregation Consent Decree since 1983. The Board of Education has adopted and the Federal Court has approved a student assignment plan to serve the goals of that Consent Decree, including racially and ethnically diverse school enrollments, and educational equity and improved student achievement. SFUSD's obligations under the Consent Decree, including the duty to use a Court-approved student assignment plan, are scheduled to end during the 2005-06 school year.

The current student assignment process used by SFUSD was developed in response to the 1999 settlement prohibiting the use of race or ethnicity as the predominant consideration in student assignment. The Court approved that settlement as fair, reasonable, and adequate. 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 its January 19, 2000 Order.

Superintendent Arlene Ackerman came to SFUSD in August 2000. In the course of assessing the needs of SFUSD students and in response to the orders of the Court, Dr. Ackerman and her staff analyzed the extent to which SFUSD had met the goals of the Consent Decree. This analysis determined that, while SFUSD has made much progress, much remained to be done for SFUSD to achieve the objectives of the Consent Decree to the extent practicable.

As part of SFUSD's extensive self-analysis, it developed a five-year comprehensive educational plan, "*Excellence For All*," which included not only a detailed program for improving academic performance and closing the achievement gap, but also a revised student assignment system, which focused on program placement, outreach and recruitment, and a race-neutral lottery process.

In 2001, the parties stipulated that SFUSD should implement *Excellence for All* and use a modified version of its "Assignment Method . . . for the 2002-2003 school year, and in subsequent years, unless changed in accordance with paragraph 13(m)." In its October 24, 2001 Memorandum Decision and Order, the Court approved the second settlement agreement. SFUSD's current student assignment process thus is required by the October 24, 2001 Order. The 2002-2003 school year was the first year in which students were assigned using this method.

Current Student Assignment Process

Since the 1999 settlement, SFUSD has operated a race-neutral, choice-based student assignment system. This system includes three parts: program placement, outreach and recruitment, and a lottery-based assignment process. The lottery process was modified as part of the 2001 settlement to include, where the demand for seats exceeds the supply, the consideration of a student's residence and six race-neutral, but educationally significant, diversity factors. The most significant determinants of a student's school assignment, however, remain parental choice and school capacity.

Under the current system, the large majority of applicants each year have been assigned to schools of their choice. However, some families have not been assigned to schools they requested, resulting in non-requested or “designated” assignments.

Program Placement

A component of SFUSD’s current student assignment process is the equitable placement of specialized educational programs and services, such as gifted and talented programs, special education programs, ELL services, alternative and magnet programs, and “newcomer” programs for recent immigrant students. SFUSD’s goals are to ensure equitable access to high quality programs throughout SFUSD and also to attract and retain a diverse student population at each school. SFUSD’s Program Placement Committee has moved several programs each year to promote equal access and diverse school enrollments, and it continues to work to achieve the goals outlined in *Excellence for All*. (See page 34 for the Committee’s recommendations on ways in which the program placement process can be strengthened and expanded to include greater community input.)

Outreach and Recruitment

The current assignment process also involves extensive efforts to promote schools and recruit students. The goals of these efforts are to inform parents about all SFUSD schools so that they can make informed choices and to recruit students from diverse backgrounds to attend each school. The current student assignment plan recognizes that effective promotion and student recruitment are critical to ensuring all students have equitable access to information about and enrollment in schools. SFUSD’s schools and the Educational Placement Center continue to focus on conducting extensive outreach and recruitment.

Diversity Index Lottery Process

The current student assignment process, which applies to all SFUSD schools except Lowell High School and the School of the Arts (“SOTA”)² incorporates several important considerations:

- a) Parent choice
- b) Sibling priority
- c) Access to programs that meet specialized learning needs
- d) Enrollment in a school close to home
- e) Enrollment diversity defined to include multiple characteristics

The current selection process is designed to attempt to give parents choice, ensure equal access, and promote diversity without using race/ethnicity. Under this system, any student may apply to any school in SFUSD. Parents or guardians may list up to seven choices on their applications.

Since SFUSD allows any student to apply to any school in the District, there are situations in which there are more applicants than seats available. Therefore, SFUSD uses a diversity index lottery system to select students when the demand is greater than the number of available openings in any school/grade/program.

² Lowell High School is an academically selective high school with admissions criteria based on its rigorous academic program. Likewise, SOTA is a high school arts magnet school with selective admissions criteria based on its specialized academic program.

The diversity index lottery is a formula that, for a particular school, grade and program, seeks to assign students who are different from each other based on the following six race-neutral factors that are correlated with academic achievement:

- (1) socio economic status
- (2) student's prior academic achievement
- (3) mother's educational background
- (4) student's language status
- (5) quality of student's prior school
- (6) student's home language.

For Kindergarten students only five of the six profiles are used; quality of student's prior school is excluded. Thirty-two (32) unique profiles are possible for a kindergarten student. For students applying to 1st through 12th grades, all six characteristics make up a student's profile; sixty-four (64) unique combinations are possible for these applicants.

Once all applications are entered into the database, students eligible for pre-assignment (younger siblings, special education inclusion students, and students exiting newcomer schools) are assigned. For each combination of grade and program in each school the computer then compares the number of remaining seats available with the number of student requests. If seats available exceed requests, all applicants are assigned. If the number of requests exceeds the number of seats available, then the diversity index lottery is used.

The lottery program first averages the "profiles" of all pre-assigned students to create a "base profile." Then all profiles in the applicant pool are ranked from highest to lowest contribution to diversity.

For attendance area schools, the computer then divides the students who have requested the program/grade into two groups: students who live in the school's attendance area and students who live outside the school's attendance area.³ The program assigns the student living within the attendance area whose profile is the most different from the base profile. The base profile is then recalculated, to include the profile of the student just assigned. The index recalculates how many seats remain for assignment, and the process is repeated until students from the attendance area no longer contribute diversity to the base profile or until no more seats remain or additional placements. When students from the attendance area no longer contribute to the diversity of the base profile, all students who requested the grade/program are considered for assignment, beginning with the student whose profile is the most different from the base profile.

For non-attendance area schools, the lottery program selects from among all applicants in a similar manner, except that no advantage is provided to any applicants based on their residential proximity to these schools.

³ Attendance areas are a remnant of the pre-1999 assignment system; therefore, while most attendance areas are contiguous, some include "satellite" areas originally created for desegregation purposes.

At the end of process, every student applicant receives an assignment offer. Students who have not been assigned to any requested schools are offered assignments to another school. These schools are selected from among geographically proximate schools with space available.

Families who are dissatisfied with their assignment offers have several options including submitting an amended application form, waiting pool request, medical appeal, and/or family hardship appeal. More details about all of these options are available in the Enrollment Guide published by EPC each year.

Concerns About the Current Student Assignment Process

Under the current system, both the number of schools with high concentrations of a single racial or ethnic group and the magnitude of such concentrations have increased since 1999. Thus, while SFUSD is complying with the Consent Decree's requirements for student assignment, as specified in Paragraph 13 of the Consent Decree, SFUSD may not be meeting the Consent Decree's central goal of the "broadest practicable distribution of students of each racial/ethnic group," as set forth in Paragraph 12 of the Consent Decree.

Two factors appear to be primarily responsible for this divergence. First, SFUSD is not currently permitted to consider race or ethnicity in student assignment, which was the manner in which racially and ethnically diverse school enrollments were achieved under Paragraph 13 of the Consent Decree prior to 1999. Second, parental choice is a significant factor under the current system; indeed, most students are assigned to one of their first two school choices.

In addition to concerns about meeting the Consent Decree's central goals, there has been a great deal of discussion in the community about whether the current student assignment process is fair and reasonable for families. In particular, numerous families have complained that the current system does not allow their children to attend schools close to their homes. Many San Francisco families prefer to send their children to schools outside their immediate neighborhoods.⁴ Nonetheless, since the District has determined school assignments through the current policy, hundreds of families each year have objected to being denied assignments in nearby schools. Families have also voiced frustration at aspects of the current system that they find confusing, particularly the use of the Diversity Index.

⁴ Over the past several years, approximately one-third of total requests for school assignments have been to applicants' own attendance area schools, with another third typically made to other schools with attendance area, and the remaining third to alternative schools (i.e., schools without an attendance area).

Superintendent's Proposal to Establish the Community Advisory Committee

On December 9, 2003, Superintendent Ackerman submitted a proposal to the Board of Education recommending the creation of “a broad-based committee – made up of diverse members of the San Francisco community who represent its various interests – to study and to make recommendations regarding the student assignment process in the District.” The Superintendent’s proposal (312-9Sp1) was taken up by the Rules, Policy and Legislation Committee of the Board of Education on January 8, 2004; it was amended and forwarded without recommendation to the full Board of Education. The proposal was then adopted, as amended, on March 9, 2004 by the Board of Education. A copy of the Board resolution is provided in Appendix A.

Per Board Resolution 312-9Sp1, the Community Advisory Committee on Student Assignment was charged with:

- Reviewing and studying the current student assignment process used by the District and student assignment processes used by other school districts to provide students with the opportunity to attend schools with diverse enrollments and to facilitate improved student achievement;
- Holding focus groups to hear what the San Francisco community thinks about the current student assignment process;
- Consulting with District staff, community, representatives, and any appropriate experts;
- Considering any relevant policies and plans, including the Consent Decree, Excellence for All, and the Facilities Master Plan; and
- Recommending three student-assignment options for the 2006-2007 school year as well suggestions with respect to any incremental changes needed during the interim.

Committee Members

The Community Advisory Committee on Student Assignment was established per Board Resolution 312-9Sp1 dated March 9, 2004.

Brief biographies of members of the Community Advisory Committee on Student Assignment appear below.

Kermit Boston is Senior Partner in BKB Associates of San Francisco. He has spent thirty years in the world of educational publishing, including twenty years with McGraw-Hill Book Company in New York City. Before joining Computer Curriculum Corporation in 1991, he spent a year with the Wasatch Educational Services in Salt Lake City, Utah. BKB Associates was started in 1999 as a company addressing Professional Development in the areas of: Leadership & Management, Diversity Management, and Employee Relations. Before going into publishing he was a classroom teacher and building Principal in the Philadelphia, West Chester (PA) and East Orange (NJ) school systems. He is married to Barbra Ruffin-Boston. They have one daughter (Kimberly), and two grandchildren (Markus and Alicia) living in Atlanta, GA.

Diana Ming Chan is a graduate of San Francisco schools, University of California at Berkeley and the University of Minnesota. Most of Ms. Chan's professional life was spent in individual and group work at Cameron House and Family Services Agency. Within those agencies her clientele were individuals who suffered from school problems, family violence, in-law stresses, delinquent behavior, depression, parenting difficult children, marital conflict, truancy from school, and acculturation stress. She has worked as a licensed clinical social worker at a number of San Francisco public schools including Francisco Middle School and Redding, Sanchez and Lafayette Elementary Schools. Since Ms. Chan's retirement, her family has established a foundation to support the process of re-installing school social workers into SFUSD schools. All four of Ms. Chan's children attended SFUSD schools.

