



Mountain View
Whisman
School District

Equitable Access to Choice Schools: Board of Trustees Study Session

Mountain View Whisman School District



Goals and Objectives

Today's Objectives:

- ❑ Explore research related to meaningful integration of choice programs
- ❑ Explore multiple lottery designs: tiered lottery, weighted lottery, quotas, and extra entries
- ❑ Explore which student demographics can/should be considered within a lottery
- ❑ Explore examples of how other district's in our community are handling enrollment lotteries
- ❑ Discuss what kind of outside supports will be necessary to execute and communicate changes to our lottery



Mountain View
Whisman
School District

Choice Schools in MVWSD

An Equity Challenge

Diminish the underrepresentation of our underserved student populations* at our choice schools while considering the legal, social, logistical, and fiscal implications.

(*Particularly with regards to students who are classified as EL and/or SED)

Connections to SP2027 and Equitable Access

- Goal Area #5: Equitable distribution of resources that support student success
 - Ensure facilities and resources equitably serve all students
- Goal Area #3: Inclusive and Supportive Culture
 - Expand stakeholders' access to the systems and strategies used to support student learning

Current Demographics

PowerSchool Data Pull, October 29, 2021											
School Name	Total Enrollment	Foster Placement	Homeless		FRPL		EL		RFEP		
Stevenson Elementary	440	0	0	0%	27	6.14%	39	8.86%	41	9.32%	
Gabriela Mistral Elementary	346	0	18	5.20%	164	47.40%	150	43.35%	19	5.49%	
District Total	4645	3	185	3.98%	1231	26.50%	972	20.93%	704	15.16%	
PowerSchool Data Pull, October 29, 2021											
School Name	Total Enrollment	Hispanic/Latino		Asian		White		Black/African American		Multiple	
Gabriela Mistral Elementary	346	237	68.50%	11	3.18%	62	17.92%	0	0%	36	10.40%
Stevenson Elementary	440	43	9.77%	171	38.86%	145	32.95%	3	1.00%	74	16.82%
District total	4645	1680	36.17%	1056	22.73%	1122	24.16%	60	1.30%	563	12.12%

Neighborhood School Analysis

STEVENSON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL			
	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21
% from BB	4%	3%	4%
% from CA	8%	7%	8%
% from AI	4%	4%	4%
% LN	19%	17%	17%
% ML	15%	14%	14%
% TH	32%	33%	31%
% VA	17%	20%	20%

Neighborhood School Analysis

MISTRAL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL			
	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21
% from BB	7%	10%	10%
% from CA	37%	36%	38%
% from AI	4%	4%	3%
% INTER	3%	2%	2%
% LN	21%	21%	21%
% ML	12%	10%	8%
% TH	9%	10%	10%
% VA	7%	8%	7%

Sibling Prevalence

		2018-19	2019-20	2020-21
ST	% Siblings in K	36%	51%	56%
	% Siblings in 1-8	59%	58%	62%
	% Siblings TOTAL	54%	57%	61%
MI	% Siblings in K	44%	47%	41%
	% Siblings in 1-8	52%	55%	49%
	% Siblings TOTAL	51%	53%	48%
CA	% Siblings in K	45%	33%	42%
	% Siblings in 1-8	42%	41%	37%
	% Siblings TOTAL	43%	40%	38%
IM	% Siblings in K	46%	43%	47%
	% Siblings in 1-8	57%	58%	53%
	% Siblings TOTAL	55%	55%	53%

Waitlist Analysis

Stevenson Elementary School, 2021

Grade Level	Total	% Asian	% Hisp/Latino	% White	ELA status (%)	% SED	Enroll. Zone
K	49	55%	10%	35%	EO 51% TBD 43% IFEP 4%	N/A	LN 27% VA 18% ML 16%
1	62	47%	3%	45%	EO 52% TBD 10% IFEP 18% RFEP 8% EL 10%	11%	TH 31% VA 21% LN 19%
2	21	67%	0%	29%	EO 57% TBD 0% IFEP 38% RFEP 0% EL 5%	5%	ML 29% VA 29% TH 19%

