

# STEVENSON LOTTERY & Transportation RESOLUTION, March 4, 2021

Starting to end the Stevenson Segregation problem:  
Economic Disadvantaged 5X underrepresented  
from the District average. Getting worse *over a decade*.

*ED is a protected class, that, for instance, is called out for preferable treatment by the state LCFF and the federal Title 1 laws and regulations.*

**This *only* concerns California law.**

The California Supreme Court, made it clear that a student in a protected class, Mary Ellen Crawford, had a right to compel *her board of education* to reduce segregation. No matter if ***de facto*** and not from blatantly ***de jura*** causes.

## ***Crawford v. Board of Education of the City of Los Angeles***

- \*Is a landmark in California Constitutional Law, almost 50 years old.
- \*It is about **California Constitution** guarantees.
- \*It is cited often in school segregation cases in California.
- \*It forms the basis for some charter school law restrictions/requirements.
- \*DWK's Sue Ann Evans has referenced it extensively in her work. (Refer to her 2010 letter to the Santa Cruz Co. BOE)

***Crawford v. Board of Education of the City of Los Angeles***

If you don't **take action** to *actually reduce* segregation at Stevenson, which is well documented, worsened over the last decade, was affirmed by Hanover Research, and was a Board discussion item in February

...

*Your Board* will be susceptible to litigation and court oversight.

*Crawford* made it *very, very* clear. A Board doing nothing, like LAUSD, **is legally unacceptable.**

## RESOLUTION (1)

The Board has broad powers of governance, and *Crawford* set the bar that all policy decisions of a Board, and many heretofore unused techniques, are game for reducing segregation of protected classes (ED re: Stevenson).

**A Weighted Random Lottery** is a perfectly fine, well understood and effective anti-segregation policy!

## RESOLUTION (1). weighted random lottery

QUESTION TO YOU: Please nod if you understand weighted random lottery.

Keeping the “sibling preference” *will delay* and smooth out the anti-segregation process. That *delay* is a negative. You have seen the percentages from your packet in February. About half of the new enrollment is NOT LOTTERY / but family siblings / bringing the *status quo* segregation percentages.

## RESOLUTION (1). weights? 2X or 5X to start?

Keeping the “sibling preference” *will delay* and that *delay* is a negative. No current families are impacted by keeping it! (political reality)

I have suggested 2X as a starting **ED weight**. **I personally think it should be 5X**, to match the current under-representation of Economically Disadvantaged families enrolled in Stevenson’s excellent educational program! No current families are impacted by increasing **ED weight!** (math reality)

# RESOLUTION (1). ED weight & “sibling” lottery math

## QUESTION TO YOU:

- Please nod if you understand the math.
- Please shake NO - If more detail needed

## RESOLUTION (2). TRANSPORTATION

Hanover Research presented why an affirmative TRANSPORTATION policy is helpful in anti-segregation efforts.

Be sure you ‘have implemented a plan that provides meaningful progress toward that goal.’ *Crawford (1976) & Evans (2010)*

Add - “and parents / guardians” to the TRANSPORTATION policy. All of us who have studied MV poor areas, know that “no private car” is a common ED family reality. An anti-segregation policy needs to be highly proactive in helping poor students getting to school (2 miles is absolutely maximum legal distance BTW, *I think it should be 1 mile*).

For Stevenson, it is especially important to help their *parents participate*.



## **RESOLUTION (3). POLICY MANUAL**

Anti-segregation policy needs to be permanently recorded and the Administrative actions to implement policy need to be confirmed in writing. The POLICY MANUAL and AR process is the way it should be recorded.

## **RESOLUTION option (4). Lottery - neighborhood cycles**

*Unlike charter school regulations*, which have proscribed rules cast in charter school law, general Ed Code districts have extremely broad latitude under *Crawford* to use multi-weight enrollment lotteries for anti-segregation policy implementation. Even charter school boards have such 'school zone' or ZIP code enrollment lottery latitude.

Option (4) would include such District-wide spreading out of Stevenson enrollment. The mathematical effect would be *to probably increase the effect of ED weighting factor*. Combined with TRANSPORTATION this might make a meaningful difference in bringing ED families to Stevenson.

No current families are impacted by this! (math reality)

## **OBSERVATIONS of Stevenson community (if time)**

Foundation; “required contribution” (*the not-so-distant past*)

Commenters / MV Voice; (all unwarranted vitriol?)

Principal Tyler Graff of Stevenson; re “parents”

Steven Nelson’s; K pre-enrollment, mom’s meet @DO

Steven Nelson’s; General Meetup (prepare for next year)

===

Retributions (past wrongs): how do we *pay it forward*?