Manika Clay is a student at Galileo Academy of Science and Technology. Her current G.P.A. is 3.0. She is the president and representative of the Black Student Union. She is involved with the Women Against Violence Everywhere (WAVE) program. She is the secretary at Rock of Ages Baptist Church. She has been involved with many other activities and hopes to continue to do work for her community.

Chris Daniels was born and reared in Baltimore, Maryland. She earned a degree in History from Morgan State University, 1972. While attending college, she also began a full time career with the federal government. She retired in 2003 after thirty-five continuous years of service. Her career has included working on large-scale data collection and statistical analysis at the Social Security Administration, service as an industrial engineer with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and management of human resources operations at the U.S. Attorney's Office. Since 2001, Ms. Daniels has served as the Education Chairperson for San Francisco chapter of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP). Ms. Daniels has been

married for twenty-five years, has been a resident of San Rafael since 1981, and has two children, ages 21 and 17. Her interests include American history and baking.

Sandra Fewer is a parent of three children who have attended or are currently attending San Francisco public schools. She is a fourth generation San Franciscan Chinese American and a graduate of San Francisco public schools. She has been a PTA President for eleven terms and parent school volunteer for over fifteen years. Since 2000, she has worked for Coleman Advocates for Children and Youth as the Director of Parent Organizing and facilitates Parent Advocates for Youth, a group that trains parents to be advocates and leaders in their schools and communities. She conducts workshops on parent rights to over 700 parents a year, serves on many district committees and is on the executive board of the San Francisco PTA. Sandra holds a BA in Administration of Justice and a MA in Public Administration.

Sandra Halladey is the mother of two children who attend public school in San Francisco. A native of England, Sandra graduated from the University of Sussex. After graduation, she volunteered in a number of nonprofit organizations and then started work in the nonprofit sector. When her first child reached preschool age, Sandra became involved with public school enrollment, school reform, and related issues. In 1999 she co-founded the San Francisco chapter of Parents for Public Schools (PPS) and she is currently the Associate Director. PPS works to encourage public school enrollment and reform and operates several parent initiated task forces for reform including one on public school enrollment. Improving public education is a family priority. Her husband, Paul, who is an artist, is committed to ensuring that public school students have access to work with professional artists.

Bill Jackson is the president and founder of GreatSchools.net, a nonprofit online guide to K-12 schools and the nation's most-visited K-12 Web site. GreatSchools.net provides parents with information that helps them choose, support and improve K-12 schools. Bill was formerly project director at Smart Valley, Inc., where he developed SmartVoter.org, now a project of the League of Women Voters. Previously, Bill was director of engineering at Tribe Computer Works and helped start Whistle Communications, a computer networking company. He has been a teacher in Washington, D.C., and Hunan, China. He holds a degree in mechanical engineering from Yale University and is a graduate of the San Francisco Coro Fellows Program. He serves as a board member of the California Voter Foundation and the San Francisco Education Fund. Recently, Bill also served as Treasurer for the campaigns for Propositions A and H, which will provide major new funding for San Francisco public schools.

Edmund (Ed) Jew is a third generation San Franciscan, educated through SFUSD schools. He holds a BA in economics from San Francisco State University and a M.B.A. from Golden Gate University. Mr. Jew is an advocate for improving the educational system for all our children. He is a third generation operator of Canton flower shop in San Francisco which his grandfather started in 1927. He is married to Lisa and has a beautiful daughter, Cammie.

Henry Louie is the President of the Asian American Legal Foundation. He is a former two term PTA president of his children's public elementary school; a former member of the SFUSD's Affirmative Action Advisory Committee; a former precinct captain for the Yes on A and B School Improvement Bonds; a former mayoral appointee to the Electoral Reform Task Force; a

former Board of Supervisors appointee to the Recreation and Parks Open Space Advisory Committee; a former executive director of the community-based non-profit, the Chinese American Voters Education Committee; and a former two-term elected member to the San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee.

Helen Lum began her career with the San Francisco Unified School District in 1994. She has worked at Newcomer High School and the District's Educational Placement Center. She left the school district in 2004.

Jaime Ramirez is the father of three elementary school age boys and an advocate for quality public schools and more immersion programs in the SFUSD. Mr. Ramirez, an immigrant from El Salvador with a M.S. degree in Civil Engineering, firmly believes that academic instruction is only the complement to home instruction for a good education. He is an active member of SF-PPS and an active volunteer. Mr. Ramirez joined the Committee in October, replacing a member who had resigned.

Victor Seeto is a native San Franciscan educated entirely in local public education institutions. He is a graduate of Lowell High School. He is the father of a daughter now enrolled in college. He holds degrees in civil engineering (U.C. Berkeley) and social work (S.F. State). He is currently retired but has worked since the late 70's in nonprofit low income housing development. His involvement in education issues include serving many years as the education committee chair of the Chinese American Democratic Club, an organization that organized the Ho vs. S.F. Unified School lawsuit brought about by Chinese-American parents. Mr. Seeto's current community activities include work with the International Hotel Citizen Advisory Committee and the Indochinese Housing Development Corporation which is located in San Francisco's Tenderloin area. Other notable experiences include: Peace Corps volunteer in Iran, National Advisory Committee for Asian American Populations for the Census Bureau, Executive Director of the Southeast Asian Refugee Resettlement Center, Curriculum Developer for the Social Work Graduate Division at San Francisco State University, and Planner for the Substance Abuse Division of the San Francisco Health Department.

Michael Smith moved to California from Pennsylvania in 1978 where he began a career with GTE Electric in telecommunications. In 1987 he co-founded Westech Communications where he served as President until 1999 providing consulting, engineering, construction and turnkey network solutions to many Fortune 500 companies and school districts throughout the greater Bay Area, New York and Boston. He continued his career in communications working with a start-up for the next few years. Mr. Smith is currently working as a licensed Realtor, serving San Francisco and Oakland. Mr. Smith has two children enrolled in the San Francisco public school system; a daughter who is a junior at Lowell High School and a son who is a seventh grader at Francisco Middle School. Mr. Smith volunteered as a communication consultant at Garfield Elementary where his son was a student for two years, training teachers on the use of computers, computer basics, and how to install and use computer programs. He is a regular participant of the Superintendent's parent roundtable and has served as Chair of the Parent Advisory Council to the San Francisco Board of Education.

Christina Wong has been a Policy Advocate at Chinese for Affirmative Action (CAA) since 1998. She is currently the lead staff for CAA's policy work on K-12 education, voting rights and language access. Prior to joining CAA, Ms. Wong was the director of the Immigrant Assistance Program of the Northern California Coalition for Immigrant Rights (NCCIR). At NCCIR, Ms. Wong developed expertise in working with new and established immigrant communities and in identifying policy issues relevant to immigrant service needs. Ms. Wong is a graduate of Hastings College of the Law.

Brief biographies of the SFUSD staff members who worked to support the Community Advisory Committee on Student Assignment appear below.

Kimberly Cobb is a Placement Counselor with SFUSD's Educational Placement Center. Since joining the staff in September 2003, she has worked with the day-to-day activities of the EPC including student placement and parent outreach. Prior to joining SFUSD, she worked as a Compensation and Benefits Analyst for Genesys Telecommunications Labs, Inc. Before moving to San Francisco, Ms. Cobb taught elementary school for many years in North Carolina. Ms. Cobb holds a B.A. in Education from North Carolina Central University.

Myong Leigh is the District's Chief of Policy and Planning. Since joining SFUSD staff in 2000, his work has focused in financial planning and resource allocation, school site-based academic decision-making and budgeting, student assignment, collective bargaining and labor relations, capital facilities planning, and transportation. Mr. Leigh previously served as the Budget Director for the District of Columbia Public Schools. He holds a Master in Public Policy from Harvard University's Kennedy School of Government and a B.S. from the Wharton School of the University of Pennsylvania.

Teresita Manalo has worked for SFUSD since July 1979 and currently serves as the Office Manager at the Educational Placement Center. Ms. Manalo holds a Bachelor of Science and Industrial Education Degree with a major in Drafting from the Don Honorio Ventural Memorial School of Arts and Trades in the Philippines.

Orla O'Keeffe has been the Executive Director of SFUSD's Educational Placement Center since July 2003. Prior to that she worked for two years as a Special Assistant to Superintendent Ackerman, and in that capacity she served as liaison to the Board of Education and the Superintendent's Cabinet, had oversight responsibility and accountability for day-to-day projects and long-term initiatives including student assignment, PeopleSoft, and the closure of McAteer High School. Prior to working for SFUSD, Ms. O'Keeffe worked for the Chicago Public Schools. Ms. O'Keeffe earned a Bachelor of Philosophy in Communication from Northwestern University.

Ky Vu is a Special Assistant to the Superintendent working in the Office of Policy and Planning. Mr. Vu has an extensive background in both the private and public sectors. After serving five years as a U.S. naval officer in Hawaii, Mr. Vu worked as a management consultant for Ernst & Young and A.T. Kearney. Following these engagements, he spent three years at Charles Schwab & Co. developing marketing strategies. Most recently, Mr. Vu taught Algebra and Advanced Placement Calculus at Leadership High School in San Francisco. Mr. Vu earned a Bachelor of Science in Mechanical Engineering from the Georgia Institute of Technology and a Master of Business of Administration from the Kellogg School of Management at Northwestern University.