MVWSD Enrollment Priorities for Choice Schools [Tiered Lottery]

- 1** - Students who reside in district and were enrolled in the same program during the prior school year
- 2** - Children of salaried district employees and were enrolled in same program during prior school year
- 3** - Students from interdistrict transfer who were enrolled in same program during prior school year
- 4** - Students who live in the district who have siblings enrolled in program during prior school year
- 5** - Children of salaried district employees (site specific) who live within the district and are new to the program
- 6** - Children of salaried district employees (site specific), interdistrict transfers, are new to the program
- 7** - Children of salaried district employees (not site-specific), live within the district, and are new to the program
- 8** - Children of salaried district employees (not site-specific), interdistrict transfers, and are new to the program (don't live in district)
- 9** - All other students who live in district and new to the program
- 10** - All other students who are interdistrict transfers and are new to the program

Current work to date

	Activity	Timeframe
Pre-Engagement	Superintendent Coffee w/Stevenson	October 2020
	Meeting with Stevenson PACT	October 2020
	Meeting with Stevenson Equity Group	December 2020
	Initiate Choice School Inquiry	November 2020
	Board Presentation on Equitable Access to Choice Schools	February 2021
School and Community Engagement	Thought Exchange: Stevenson	March 2021
	Parent Engagement: Focus Groups	March 2021
	Staff Engagement: Focus Groups	March 2021
	Leadership Engagement: Focus Group	March 2021
	Focus Group Data Synthesis	April 2021
	1:1 with Principal Santiago and Director Henderson bi-monthly	Ongoing
Board Engagement		
	Update to BOT about Focus Group Analysis	October 2021
	Update to BOT about Timeline and Ramifications	November 2021



Mountain View
Whisman
School District

What the Research Tells Us

About the academic benefits of an integrated education

- higher achievement in math, science, language, and reading
- school climates supportive of learning and studying
- increased likelihood of graduating from high school and entering and graduating from college
- higher income and educational attainment
- increased access to highly qualified teachers and leaders who are less likely to transfer to other schools
- enhanced classroom discussion
- more advanced social and historical thinking

*Ayscue, J. Frankenberg, E., & Siegel-Hawley, G. (2017), National Coalition on School Diversity

About the social benefits of an integrated education

- Reduces, prejudice, negative attitudes and stereotypes
- increases positive relationships and friendships across racial lines
- improved critical thinking and problem solving skills
- increased civic participation in a diverse global economy
- more likely for students to hold jobs in integrated workplaces as adults

*Tropp, L.R., & Tropp, L. (2006). Intergroup Attitudes and Relations in Childhood Through Adulthood

Mountain View Whisman School District

Considerations on racial integration

- U.S. DOE, DOJ *Guidance on Voluntary Use of Race to Achieve Diversity*
 - Since rescinded by Trump Administration but under review by Biden Administration
- **Approaches that DO NOT rely on race**
 - First determine if goals can still be met without using race
 - Factors considered could include SES, parent education, students' household status (dual or single parent), neighborhood SES, geography lines, and composition of area housing (subsidized, single-family, high-density public, or rental)

Considerations on racial integration

- **Approaches that SOMEWHAT rely on race**
 - Generalized race-based approaches -- may employ expressly racial criteria, such as overall composition of neighborhoods, but do not involve decision making on the basis of an individual student's race (i.e. a school district could draw attendance zones based on racial composition of neighborhoods, but all students within those zones would be treated the same regardless of race)
- **Approaches that DO rely on race**
 - meets a compelling interest that closely fits goals of achieving diversity, not avoiding it
 - can be used as a 'plus' factor but not the other way around
 - cannot be used as sole factor in student profile

About best practices for increasing diversity in choice/magnet programs

- Enrollment practices
 - Implementation of inclusive enrollment practices
 - Using race and income factors together in choice school lotteries is best approach

*Reardon, S.F. Yun, J.T, & Kurlaender, M. (2006) "Simulation Models of the Effects of Race- and Socioeconomic-Based Affirmative Action Policies", Center for Education Policy Analysis, Stanford University