Committee Meetings

Schedule, Agenda, and Information Reviewed

Meeting Date	Agenda	Handouts
April 29, 2004	Introductions Role of Committee / Board Resolution History of Desegregation Preview of Future Topics Guiding Principles/Norms	Board Resolution Overview of History of Desegregation Excellence for All Outline of Future Meeting Topics
May 6, 2004	Norms/Ground Rules Guiding Principles Current Student Assignment Process Student Assignment Data Attendance Area Boundaries	PowerPoint on Current SFUSD Student Assignment Process Enrollment Guide Student Assignment Data School Maps Application forms Address verification procedures Outreach summary Pin Maps Request data Placement results Options for Round 1 applicants Waiting pool flyer and list Drop school list Medical and family hardship appeals
May 12, 2004	Ground Rules Current Student Assignment Process Demographics	Total requests by school by choice Diversity Index characteristics and racial ethnic breakdown of requests and placements for Round 1 2004-05 SY
May 19, 2004	Ground Rules Demographics Focus Group Discussions	Demographic analysis and enrollment forecasts Residences of students by ethnicity 1983 and 1993 Pin Maps of SFUSD students 1998-1999 Pin Maps of SFUSD students 1999-2000 CBEDS data
May 26, 2004	Focus Groups Guiding Principles Demographics – attendance boundaries, housing patterns, transportation, Facilities Master Plan	Ground Rules Memo from Hogan and Hartson Consent Decree Booklet
June 2, 2004	Guiding Principles	Boston Globe Editorial Presentations regarding Excellence for All and the 1999 Student Assignment Committee

SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

Meeting Date	Agenda	Handouts
June 9, 2004	Guiding Principles Previous Student Assignment Process Demographics	Guiding Principles Recent History of Student Assignment Demographics Information Booklet Future Meeting Topics
June 16, 2004	Demographics – Why is Demographics Important in Student Assignment?	SFUSD 3- Year Enrollment Pattern Changes (Fall 2001 to Fall 2003) SFUSD 10- Year Enrollment Pattern Changes (Fall 1994 to Fall 2003) 2004-2005 Diversity Index Characteristics & Ethnic Counts of Requests and Placements Demographic Analyses and Enrollment Forecasts Report - Executive Summary Pin Maps of SFUSD Students 1999-2000 Residences of Students by Ethnicity 1983 & 1993 CBEDS Data – October 1, 2003 Student Enrollment: 1967-68 to 2002-03
June 23, 2004	SFUSD Academic Initiatives Budget	STAR Instructional Walk-throughs STAR Schools Initiative Brochure Secondary School Redesign Initiative Fact Sheet – February 2003 Secondary School Redesign Initiative PowerPoint Presentation SFUSD – The Secondary School Redesign Initiative Dream Schools PowerPoint Presentation Dream Schools Brochure Background on the Weighted Student Formula Memorandum – Teacher Experience, Building Tenure, and Average Salary by School Site Fall Allocations 2004-2005
June 30, 2004	SFUSD Academic Initiatives Weighted Student Formula STAR Schools Dream Schools SSRI	Program Placement Inter District Policy Budget: Central vs. Site Based Responsibilities
July 21, 2004	SFUSD Academic Initiatives Program Placement Link between student assignment and achievement 2004-05 Enrollment Update	Open enrollment flyer Program Placement The Social Context of Education Articles/presentations regarding other districts: Boston, Cambridge, Lee County (Florida) NCLB
July 28, 2004	Community Conversations What Other Districts Are Doing	Pros and cons of boundary systems and choice systems
August 4, 2004	Choice System Hybrid Models	Pros and cons of boundary systems and choice systems (revised)

SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

Meeting Date	Agenda	Handouts
August 11, 2004	Historical overview of school segregation in SF Budget	Memo re: Policies and Practices Allegedly Used to Segregate SFUSD Summary of input from Excellence for All community meetings Charter information Guiding principles Facilities Master Plan CBEDS data Dream School data Maps highlighting STAR/IIUSP schools Budget: Preliminary Allocations Budget: Teach-In Packet
August 18, 2004	Guiding Principles Capacity Student Assignment: 2 years before Diversity Index Dream Schools NCLB Inter District Assignments Location of STAR and IIUSP schools	Maps highlighting STAR/IIUSP schools
August 25, 2004	Capacity Student Assignment: 2 years before Diversity Index Dream Schools Community Conversations Phase II meeting topics	Facilities Master Plan Racial/Ethnic breakdown of entering grades: 1999 to 2003 (CBEDS) Student Assignment Plan 2000-2001 Questions for Community Conversations Draft recommendation re: academic initiatives
September 1, 2004	Community Conversations Phase II meeting topics	Questions for Community Conversations API growth and AYP Progress in 2003-04 Phase II meeting topics
September 8, 2004	Community Conversations Phase II meeting topics Preparation for discussion of options	Questions for Community Conversations Phase II meeting topics
September 29, 2004	Community Conversations Board Resolution	Data from handheld devices Data from written feedback Community meeting questions Board resolution
October 6, 2004	Ground rules Guiding principles Develop options Homework assignment	Guiding principles Ground rules Enrollment Fair flyer Homework assignment
October 13, 2004	Develop options	None
October 20, 2004	Develop options Safety	SFUSD Parent/Guardian Handbook Safety information Draft options
October 27, 2004	Develop options	Draft options / features Maps Enrollment workshops and flyers

Meeting Date	Agenda	Handouts
November 3, 2004	Develop options	Maps
November 8, 2004	Develop options	Maps Transportation matrix Draft options / features
November 10, 2004	Develop options	Maps Transportation matrix Draft options
November 17, 2004	Develop options	Maps Transportation matrix Draft options
December 7, 2004	Discussion with Superintendent Develop options	Overview of simulations
December 15, 2004	Develop options	Simulations data
December 22, 2004	Develop options	Simulations data
January 5, 2005	Develop options	Simulations data
January 12, 2005	Review draft recommendations	Draft recommendations

Ground Rules

The ground rules developed and agreed upon by the Community Advisory Committee on Student Assignment during their initial meetings in the spring of 2004 are outlined below. This final revision of the ground rules was completed on May 19, 2004.

1. One conversation will be held at a time, with no “side bar” conversations.
2. Committee members should continuously stay on task.
3. The Committee will maintain a “parking lot” of open and unresolved issues and will revisit it periodically. Staff will review parking lot items and will incorporate them into subsequent meeting agendas as appropriate. Committee members may request that parking lot items be revisited for particular meetings or discussions.
4. Agendas should be followed as closely as possible.
5. Committee members may request revisions to the agenda at the beginning of each meeting.
6. The Facilitator should exercise discretion in limiting discussion on non-agenda items or when discussion on agenda items must move forward based on time constraints.
7. Meetings are open for observation from non-committee members, and observers may make comments during the last ten minutes of each meeting. Audience comments will be focused on the agenda items. Staff will provide speaker cards for observers who wish to make comments, and observers will make comments in the order that speaker cards are received.
8. Agendas and meeting summaries should be available to the public, including on the District’s web site.
9. Committee members will not invite or encourage attendance by observers (i.e., “stack meetings”) in order to influence or inhibit discussion through intimidation.
10. Committee members will actively listen to each other and will operate in good faith in discussions and in making decisions.
11. Committee members will conduct themselves in a respectful and empathetic manner towards all participants. Committee members will refrain from name-calling, shouting, obscenity/profanity, and disrespectful body language.
12. Committee members may request to re-open discussion on the Ground Rules.
13. Email will be used to communicate re. Meeting schedules and logistical matters, and substantive discussion should be reserved for committee meetings rather than email.

14. Meeting notes will be kept for each meeting and will be confirmed at the beginning of the next meeting. No comments will be attributed to individuals in meeting notes.
15. The Committee's first goal will be to make decisions by reaching consensus. Consensus means that all members agree, can support, or can "live with" the decision(s) reached.
16. The Committee will discuss and seek consensus on principles underlying student assignment policies such as diversity, parent choice, and student achievement.
17. The Committee will identify three options to recommend to the Superintendent by consensus. The Committee will differentiate the relative support for each of the three options. The Committee will provide a synopsis of the discussion regarding the recommendations/options.
18. Meetings will begin on time and members should make reasonable efforts to attend and arrive promptly to meetings.
19. Committee members will be responsible for obtaining updates regarding meetings (or portions of meetings) they do not attend. The Committee generally will not revisit topics for the purpose of updating members who were absent during previous discussions.

Guiding Principles

The fifteen guiding principles outlined below were developed during Committee discussions on 5/26/04, 6/02/04, and 6/09/04 and agreed upon during the last of these meetings. The Committee did not elect to rank or prioritize the list of guiding principles.

Principle(s)	SFUSD's Student Assignment Policies Should...
A. Every child should have an opportunity for an excellent education.	...support high quality educational opportunities for all students including a variety of program options and maximize students' potential to increase academic achievement.
B. Diversity among a school's student population (racial, ethnical, socioeconomic) enhances students' educational opportunities and achievement.	... promote diversity of students based on race / ethnicity, socioeconomic background, language proficiency, and student achievement.
C. Families should have opportunities to choose the schools that best meet their children's needs.	...provide reasonable opportunities for families to make choices regarding schools. (<i>For example, before/after school care and other activities</i>).
D. Families should be offered a reasonable level of certainty / predictability regarding their children's school assignments.	...reflect and acknowledge the desire that many families have to be reasonably certain of their children's school assignments.
E. Families should have opportunities to choose to attend schools that are near their homes.	...provide families reasonable opportunities for their children to attend schools near their homes if they so choose.
F. Safety of students must be protected.	...not compromise the safety of the District's students.
G. School location and capacity and program placement should be modified to reflect demand.	...promote / allow for / lead to the modification of seat capacities based on patterns of demand.
H. Parental involvement in the school community contributes to the success of the school.	...promote parental involvement (including enhanced outreach to schools where parent participation is low) and promote a sense of community, including local businesses.
I. Parents and others should be able to understand how the assignment and enrollment systems work.	...be simple, straightforward and transparent enough so that parents and others can understand them reasonably well.

Principle(s)	SFUSD's Student Assignment Policies Should...
J. Parents should be informed about the quality, programs, and safety / climate of schools.	...emphasize and respond to parents' needs for information about the quality, programs, and safety / climate of schools.
K. Parents should be allowed to keep their children in school together.	...provide families opportunities to keep siblings together.
L. Students with special needs should receive educational services that are appropriately designed for their learning characteristics.	...provide appropriate placements for students with special needs.
M. The District's transportation system and after-school programs should be fair and equitable.	...incorporate or be accompanied by a fair and equitable provision of transportation services and after-school programs.
N. Students who live in San Francisco should be given a higher priority in placement than non-San Francisco residents.	...provide a priority in assignments for students who live in San Francisco.
O. All parents and students should be treated equitably in student assignment.	...be equitable in principle and be applied fairly and even-handedly in practice.

Community Conversations

Board Resolution 312-9Sp1 stipulated that the Committee had to hold focus groups to hear what the San Francisco community thinks about the current student assignment process. During the month of September 2004, the Committee hosted the following five community conversations around the city.

Date	Time	Location	Address
Monday, Sept. 20, 2004	6:30pm to 8:00pm	Roosevelt School Auditorium	460 Arguello Blvd. SF, CA 94118
Tuesday, Sept. 21, 2004	6:30pm to 8:00pm	Gordon J. Lau School Auditorium	950 Clay St. SF, CA 94108
Wednesday, Sept. 22, 2004	6:30pm to 8:00pm	Thurgood Marshall Auditorium	45 Conkling St. SF, CA 94124
Thursday, Sept. 23, 2004	6:30pm to 8:00pm	Horace Mann School Auditorium	3351-23rd St. SF, CA 94110
Monday, Sept. 27, 2004	6:30pm to 8:00pm	A.P. Giannini School Auditorium	3151 Ortega St. SF, CA 94122

Questions

The community conversations were interactive in nature; participants were able to provide instant feedback to a series of questions using hand held devices. The questions were displayed on a large screen at each session (English, Chinese, and Spanish versions of the questions were posted on screens at all of the community conversations). A copy of the questions from the community conversations is provided in Appendix B.

Profile of Participants

Approximately 403 community members voluntarily participated in the five community conversations. A profile of the participants is provided below.

Racial/Ethnic Breakdown of Participants

Race/Ethnicity	Community Conversation Participants	SFUSD Students
African American	4%	14.5%
American Indian	0%	.6%
Chinese	46%	31.3%
Other Asian/Pacific Islander	7%	8.3%
Latino/Hispanic	5%	21.4%
Other Non-White	0%	11.7%
White	19%	9.6%
Bi-Racial / Multi-Racial	3%	
Decline to State	3%	2.6%
No Response to question	13%	

Zip Code Breakdown of Participants

Zip Group	Zip Code	Neighborhood	Community Conversation Participants	SFUSD Students
1	94112	Ingleside, Oceanview, Excelsior	5%	15%
2	94134	Vis Valley, Portola	2%	10%
3	94124	Bayview/Hunters Point	1%	11%
4	94122 94116	Sunset Parkside, Forest Hill	33%	15%
5	94121 94118	Richmond Presideo Heights, Laurel Heights	24%	9%
6	94132 94127	Merced, Lakeshore, Stonestown Miraloma Park, West Portal, St. Francis Woods	4%	5%
7	94131 94114	Twin Peaks, Glen Park, Diamond Heights Castro, Noe, Corona Heights, Duboce Triangle	3%	3%
8	94102 94115 94117	Western Addition Pacific Hights, Anza Vista, Western Addition Haight Asbury, Hayes Valley	4%	8%
9	94110 94103 94107	Mission, Bernal Heights South of Market Potrero Hill	4%	16%
10	94109 94133 94108 94123 94130	Nob Hill, Russian Hill, Tenderloin, Telegraph Hill, North Beach, Fisherman's Warf, China Town, Marina, Cow Hollow, Treasure Island	6%	7%
No Response to question			13%	

Choice Breakdown of Participants

Received Choice	Community Conversation Participants	2004-2005 SY
Yes	40%	86%
No	20%	14%
Yes/No	31%	
N/A	10%	
No Response to question	22%	

Data from Community Conversations

Data collected during the community conversations is provided in Appendix C. It is important to consider the following when reviewing the data from the community conversations:

- There are almost 60,000 students in SFUSD, and there were only about 403 community members who participated in the community conversations
- Participants were not randomly selected. Instead, all members of the San Francisco community were invited to attend one of five sessions.
- The zip code and racial ethnic breakdown of the participants is not similar to the zip code and racial ethnic breakdown of SFUSD's student population.

Recommendations

Overview

During the course of its meetings, the Committee decided to distinguish between two groups of recommendations. The first set of recommendations comprises three mutually exclusive approaches to allocating seats to oversubscribed schools. The second set includes “cross-cutting” recommendations that could be applicable to any method of allocating oversubscribed seats.

Particularly in contemplating how spaces should be assigned when requests exceed seat capacities, the Committee considered the myriad, often conflicting interests cited by students, families and community members. Building on the development of its guiding principles (see page 25), extensive review of data, and feedback solicited from the Community Conversations, the Committee conducted an exercise designed to stimulate discussion on ways in which families with various perspectives might view alternative District student assignment policies (See Appendix D: “Five Families” Exercise). Illustrated by narratives of five hypothetical families in this exercise, the Committee carefully considered the following values: assignment to a school close to home, access to a high-quality education, predictability and transparency in the assignment process, access to schools with specialized programs, and exposure to students of different backgrounds.

Options For Determining Assignments to Oversubscribed Schools

Over the course of several meetings, Committee members proposed, discussed, and revised numerous options. The Committee also carefully reviewed simulations, prepared by District staff using actual enrollment requests for School Year 2004-05, of Kindergarten, 6th grade, and 9th grade assignment outcomes that would have resulted under six different options.⁵ These results were compared across simulations on various dimensions, including the following:

- Percentage of overall assignments to requested schools vs. non-requested schools
- Assignments for attendance area students vs. non-attendance area students
- Assignments for students with low academic achievement vs. other students
- Assignments for students from low socioeconomic backgrounds vs. other students
- Assignments for students by racial / ethnic background
- Number of schools with 45% or more of assignments being offered to students of a single racial / ethnic group
- Assignments for students by zip code

Summaries of these simulations and data are included in Appendix E.

⁵ The Committee recognizes that changes in SFUSD’s assignment policies could affect the requests indicated on enrollment applications.

In general, the Committee found that the results along these dimensions were quite similar. In some respects, the data indicated moderate differences across the simulations. In evaluating these options, the Committee paid particular attention to the proportion of requested vs. non-requested assignments, the assignment results for attendance area vs. non-attendance area students, and the number of schools with high concentrations of students from a single racial / ethnic group.

The simulations indicated that more families would receive assignments to requested schools under all three options recommended by the Committee than they would under the current system, as indicated in the table below.

Simulation Results: Percent of Applicants Receiving Requested Schools

Outcome	Current System	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Received 1 st choice	58%	59%	60%	60%
Received any choice	78%	84%	84%	84%
Received no choice	21%	16%	16%	16%

The simulations indicated that more students would receive assignments to their attendance area schools in Option 1 and Option 2 than under the current system, but slightly fewer students would receive assignments to their attendance area schools using Option 3. These results are summarized in the table below.

Simulation Results: Percent of Applicants Receiving Attendance Area Schools vs. Other Schools

Outcome	Current System	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Requested and received student's own Attendance Area school	29%	32%	33%	28%
Requested and received any other school	50%	53%	51%	56%
Received no choice	21%	16%	16%	16%

The simulations suggested that the number of schools with high racial concentrations would be slightly increased under Options 1 and 3 and slightly reduced under Option 2, as indicated in the following table.

Simulation Results: Number of Schools with > 45% of Assignments to a Single Racial / Ethnic Group

Current System	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
42	45	40	48

The Committee agreed to recommend three options for assigning seats to schools in cases in which requests for seats outnumber available seats. These options primarily vary with respect to the following issues:

- Preference, if any, provided on the basis of the geographic relationship between an applicant’s residence and the location of the requested school; and
- When and whether a random lottery and/or index of factors linked to academic achievement is used to determine assignments.

Individual Committee members expressed preferences among the three options, and some members do not support every aspect of all three options. For example, a member may have opposed the continued use of the Diversity Index in general but could nonetheless agree to include one option that maintained features that were similar in some respects to the current Diversity Index. All Committee members agreed that these ideas together represent a reasonable set of options for the Superintendent and Board to consider.

In all three options, the Committee recommends that the District continue to offer placement priorities to students on the basis of sibling status and programmatic needs of certain special education and English Learner students.

Option 1

For every school with an attendance area (also see “Attendance Areas” below), this option would reserve 50% of available seats for students residing within the attendance area and 50% for students outside of the attendance area. Attendance area students would be selected by pure random lottery, while an index of factors linked to academic achievement (also see discussion of “Diversity Index” below) would be used to assign seats to non-attendance area students.

Additional details are described below.

- A random lottery will be conducted for attendance area applicants to determine assignments for 50% of the available seats.
- Non-attendance area applicants will be selected through a separate lottery for the other 50% of seats using an index of factors linked to academic achievement.
- Pre-assigned students will be assigned to the appropriate group of seats based on whether or not they reside in attendance area.

- If the seats allocated to either group are not filled, the remaining seats will be made available to the other group (if there are remaining applicants in this group), using a random lottery if necessary.
- All assignments to schools without attendance areas will be determined using a random lottery.

Option 2

For every school with an attendance area (also see “Attendance Areas” below), this option would reserve sixty percent (60%) of available seats for students residing within the attendance area and forty percent (40%) for students outside of the attendance area. Students in both groups would be selected by pure random lottery for the respective sets of seats. With the exception of program placements and pre-assignments, no other factors would be used to assign seats.

Additional details are described below.

- A random lottery will be conducted for attendance area applicants to determine assignments for 60% of the available seats.
- A random lottery will be conducted for non-attendance area applicants to determine assignments for the other 40% of the available seats.
- Pre-assigned students will be assigned to the appropriate group of seats based on whether or not they reside in attendance area.
- If the seats allocated to either group are not filled, the remaining seats will be made available to the other group (if there are remaining applicants in this group), using a random lottery if necessary.
- All assignments to schools without attendance areas will be determined using a random lottery.

Option 3

Under this option, all offers to all schools would be determined through a random lottery. No attendance areas would exist, and no preference would be provided to any applicant to any school based on geographic residence, any characteristic linked to academic achievement, or any other factor. The District would work with individual schools in outreach and program development to provide information to prospective families and achieve diverse school enrollments.

Other Recommendations

In addition to the three options outlined above, the Committee offers additional recommendations that could accompany any of the three options, or variations thereof.

Attendance Areas

The Committee believes that the District’s attendance areas are out-of-date and urges the District to reexamine and revise them. Concerns with the existing attendance areas include the following:

- Several areas of the city do not fall within an existing attendance area for at least one grade level;
- The distinction between “alternative” schools, for which attendance areas do not exist, and attendance area schools has been blurred and should be clarified, and attendance areas should be established for any schools that do not meet specific criteria identifying alternative schools with specialized programs (such as language immersion programs); and
- “Satellite” or non-contiguous attendance areas in some cases are based on student assignment policies that are no longer in place and should therefore be revised.

The Committee recognizes that revisions to attendance areas must be undertaken carefully on the basis of current demographic information. Additionally, since creation of or modifications to any given attendance area could affect the optimal boundaries of others, revisions should be contemplated in a comprehensive manner. For example, establishing an attendance area for a school that currently does not have one would probably necessitate modifying the attendance area for one or more nearby schools. The Committee also discussed the idea of each student’s attendance area school being identified as the school closest to his/her residence, as opposed to being based on residence within an established attendance area boundary of a school.⁶

Academic Initiatives

The Committee, recognizing the essential link between the academic and program quality in each District school, offers the following recommendations.

Program Placement – The Committee acknowledges and supports the objective of the District’s program placement process, which is to achieve an equitable distribution of SFUSD programs across schools in different areas in the city in accord with *Excellence for All*. However, although individual school sites can propose modifications to placement of programs within their schools, few other formal avenues for broader community input exist. To this end, the Committee recommends that the District provide one or more ways in which the San Francisco community can provide input into program placement decisions.

Dream Schools – The Committee supports the District’s attempt to improve underperforming schools through strategic initiatives focused on particular schools such as the Dream Schools. The Committee acknowledges the rationale for creating a K-12 pathway for the first cohort of Dream Schools and the advantages of continuity that will be provided to students and families

⁶ Using established boundaries can lead to situations in which a student resides in the attendance area boundary of a school which is actually further away than another school. The Committee discussed whether geographic mapping technology could help develop a system which would not rely on school-based boundaries but would instead link each student to the school closest to his/her residence as the attendance area school.

who elect to remain in the Dream Schools through high school graduation. The Committee also encourages the District to continuously consider, in its planning for any future cohorts of Dream Schools or other academic initiatives, the likely effects of such initiatives on the diversity of the affected schools as well as how to reconcile promotion policies across grade spans with existing District student assignment policies. The Committee also encourages the District to expand outreach for current and future Dream Schools to include personal contact made by staff members who are familiar with the cultural background of all potentially interested families.