About best practices for increasing diversity in choice/magnet programs

- Recruitment and Communication
 - effective outreach
 - information sessions or fairs in different locations in community, publications, dedicated employees for outreach, mailings, websites, visits to feeder schools
 - integration embedded into school design, mission, structure, focus, and set of clear desegregation goals
 - Example: [The City School](#)

*Learning Policy Institute, Advancing Integration and Equity Through Magnet Schools (2021)

*Frankenberg and Siegel-Hawley (2008)

Considerations on finding what is right for MVWSD

- Student population and future projects
 - What will the demographics of students look like in 5 years? 10 years? How does this impact the way we craft policy around the enrollment lottery?
- Short- and long-term goals of district related to school integration
 - As we look at future growth, what kind of integration are we looking for in our schools? How does this impact the way we craft policy around the enrollment lottery?
- Flexibility
 - What kind of flexibility do we want to have in our lottery? Do we want the lottery to be responsive to shifting demographics and needs yearly? Every 5 years?



Mountain View
Whisman
School District

Levers for Change: Enrollment Practices

Lottery Designs

Lottery Design	Description
Tiered Lottery	Showcases a tiered (numerated) lottery including multiple priorities that rank against each other
Weighted/Scored Lottery	Uses points per priority which are then added together to rank students by total score
Quotas	Allows administrators to set a quota for students in specific priority groups (eg. no more than 25% of seats for siblings as part of the 1st priority group). Can be set with percentage limits or minimums but also by total seats
Tiered Lottery - Multiple Priorities Single Group "OR"	Showcases a tiered lottery (numerated) including multiple priorities that rank against each other with more than 1 priority in a single sub lottery group where students can meet EITHER priorities to be ranked accordingly
Tiered Lottery - Multiple Priorities Single Group "AND"	Showcases a tiered lottery (numerated) including multiple priorities that rank against each other with more than 1 priority in a single sub lottery group where students MUST meet both priorities in the single group or tier
Extra Entries	Uses entries for each priority group. Provides additional entries based on these priorities assigned, which doesn't guarantee placement but provides higher odds based on entries.
Extra Entries Cumulative	Uses entries for each priority group. Provides additional entries based on these priorities assigned, which doesn't guarantee placement but provides higher odds based on entries. This version adds together the entries if a student meets more than 1.

Tiered Lottery

- Showcases a tiered (numerated) lottery including multiple priorities that rank against each other
- Our current preferences list is a tiered lottery
- Tiered lotteries can contain groups within the tiers. Within each group on the tier, district can utilize 'AND' or 'OR' conjunction (can meet 1 of several criteria to qualify under tier [OR]; have to meet all criteria to qualify for tier [AND])
- Tiered lotteries can also utilize quotas to ensure at least a basic number of students of a certain demographic will be offered seats

Tiered Lottery Approach (Example)

- Run a random number series for the entire list first then sort by preferences
- Sort first by preferences in order, then assign randomized numbers for each group
- Sort by preference and then by school design (i.e. dual immersion) before assigning randomized numbers
- Create a set-aside (quota) to ensure at least a basic number of students who met a certain school design preference will be offered seats
 - If seats remain after all applicants in this category are admitted, they are not released to the next level of priority, but held until more students in this category apply

Quotas

- Allows administrators to set a quota for students in specific priority groups (eg. no more than 25% of seats for siblings as part of the 1st priority group). Can be set with percentage limits or minimums but also by total seats
- Can be used alone or as a part of either a tiered or a weighted lottery system

Extra Entries

- Uses entries for each priority group. Provides additional entries based on these priorities assigned, which doesn't guarantee placement but provides higher odds based on entries.
- Tiered lotteries with extra entries has a few versions -- one version adds together the entries if a student meets more than 1 [cumulative]

Weighted Lottery

- Uses points per priority which are then added together to rank students by total score
- Can consider multiple student demographics without needing to have a ranking system
- Can adapt to district's integration goals from year-to-year
- Requires mathematical justification for weights that respond to integration goals

Establishing mathematical justification for weights (Example)