Teacher and Staff Quality – The Committee wishes to emphasize the connection between quality staff and excellence in education and note the importance of having high standards incorporated into the evaluation of teachers and principals. Also, exceptional teachers and school administrators who perform above and beyond the typical expectations of their roles should be recognized and rewarded.

School Safety – The Committee observes the high priority that families place on ensuring that their children attend schools that are safe places to learn. It recommends that the District constantly place a high priority on efforts to maintain and improve the security and climate of all schools, particularly schools that families may currently avoid due to concerns related to safety.

Sharing Effective Practices Across Schools – The Committee, noting that some schools with similar student populations perform far better academically than others, recommends that the District actively foster sharing of knowledge regarding effective practices. A variety of school community members should be involved in this exchange of knowledge, including the principal, teachers, parents, and students.

Outreach and Recruitment

The Committee notes that continued attention to outreach and improvement must accompany the District's efforts to improve schools. Past experience has shown that community perceptions often lag years behind genuine improvements to specific schools as well as San Francisco's public schools generally. Considering these trends, the Committee recommends that the District, in partnership with community organizations such as Parents for Public Schools, continue to inform the public about high-quality public school options. The Committee recognizes that outreach and recruitment activities are essential at the District level as well as at individual school sites. Schools that most effectively inform families and community members about their programs should be recognized and should share their strategies with other schools. In particular, schools that successfully achieve more diverse enrollments through outreach and recruitment should work with schools with high concentrations of students (e.g., 50% or more) from a single racial / ethnic group.

Student Assignment Interventions for Under-Requested and/or Underperforming Schools

Building on efforts including the STAR schools intervention program for underperforming schools, the Committee recommends that the District identify and implement a series of interventions related to student assignment for schools meeting certain additional criteria. These criteria would include school safety and climate, demand and parent opinion (such as enrollment and demand trends and surveys), and measurements of academic performance (such as test scores, qualitative external evaluations). If schools met the identified criteria, the District could

apply interventions beginning with academic intervention and support and community input. For schools that do not improve over time, the District could apply more dramatic steps such as not permitting additional students to enroll or school closure. Throughout this process, the District should involve the school's neighboring community, including families who attend and choose not to attend the school, to solicit opinions and suggestions on how to make strategic improvements.

Assistance for Schools with High Racial / Ethnic Concentrations

The Committee recommends that the District work with schools to identify ways to achieve greater racial diversity, particularly through outreach and program development, in cases in which more than 50% of students represent a single racial / ethnic group. In addition, the District should examine practices across schools to work with students who are among very small racial / ethnic minorities within their schools.

Transportation

The Committee noted that the District's transportation services are an important policy area that is closely related to supporting its student assignment policies. Recognizing that the routes and schedules that are currently in place have generally been maintained for several years without dramatic alteration, the Committee recommends that the District modify its transportation services so they are aligned with the student assignment policies that are ultimately approved by the Board of Education. The Committee also recommends that, to the greatest extent possible, the District offer transportation for students who do not receive assignments to any of their requested schools.

Modification of Capacity

The Committee supports the idea of modifying school enrollment capacities based on patterns of demand. The District may also have opportunities to modify enrollment capacities in schools and programs to promote greater diversity. Both of these principles are illustrated by the establishment of the new School of the Arts Academy, a new program scheduled to open in SY 2005-06 that will expand SOTA's total capacity. Located in the center of San Francisco, the SOTA Academy should help alleviate some demand for West-side high schools that are typically extremely oversubscribed as well as attract students from diverse backgrounds. In considering similar decisions in the future, the Committee encourages the District to consider carefully the fiscal implications of any such adjustments to school capacities.

Designated Assignments

In cases in which students do not receive assignments to requested schools, the Committee recommends that the District continue its policy of considering the student's home address as well as SFUSD's transportation infrastructure when selecting a placement for students. Where possible, the District should continue its efforts to offer assignments within one mile of elementary students' homes and within two miles of middle school students' homes if requested by parents / guardians.

Related Topics Discussed by the Committee

The Committee also discussed several other important issues, but did not reach consensus on specific recommendations. These included the items described below.

Race

The Committee discussed whether race should be included as a factor in determining assignments to schools but did not reach an agreement on this question. Individual Committee members expressed a variety of views regarding racial /ethnic diversity in the District's schools.

Several Committee members were highly concerned about racial segregation and isolation and support student assignment policies that promote racially diverse school enrollments and seek to minimize the number of schools with high concentrations of students from a single racial group. These members pointed out the significant differences that exist between the academic achievement of students of different ethnic groups and across schools with high concentrations of African-American and Latino students versus Chinese and white families. In light of these trends, several members expressed the importance of avoiding a student assignment system that would exacerbate the achievement gap.

Others felt that although racial diversity is a generally positive goal for educational purposes, the District should not prioritize racial diversity in student assignment at the expense of other considerations that are important to families, particularly the opportunity to attend a school close to home and the opportunity to attend a school of their choosing. Several members also argued that individual school enrollments to some extent simply reflect the District's current demographic profile, which itself has become more racially concentrated over the past several years. For example, since students identified as Chinese make up 31% of the District's students, many schools will naturally have concentrations of Chinese students that are greater than 45%, a figure which has commonly been used as a threshold for determining racial identifiability. Additionally, the city's housing patterns reflect racial concentrations that vary greatly from one neighborhood to another. Several members questioned whether the District should be expected to achieve school enrollments that are dramatically more diverse considering these factors.

The Committee agreed that the District should work with the City and County of San Francisco to provide input into housing planning decisions that promotes greater residential diversity.

Diversity Index

The Committee discussed the advantages and disadvantages of the current Diversity Index at length (see "Concerns About the Current Student Assignment Process" on page 13). Committee members expressed a range of views regarding whether certain aspects of the Diversity Index should be maintained or whether the general approach of assigning students on the basis of factors linked to student achievement should be preserved at all.

Several Committee members argued that the Diversity Index had been so controversial and divisive that the District would be better off discontinuing its use entirely. Others felt that aspects of the current lottery process could be salvaged and potentially modified and improved.

For example, data for several factors in the current Diversity Index are self-reported and therefore difficult to verify, such as whether the student's mother or primary caregiver completed high school. The current system of factors is also complicated and therefore difficult to comprehend. The Committee generally agreed that if any aspects of the Diversity Index are maintained, the District should consider modifying the current methodology to make it simpler and/or to reduce the possibility of inaccuracies in self-reported data. The advantages, disadvantages, and implications of any such modifications should be carefully reviewed, potentially with continued input from the Committee.

Use of Zones / Clusters

The Committee explored the idea of grouping the schools at each grade level into geographic clusters for the purpose of student assignment, with students being provided preferences to attend a school within their respective cluster. An overarching concern with this approach was that the District's schools are located in such a way that in some cases it would be very difficult to establish groups of schools based on geographic location that were equivalent in their academic performance or patterns of demand. The Committee felt that in order to establish reasonably diverse clusters, the zones would need to be so large as to defeat the primary purpose of practical convenience underlying this approach.

Assignment Priority for Children of Teachers / Staff

The Committee discussed whether children of teachers or other school staff should receive an assignment priority but reached no agreement on this issue. Some members argued that it was in the District's interests to extend to teachers the convenience of allowing their children to attend their school and that such a priority would also establish a valuable incentive for teachers to demonstrate even greater commitment to their schools. The Committee also discussed whether teachers could receive an assignment priority that was not necessarily tied to the schools at which they teach. Others opposed any assignment priorities for teachers or other staff because such priorities would consume too many seats. Additionally, an assignment priority linked to a teacher's school could establish unintended incentives to seek out teaching assignments in high-performing schools and avoid teaching in underperforming schools.

Admissions Procedures for Lowell High School and School of the Arts

The Committee did not address issues regarding admissions procedures for these two schools.

Conclusion

Through the course of their work, all the members of the Community Advisory Committee on Student Assignment have learned a great deal about the SFUSD and the specific challenges in the area of student assignment. The members hope the recommendations and observations outlined in this report will help advance the community-wide conversation that must be held regarding school options for San Francisco's families. The Committee does not view these recommendations as a menu of options within which the Superintendent, Board of Education, or community should limit their thinking. Instead, this report is submitted with the goal of generating additional dialogue and ideas. As the District moves forward in its deliberations regarding student assignment, the Committee is prepared to reconvene and provide additional advice or otherwise assist as requested in this extremely important discussion.

Appendix A: Superintendent's Proposal 312-9Sp1

Adopted, As Amended, by the Board of Education at its Regular Meeting of March 9, 2004

Final copy with amendments incorporated

**SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
San Francisco, California**

Superintendent's Proposal

312-9Sp1 Community Advisory Committee on Student Assignment

WHEREAS: The San Francisco Unified School District has been a party to a desegregation Consent Decree since 1983; and

WHEREAS: The Board has adopted and the Court has approved a student assignment plan to serve the goals of that Consent Decree, including racially and ethnically diverse school enrollments, and educational equity and improved student achievement; and

WHEREAS: The District's obligations under the Consent Decree, including the duty to use a Court-approved student assignment plan, are scheduled to end during the 2005-2006 school year; and

WHEREAS: There has been a great deal of discussion in the community about the current student assignment process, whether the current method, including the use of a lottery involving a "Diversity Index," is meeting the goals of the Consent Decree, and whether the process is serving the District's other educational goals, including educational equity and improved achievement,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED: That the Board of Education establish a broad-based committee -- made up of diverse members of the San Francisco community who represent its various interests -- to study and to make recommendations regarding the student assignment process in the District; and

FURTHER BE IT RESOLVED: That each Commissioner and Student Delegate shall nominate up to five individuals for possible participation on the committee by submitting their names to the Superintendent by March 20, 2004; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED: That each of the other parties to the Consent Decree be invited to nominate three individuals for possible participation on the committee by submitting their names to the Superintendent by March 20, 2004; and

FURTHER BE IT RESOLVED: That if additional candidates are needed to ensure diversity, fair representation of the community, or special expertise, the Superintendent may select up to three individuals for possible participation on the committee; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED: That, by April 13, 2004, the Superintendent shall select up to twenty (20) individuals from among the nominees to constitute a broadly diverse committee that is representative of the various groups and interests in San Francisco and that also includes at least one of the nominees of each commissioner and at least one student representative nominated by each student delegate and of each other party to the Consent Decree; and

FURTHER BE IT RESOLVED: That the Superintendent shall chair the committee and it shall be charged with:

- (1) Reviewing and studying the current student assignment process used by the District and student assignment processes used by other school districts to provide students with the opportunity to attend schools with diverse enrollments and to facilitate improved student achievement;
- (2) Holding focus groups to hear what the San Francisco community thinks about the current student assignment process;
- (3) Consulting with District staff, community, representatives, and any appropriate experts;
- (4) Considering any relevant policies and plans, including the Consent Decree, Excellence for All, and the Facilities Master Plan; and
- (5) Recommending three student-assignment options for the 2006-2007 school year as well suggestions with respect to any incremental changes needed during the interim; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED: That the Committee, the Superintendent, and the Board shall adhere to the attached timeline, to the extent practicable, in completing the tasks required by this resolution.

12/9/03
1/13/04
3/9/04

Please Note:

- Referred to the Rules and Legislation Committee on 12/9/03 by order of the Chair.

New timeline language incorporated by Legal Counsel in <i><u>bold, italics and underscored</u></i> . Old language stricken out .

- Taken up by the Rules, Policy and Legislation Committee on 1/8/04. Amendments in ***bold, italics, and underscored***. Forwarded to the Board of Education, as amended, without recommendation.
- Taken up in Regular Session on 1/13/04. Postponed for one month.
- Adopted, as amended, on March 9, 2004.

**TIMELINE FOR COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON STUDENT ASSIGNMENT
(312-9Sp1)**

<u>Deadline</u>	<u>Task</u>
March 20, 2004	Nominations from Commissioners and parties to be submitted to the Superintendent
April 13, 2004	Superintendent to select Committee
May 2004	Committee to begin work
Spring 2004	Committee to hold focus groups
May – Oct. 2004	Committee to continue and to complete work
November 15, 2004	Committee to develop three options
Nov. 2004 -- Jan. 2005	Superintendent to hold town hall meetings regarding options
February 2005	Superintendent to make recommendation to Board
March 2005	Board to hold hearings on the Superintendent's recommendation
April 2005	Board to adopt student assignment process
May – Oct. 2005	Superintendent and staff to plan for implementation
Fall 2006	District to implement new plan

Appendix B: Community Conversations

We need your advice concerning our district's student assignment policies. By answering the questions we have prepared, you will be helping us do a better job of serving our students and their families.

Information about Participants

1. How Are You?

- 1) Don't even ask
- 2) Bad
- 3) Okay
- 4) Good
- 5) Terrific

2. Why are you here tonight?

- | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| To Gather
Information | | | | | To Present a
Viewpoint or
Share my opinion |

3. I am comfortable publicly speaking in large groups.

- | | | | | | |
|-------------------|---|---|---|---|----------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Strongly Disagree | | | | | Strongly Agree |

4. How long have you lived in San Francisco?

- 1) Less than 1 year
- 2) 1-3 years
- 3) 4-5 years
- 4) 6-10 years
- 5) 11-15 years
- 6) 16-20 years
- 7) More than 20 years

5. Which location best describes where you live?

[Combinations of zip codes to come]

- 1)
- 2)
- 3)
- 4)
- 5)
- 6)
- 7)
- 8)
- 9)
- 10) Outside of San Francisco

6. Which category best describes your sex / gender?

- 1) Female
- 2) Male

Appendix C: Data from Community Conversations

You need Acrobat Reader to view the attachment. If you do not have a copy of Acrobat Reader, you can download a free copy from the internet. The link to this attachment is on our web site. When you double click the link, the attachment will open. It is a 16 page attachment.

Appendix D: “Five Families” Exercise

**Community Advisory Committee on Student Assignment
Homework Assignment**

Consider the hypothetical statements of five families on the following pages. Spend some time reflecting objectively on the perspectives described in each statement. For each description, spend a few minutes trying to understand why someone might make such a statement. Then think about and answer the following questions.

1) Which statement(s) best match(es) your frame of mind so far in thinking about student assignment?

2) Are there one or more statements that you have not paid as much attention to, but which you think is(/are) important to consider?

3) Are there one or more statements that you do not think are important to considering when developing options? Why not?

4) Now spend some time thinking of one or more options for a student assignment system in San Francisco. Record these on a separate form (provided).

5) How well does (each of) your option(s) address the concerns or points raised by each of the four families? Using the form, give yourself a grade (A to F) for each family.

6) Based on the grades you think each of the five families would give to your option(s), do you think the CACSA should recommend any of the options you identified? Why or why not?

Family A

Our daughter is an 7th grader at Hoover Middle School. In two years, my wife and I want her to attend Lincoln High School, which is six blocks from our house in the Sunset. We bought our home about eight years ago and until recently had assumed that she would be able to attend either Lowell or Lincoln. We are very concerned that she will be sent to a school across town in an unfamiliar and unsafe neighborhood. We are worried that she will be separated from her friends and spend too much time on MUNI when she should be doing homework. We want to remain involved parents when our daughter goes to high school, but since we both have busy jobs and many demands on our time, the best way we can do this is if she attends school nearby. I don't have a problem with diversity, but the District should not force our kids to go to bad schools across town to promote it.

Family B

My four-year old son is really looking forward to going to Kindergarten. He is in pre-school for the first time and is doing great. His teachers and I can tell that he's a gifted child with a lot of potential. The problem is that the elementary school that is closest to my home is struggling academically, and so are all the other schools nearby. I'm afraid that if my son went to any of these schools, he would not do well and would not fulfill his potential. I'm a single mom who is barely making it even though I'm working two jobs, and I want my child to have a better life. All my hopes for him depend on a good education. I can see why people who live near good schools would want their kids to go to them, but I still don't think kids should be forced to go to low-performing schools just because of where they live. Having separate and unequal schools is just not fair.

Family C

We just went through the assignment process for our 9th grade grandson and have to say the process was a nightmare for our family. It was very distressing not to know where he was going to go to school and frustrating not to know how the system worked. My husband attended the enrollment fair, and he and I visited a couple of schools and put seven schools down on our grandson's enrollment application. We did research like the District said we should do. We waited nervously for the assignment letter and were very sad and upset when he didn't get any of the schools we put down. Most of the children of our friends got schools they wanted, which in some ways made it even harder for us (Why them and why not us?!). We filed a medical appeal (he has asthma) and went to the EPC several times. Over the summer we got off of a waiting pool and into our first choice school. The District staff explained the system to us a few times, but to this day I don't think it makes much sense.

Family D

At first, my partner and I had a lot of questions about SFUSD's process for placing kids into schools. We recently moved here from another state, and neither of us had heard about this type of system before. We thought we would just sign up for a school near our home (or one of our jobs) and that most schools would be pretty similar. Still, when we found out it didn't work that way, we wanted to do whatever we needed to for our daughter's education. We visited nearly a dozen schools and talked to principals, teachers and parents. We surfed the web and checked out not only test scores but different types of academic programs. The more we learned about various schools, the more important it seemed for us to learn more and make a careful decision based on our daughter's personality and needs. We eventually put down seven choices, and we received our fourth choice, a Spanish immersion program. Our daughter is happy and doing well in her school. As for my partner and me, all the research we did about what to look for in a school has helped us to be much more involved in our child's education and in the life of her school.

Family E

One of the most important considerations for my family in choosing a school is whether our son will get to know children who come from different backgrounds. My wife and I both attended public schools in California, and we benefited tremendously from interacting with many different types of kids. Our society is becoming more and more diverse, and young people that have not learned how to interact comfortably with people of different backgrounds will be at a disadvantage in the workplace and in life. Of course, we want our son to attend a school that will provide a high-quality education academically. Ideally, we would find appealing schools that include students from different backgrounds. We don't want to be limited to schools that serve a high concentration of one group of families, even if they share our background. One of our favorite aspects of life in San Francisco is the incredible diversity of the city's residents and families. The last thing we want is for our son to attend a school that is basically serving families that are just like ours.

Appendix E: Simulation Data

SIMULATIONS FOR CACSA
CONDENSED DESCRIPTION/HIGH LEVEL OVERVIEW OF DECISION RULES

Sim. #	NON-ATTENDANCE AREA SCHOOLS	ATTENDANCE AREA SCHOOLS			Pre-Assigned Students	Unfilled Allocations
		Attendance Area Applicants	Non-Attendance Area Applicants	Other Category		
Sim. 1 (Option 1)	Random Lottery	50% of capacity Random Lottery	50% of capacity DI Lottery	None	Take seats based on type of applicant	Remaining seats made available to other group and assigned based on lottery method ascribed to group.
Sim. 2 (Option 2)	Random Lottery	60% of capacity Random Lottery	40% of capacity Random Lottery	None	Take seats based on type of applicant	Remaining seats made available to other group and assigned based on lottery method ascribed to group.
Sim. 3	Random Lottery	70% of capacity Random Lottery	15% of capacity Random Lottery	15% of capacity for low SES applicants Random Lottery	Take seats based on type of applicant	Remaining seats made available to other group and assigned based on lottery method ascribed to group. Priority to AA students, then low SES, then non-AA students.
Sim. 4	Random Lottery	60% of capacity Random Lottery	40% of capacity DI Lottery	None	Take seats based on type of applicant	Remaining seats made available to other group and assigned based on lottery method ascribed to group.
Sim. 5 (Option 3)	Random Lottery	Random Lottery			Random Lottery	Not applicable.
Sim. 6	Random Lottery	70% of capacity Random Lottery	15% of capacity Random Lottery	15% of capacity for low academic achievement applicants Random Lottery	Take seats based on type of applicant	Remaining seats made available to other group and assigned based on lottery method ascribed to group. Priority to AA students, then low academic achievement, then non-AA students.

- Simulations 1, 2, and 4 are similar. The only differences are the % set aside and the lottery processes.
- Simulations 3 and 6 are similar. The only difference is the characteristic that gets priority: 3 is low SES, 5 is low Academic Achievement.
- Simulation 5 is pure random lottery.

SUMMARY OF SIMULATIONS CONDUCTED BY EPC FOR THE CACSA

Simulation Results: Percent of Applicants Receiving Requested Schools

Kindergarten

CHOICE	R1 Sim	Simulation1 (Option 1)	Simulation2 (Option 2)	Simulation3	Simulation4	Simulation5 (Option 3)	Simulation6
1st Choice	67%	64%	68%	64%	65%	65%	65%
Choice	84%	85%	86%	86%	86%	85%	85%
No Choice	16%	15%	14%	14%	14%	15%	15%

6th Grade

CHOICE	R1 Sim	Simulation1 (Option 1)	Simulation2 (Option 2)	Simulation3	Simulation4	Simulation5 (Option 3)	Simulation6
1st Choice	81%	78%	79%	78%	79%	80%	79%
Choice	90%	91%	91%	92%	92%	91%	91%
No Choice	10%	9%	9%	8%	8%	9%	9%

9th Grade

CHOICE	R1 Sim	Simulation1 (Option 1)	Simulation2 (Option 2)	Simulation3	Simulation4	Simulation5 (Option 3)	Simulation6
1st Choice	35%	42%	42%	42%	40%	41%	45%
Choice	66%	78%	78%	78%	78%	77%	78%
No Choice	34%	22%	22%	22%	22%	23%	22%

K, 6, 9

CHOICE	R1 Sim	Simulation1 (Option 1)	Simulation2 (Option 2)	Simulation3	Simulation4	Simulation5 (Option 3)	Simulation6
1st Choice	58%	59%	60%	59%	59%	60%	61%
Choice	78%	84%	84%	84%	84%	84%	84%
No Choice	21%	16%	16%	16%	16%	16%	16%

SUMMARY OF SIMULATIONS CONDUCTED BY EPC FOR THE CACSA

**Simulation Results: Percent of Applicants Receiving
Attendance Area Schools vs. Other Schools**

Kindergarten

Attend. Area	R1 Sim	Simulation1 (Option 1)	Simulation2 (Option 2)	Simulation3	Simulation4	Simulation5 (Option 3)	Simulation6
Requested and Assigned to own Attendance Area school	28%	31%	33%	34%	31%	27%	34%
Requested and Assigned to school other than own Attendance Area school	56%	54%	53%	52%	55%	58%	53%
Not Assigned	16%	15%	14%	14%	14%	15%	14%

6thGrade

Attend. Area	R1 Sim	Simulation1 (Option 1)	Simulation2 (Option 2)	Simulation3	Simulation4	Simulation5 (Option 3)	Simulation6
Requested and Assigned to own Attendance Area school	38%	48%	47%	48%	47%	38%	47%
Requested and Assigned to school other than own Attendance Area school	52%	44%	45%	44%	45%	53%	44%
Not Assigned	10%	9%	9%	8%	8%	9%	9%

SUMMARY OF SIMULATIONS CONDUCTED BY EPC FOR THE CACSA

**Simulation Results: Percent of Applicants Receiving
Attendance Area Schools vs. Other Schools**

9th Grade

Attend. Area	R1 Sim	Simulation 1 (Option 1)	Simulation 2 (Option 2)	Simulation 3	Simulation 4	Simulation 5 (Option 3)	Simulation 6
Requested and Assigned to own Attendance Area school	23%	20%	23%	26%	21%	22%	25%
Requested and Assigned to school other than own Attendance Area school	42%	58%	55%	52%	57%	56%	53%
Not Assigned	34%	22%	22%	22%	22%	23%	22%

SUMMARY OF SIMULATIONS CONDUCTED BY EPC FOR THE CACSA

**Simulation Results: Number of Schools with > 45% of Assignments
to a Single Racial / Ethnic Group (Summary)**

Simulation	# AA >45%	# C >45%	# OW >45%	# SS > 45%	Total >45%
Round 1	4	18	2	18	42
Sim 1 (Option 1)	7	17	3	18	45
Sim 2 (Option 2)	7	16	2	15	40
Sim 3	8	19	2	19	48
Sim 4	8	12	2	18	40
Sim 5 (Option 3)	7	20	2	19	48
Sim 6	7	20	2	18	47

AA = African American
 C = Chinese
 OW = Other White
 SS = Hispanic / Latino

SUMMARY OF SIMULATIONS CONDUCTED BY EPC FOR THE CACSA

**Simulation Results: Schools with > 45% of Assignments
to a Single Racial / Ethnic Group (Details)**

Applicant Pool >45%	SCHNAME	Grade	Placements >45%	Round 1	Sim 1	Sim 2	Sim 3	Sim 4	Sim 5	Sim 6
Yes	A P GIANNINI MIDDLE	06	C	X	X	X	X		X	X
	ABRAHAM LINCOLN HIGH	09	C	X		X	X		X	X
	AIM HIGH ACADEMY	06	AA				X	X		
	ALICE FONG YU ALTERNATIVE	K	C	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
	ALVARADO	K	SS	X						
Yes	BRYANT ELEMENTARY	K	SS	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Yes	BUENA VISTA	K	SS	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
	BURBANK	06	SS	X						
Yes	CESAR CHAVEZ ELM	K	SS	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Yes	CLEVELAND ELM	K	SS	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Yes	DR CHARLES DREW ECDC	K	AA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Yes	DR WILLIAM L COBB ELM	K	AA		X	X	X	X	X	X
Yes	E R TAYLOR ELM	K	C	X	X	X	X		X	X
Yes	EVERETT MIDDLE	06	SS	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
	FAIRMOUNT ELM	K	SS						X	
Yes	FRANCIS SCOTT KEY ELM	K	C	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Yes	FRANCISCO MIDDLE	06	C		X		X		X	X
Yes	FRANK MCCOPPIN ELM	K	C	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Yes	G W CARVER ELM	K	AA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Yes	GARFIELD ELM	K	C	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Yes	GEORGE MOSCONE SCHOOL	K	SS	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
	GEORGE WASHINGTON HIGH	09	C			X	X			
	GLEN PARK ELM	K	SS				X	X		
Yes	GOLDEN GATE ELM	K	AA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Yes	GORDON J LAU	K	C	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Yes	GRATTAN ELM	K	OW	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
	GUADALUPE ELM	K	C	X					X	X
	HILLCREST ELM	K	SS		X		X	X	X	X
Yes	HORACE MANN MIDDLE	06	SS	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Yes	JAMES LICK MIDDLE	06	SS	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Yes	JEAN PARKER ELM	K	C	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
	JEFFERSON	K	C	X						
	JOHN MUIR ELM	K	SS	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Yes	JOHN O'CONNELL HIGH	09	SS	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Yes	JOHN YEHALL CHIN	K	C	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
	JOSE ORTEGA ELM	K	AA		X	X	X	X	X	X
Yes	JUNIPERO SERRA	K	SS		X	X	X	X	X	X
	LAFAYETTE ELM	K	C						X	X
Yes	LAWTON ALTERNATIVE	K	C	X		X	X	X	X	X
Yes	LEONARD R FLYNN	K	SS	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Yes	MALCOLM X ELM	K	AA		X	X	X	X	X	X
Yes	MARINA MIDDLE	06	C	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Yes	MARSHALL ELM	K	SS	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

Applicant Pool >45%	SCHNAME	Grade	Placements >45%	Round 1	Sim 1	Sim 2	Sim 3	Sim 4	Sim 5	Sim 6
Yes	MIRALOMA ELM	K	OW	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Yes	MONROE ELM	K	SS	X	X		X		X	X
Yes	PAUL REVERE/ANNEX ELM	K	SS	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
	PRESIDIO MIDDLE	06	C		X	X	X		X	X
Yes	R L STEVENSON ELM	K	C	X	X		X	X	X	X
	ROOSEVELT MIDDLE	06	C		X					
Yes	SANCHEZ ELM	K	SS	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Yes AA	STARR KING ELM	K	SS & AA	X	X		X	X	X	X
Yes	SUTRO	K	C	X						
Yes	TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY ACADEMY	06	AA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Yes	ULLOA ELM	K	C	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
	WEST PORTAL ELM	K	C	X	X		X		X	X
	WILLIAM R DEAVILA	K	OW		X					
Yes	YICK WO ALT ELEM	K	C		X	X	X	X	X	X
TOTALS				42	45	40	48	40	48	47

AA = African American
 C = Chinese
 OW = Other White
 SS = Hispanic / Latino

SUMMARY OF SIMULATIONS CONDUCTED BY EPC FOR THE CACSA

**Simulation Results: Percent of Applicants Receiving Requested Schools
by Ethnicity for Kindergarten**

Eth	#	%	Option 1		Option 2		Option 3		Option 1		Option 2		Option 3		Option 1		Option 2		Option 3	
			R1 S 1st Choice	R1 S No Choice	S1 1st Choice	S1 No Choice	S2 1st Choice	S2 No Choice	S3 1st Choice	S3 No Choice	S4 1st Choice	S4 No Choice	S5 1st Choice	S5 No Choice	S6 1st Choice	S6 No Choice				
AI	30	1%	67%	13%	70%	3%	70%	10%	63%	10%	53%	10%	50%	13%	53%	7%				
AR	2	0%	100%	0%	100%	0%	100%	0%	50%	50%	100%	0%	100%	0%	100%	0%				
B	288	8%	79%	6%	74%	8%	78%	6%	73%	6%	75%	7%	75%	6%	75%	9%				
C	951	25%	76%	10%	71%	12%	71%	12%	74%	11%	74%	11%	73%	12%	72%	11%				
F	169	5%	82%	7%	81%	6%	83%	4%	81%	4%	78%	7%	77%	7%	79%	6%				
J	51	1%	67%	14%	57%	25%	61%	14%	59%	14%	61%	14%	53%	24%	57%	24%				
K	29	1%	86%	14%	83%	7%	72%	14%	72%	7%	72%	10%	62%	10%	72%	3%				
ON	246	7%	57%	21%	56%	19%	55%	18%	56%	23%	55%	22%	59%	24%	56%	23%				
OW	575	15%	49%	29%	47%	24%	50%	22%	50%	21%	49%	21%	50%	22%	51%	21%				
SA	47	1%	74%	11%	81%	9%	81%	11%	77%	6%	74%	9%	79%	9%	77%	11%				
SE	100	3%	79%	9%	73%	9%	70%	11%	68%	11%	68%	13%	74%	7%	72%	11%				
SS	814	22%	74%	10%	68%	12%	68%	12%	68%	11%	70%	11%	71%	10%	69%	11%				
DS	437	12%	47%	30%	51%	24%	49%	23%	47%	24%	52%	24%	51%	24%	49%	24%				

3739

Totals 67% 16% 64% 15% 68% 14% 64% 14% 65% 14% 65% 15% 65% 15%

AI = American Indian AR = Arabic B = African American C = Chinese F = Filipino IC = Indo-Chinese J = Japanese
 K = Korean ON = Other Non-White OW = White SA = Samoan SE = South East Asian SS = Hispanic / Latino DS = Decline to State

SUMMARY OF SIMULATIONS CONDUCTED BY EPC FOR THE CACSA

**Simulation Results: Percent of Applicants Receiving Requested Schools
by Ethnicity for 6th Grade**

Eth	#	%	Option 1		Option 2		Option 3		Option 3		Option 3		Option 3		Option 3	
			R1 S 1st Choice	R1 S No Choice	S1 1st Choice	S1 No Choice	S2 1st Choice	S2 No Choice	S3 1st Choice	S3 No Choice	S4 1st Choice	S4 No Choice	S5 1st Choice	S5 No Choice	S6 1st Choice	S6 No Choice
AI	20	1%	85%	5%	90%	5%	75%	10%	65%	10%	60%	15%	90%	5%	70%	10%
AR	8	0%	75%	13%	75%	13%	75%	13%	75%	13%	75%	13%	63%	25%	88%	0%
B	373	11%	83%	6%	82%	6%	77%	7%	79%	7%	75%	8%	79%	5%	83%	8%
C	1182	33%	77%	13%	74%	9%	80%	7%	80%	6%	80%	7%	79%	9%	78%	8%
F	226	6%	93%	3%	93%	3%	86%	6%	87%	5%	90%	4%	92%	4%	88%	5%
IC	12	0%	92%	0%	100%	0%	92%	8%	83%	17%	100%	0%	92%	0%	75%	8%
J	35	1%	71%	20%	80%	9%	77%	17%	66%	26%	74%	20%	74%	20%	71%	23%
K	29	1%	69%	14%	90%	7%	66%	21%	72%	14%	90%	7%	69%	14%	79%	14%
ON	392	11%	79%	11%	79%	8%	77%	10%	76%	9%	79%	9%	81%	10%	77%	9%
OW	334	9%	67%	19%	64%	20%	67%	19%	63%	19%	66%	17%	69%	19%	65%	19%
SA	29	1%	90%	3%	93%	3%	93%	0%	97%	0%	86%	3%	83%	3%	93%	0%
SE	15	0%	87%	3%	87%	7%	93%	0%	73%	13%	67%	13%	80%	0%	67%	7%
SS	827	23%	89%	5%	83%	7%	83%	7%	82%	7%	81%	8%	84%	7%	83%	6%
DS	49	1%	71%	6%	65%	4%	53%	18%	59%	12%	53%	14%	63%	10%	49%	20%

3531

Totals 81% 10% 78% 9% 79% 9% 78% 8% 79% 8% 80% 9% 79% 9%

AI = American Indian AR = Arabic B = African American C = Chinese F = Filipino IC = Indo-Chinese J = Japanese
K = Korean ON = Other Non-White OW = White SA = Samoan SE = South East Asian SS = Hispanic / Latino DS = Decline to State

SUMMARY OF SIMULATIONS CONDUCTED BY EPC FOR THE CACSA

**Simulation Results: Percent of Applicants Receiving Requested Schools
by Ethnicity for 9th Grade**

Eth	#	%	Option 1		Option 2		Option 3		Option 1		Option 2		Option 3		Option 1		Option 2		Option 3	
			R1 S 1st Choice	R1 S No Choice	S1 1st Choice	S1 No Choice	S2 1st Choice	S2 No Choice	S3 1st Choice	S3 No Choice	S4 1st Choice	S4 No Choice	S5 1st Choice	S5 No Choice	S6 1st Choice	S6 No Choice	S6 1st Choice	S6 No Choice	S6 1st Choice	S6 No Choice
AI	39	1%	49%	23%	44%	8%	46%	13%	33%	15%	33%	18%	38%	21%	41%	8%				
AR	14	0%	50%	14%	50%	14%	57%	14%	43%	14%	43%	14%	57%	0%	64%	7%				
B	521	11%	57%	13%	49%	13%	47%	14%	48%	14%	47%	12%	50%	16%	58%	14%				
C	1610	33%	27%	40%	37%	29%	38%	24%	38%	24%	37%	24%	36%	25%	40%	26%				
F	322	7%	41%	20%	46%	15%	46%	16%	48%	16%	44%	16%	47%	13%	46%	12%				
IC	4	0%	50%	50%	50%	0%	25%	25%	50%	25%	50%	0%	0%	50%	25%	25%				
J	59	1%	12%	63%	25%	34%	31%	37%	29%	37%	29%	41%	27%	37%	31%	34%				
K	56	1%	14%	34%	34%	14%	25%	21%	25%	23%	18%	27%	20%	25%	39%	20%				
ON	399	8%	30%	37%	38%	22%	41%	22%	41%	22%	36%	25%	38%	23%	42%	26%				
OW	582	12%	14%	58%	38%	27%	36%	32%	37%	30%	34%	31%	36%	32%	38%	29%				
SA	29	1%	83%	10%	72%	7%	66%	21%	59%	14%	69%	21%	69%	7%	69%	14%				
SE	117	2%	43%	34%	44%	21%	37%	26%	41%	23%	39%	23%	41%	25%	40%	29%				
SS	895	19%	53%	20%	52%	15%	51%	17%	51%	17%	49%	17%	50%	17%	54%	16%				
DS	162	3%	16%	59%	38%	29%	39%	31%	40%	35%	42%	35%	37%	33%	43%	33%				

4809

TOTALS 35% 34% 42% 22% 42% 22% 42% 22% 40% 22% 41% 23% 45% 22%

AI = American Indian AR = Arabic B = African American C = Chinese F = Filipino IC = Indo-Chinese J = Japanese
K = Korean ON = Other Non-White OW = White SA = Samoan SE = South East Asian SS = Hispanic / Latino DS = Decline to State

SUMMARY OF SIMULATIONS CONDUCTED BY EPC FOR THE CACSA

**Simulation Results: Percent of Applicants Receiving Requested Schools
by Academic Achievement**

Kindergarten

Positive AAS: applicants have not attended pre-school.

CHOICE	R1 Sim	Simulation1 (Option 1)	Simulation2 (Option 2)	Simulation3	Simulation4	Simulation5 (Option 3)	Simulation6
1st Choice	93%	80%	74%	73%	73%	75%	93%
Choice	99%	94%	90%	91%	90%	90%	98%
No Choice	1%	6%	10%	9%	10%	10%	2%

Negative AAS: applicants have attended pre-school.

CHOICE	R1 Sim	Simulation1 (Option 1)	Simulation2 (Option 2)	Simulation3	Simulation4	Simulation5 (Option 3)	Simulation6
1st Choice	62%	61%	63%	63%	64%	63%	59%
Choice	82%	83%	85%	85%	85%	84%	83%
No Choice	18%	17%	15%	15%	15%	16%	17%

6th Grade

Positive AAS: applicants scored below the 30th percentile on standardized tests.

CHOICE	R1 Sim	Simulation1 (Option 1)	Simulation2 (Option 2)	Simulation3	Simulation4	Simulation5 (Option 3)	Simulation6
1st Choice	97%	95%	83%	83%	81%	83%	97%
Choice	99%	99%	95%	94%	95%	95%	99%
No Choice	1%	1%	5%	6%	5%	5%	1%

Negative AAS: applicants scored above the 30th percentile on standardized tests.

CHOICE	R1 Sim	Simulation1 (Option 1)	Simulation2 (Option 2)	Simulation3	Simulation4	Simulation5 (Option 3)	Simulation6
1st Choice	78%	75%	78%	97%	78%	80%	75%
Choice	88%	90%	91%	91%	91%	90%	90%
No Choice	12%	10%	9%	9%	9%	10%	10%

SUMMARY OF SIMULATIONS CONDUCTED BY EPC FOR THE CACSA

**Simulation Results: Percent of Applicants Receiving Requested Schools
by Academic Achievement**

9th Grade

Positive AAS: applicants scored below the 30th percentile on standardized tests.

CHOICE	R1 Sim	Simulation1 (Option 1)	Simulation2 (Option 2)	Simulation3	Simulation4	Simulation5 (Option 3)	Simulation6
1st Choice	86%	70%	59%	60%	57%	60%	88%
Choice	98%	95%	88%	88%	86%	88%	98%
No Choice	2%	5%	12%	12%	14%	12%	2%

Negative AAS: applicants scored above the 30th percentile on standardized tests.

CHOICE	R1 Sim	Simulation1 (Option 1)	Simulation2 (Option 2)	Simulation3	Simulation4	Simulation5 (Option 3)	Simulation6
1st Choice	28%	39%	39%	40%	38%	38%	39%
Choice	61%	75%	76%	77%	76%	76%	75%
No Choice	39%	25%	24%	23%	24%	24%	25%

SUMMARY OF SIMULATIONS CONDUCTED BY EPC FOR THE CACSA

**Simulation Results: Percent of Applicants Receiving Requested Schools
by Socio Economic Status**

Kindergarten

Positive SES: applicants participate in CalWorks / Public Housing / Free and Reduced Lunch.

CHOICE	R1 Sim	Simulation1 (Option 1)	Simulation2 (Option 2)	Simulation3	Simulation4	Simulation5 (Option 3)	Simulation6
1st Choice	83%	77%	76%	77%	77%	77%	76%
Choice	95%	92%	92%	92%	92%	91%	91%
No Choice	5%	8%	8%	8%	8%	9%	9%

Negative SES: applicants do not participate in CalWorks / Public Housing / Free and Reduced Lunch.

CHOICE	R1 Sim	Simulation1 (Option 1)	Simulation2 (Option 2)	Simulation3	Simulation4	Simulation5 (Option 3)	Simulation6
1st Choice	55%	54%	56%	55%	56%	57%	56%
Choice	77%	80%	81%	81%	81%	81%	81%
No Choice	23%	20%	19%	19%	19%	19%	19%

6th Grade

Positive SES: applicants participate in CalWorks / Public Housing / Free and Reduced Lunch.

CHOICE	R1 Sim	Simulation1 (Option 1)	Simulation2 (Option 2)	Simulation3	Simulation4	Simulation5 (Option 3)	Simulation6
1st Choice	83%	81%	82%	82%	81%	83%	82%
Choice	92%	93%	94%	95%	94%	94%	94%
No Choice	8%	7%	6%	5%	6%	6%	6%

Negative SES: applicants do not participate in CalWorks / Public Housing / Free and Reduced Lunch.

CHOICE	R1 Sim	Simulation1 (Option 1)	Simulation2 (Option 2)	Simulation3	Simulation4	Simulation5 (Option 3)	Simulation6
1st Choice	78%	74%	74%	71%	75%	75%	73%
Choice	87%	88%	87%	86%	87%	86%	87%
No Choice	13%	12%	13%	14%	13%	14%	13%

SUMMARY OF SIMULATIONS CONDUCTED BY EPC FOR THE CACSA

**Simulation Results: Percent of Applicants Receiving Requested Schools
by Socio Economic Status**

9th Grade

Positive SES: applicants participate in CalWorks / Public Housing / Free and Reduced Lunch.

CHOICE	R1 Sim	Simulation1 (Option 1)	Simulation2 (Option 2)	Simulation3	Simulation4	Simulation5 (Option 3)	Simulation6
1st Choice	44%	46%	45%	45%	43%	44%	49%
Choice	75%	81%	81%	82%	82%	81%	82%
No Choice	25%	19%	19%	18%	18%	19%	18%

Negative SES: applicants do not participate in CalWorks / Public Housing / Free and Reduced Lunch.

CHOICE	R1 Sim	Simulation1 (Option 1)	Simulation2 (Option 2)	Simulation3	Simulation4	Simulation5 (Option 3)	Simulation6
1st Choice	25%	39%	39%	39%	38%	32%	41%
Choice	57%	74%	74%	74%	74%	73%	74%
No Choice	43%	26%	26%	26%	26%	27%	26%