Formula to assist in determining a mathematical rationale for weights utilized

Calculating Mathematical Justification:

x= # of educationally disadvantaged students estimated

y= # of expected total applicants

z= % chance in lottery

a= # of additional chances
(weight minus one)

b= revised % chance in lottery

$$\frac{x+(ax)}{y+(ax)} = b$$

Example: 22% educationally disadvantaged applied, seeking target of 50% enrollment. Consider weight of 3.

$$\frac{22}{100} = 22\% \text{ chance}$$

100

3 chances would mean an additional 2 chances, so $ax = (2)(22) = 44$

$$\frac{22+(44)}{100+(44)} = \frac{66}{144} = 45.8\%$$

100+(44) 144

Establishing a mathematical justification for weights (Example)

If there was an open lottery with no priorities, and 7 of the 124 applicants for ST were SED, the chance of an SED applicant getting accepted into the school would be 6%. With a desired enrollment of at least 20% SED for ST, the characteristics of a student who is SED should be weighted 4.

If there was an open lottery with no priorities, and 75 of the 124 applicants for ST were siblings, the chances of an SED applicant getting accepted into the school would be 60%. With a desired enrollment of siblings no greater than 50%, the characteristics of a student who is a sibling should be weighted 1 (if that is still desired).

*students who were enrolled at ST previous year would be exempt from lottery

Student characteristics in a lottery

- Race (can be used when race-neutral proxies are not reasonable)
- Socioeconomic Status
 - FRPL is only one of three measures utilized to determine socioeconomic disadvantage and is dichotomous (you either qualify or you don't)
 - SED is a designation given to students who meet at least one of three of these criteria: (1) FRPL-eligible, (2) parent education (high-school or less), (3) foster youth
- ELL status
- Academic achievement
- Special education status
- Geography (geographic census block)

Other [possible] race-neutral proxies

- Other examples of alternatives measures to SES include neighborhood income or residence, whether a student attended pre-school, whether families receive income-based governmental assistance, parental educational attainment
- ELL status, academic achievement, and special education status are also used but in combination with one or more of the above

Can socioeconomic diversity plans produce racial diversity in schools?

- Integration plans that incorporate SES can take several forms, including:
 - plans that use SES to achieve socioeconomic integration only
 - race conscious plans that use SES factors to achieve racial and socioeconomic integration,
 - race conscious plans that use racial factors (neighborhood or school makeup, etc.) and socioeconomic factors to achieve racial (and socioeconomic) integration
- Success of integration using SES as a factor depends at least in part on how extreme residential segregation by race is, how many students you want to reach and how you define SES

Drawbacks of using simple SES measures to promote integration

- FRPL eligibility is dichotomous: you are or aren't poor, which ignores highly meaningful variations in income levels, but recent alternatives are not widely studied
- While there is a strong relationship between race and poverty, it is imperfect and it varies across communities (recent study of U.S. metros found that the racial and economic segregation work independently of one another; in a district where racial groups are separated by substantial geographic distances regardless of income, it may be more difficult to draw attendance zones that are integrated by race as well as SES)
- SES plans that used more nuanced measures of SES beyond binary FRPL measure would likely be associated with higher racial integration --

Examples in our community

- SFUSD “diversity index lottery” -- race neutral proxies
 - 5 factors: extreme poverty (in public housing, foster care, homeless), SES (FRPL status), CalWORKS, and/or public housing programs, home language (whether other than English), the academic performance rank of student’s prior school, students most recent prior test score (whether below 30th percentile)

Examples in our community

- Oakland Unified School District
 - “Equitable Enrollment Priority” -- uses prioritized, geographic census block groups
 - Used American Community Survey (ACS) 5-year estimates by census block group
 - Median household income from 2017, 2018, and 2019
 - Latina/o and African-American population from 2019; AND
 - OUSD’s free- or reduced-priced lunch (FRPL) rate by census block group from Fall 2019

Considerations for Board Policy

When seeking to utilize a **weighted** lottery, the BP/AR must include and address the following:

- Categories and Sets/Subsets of students to receive weights in lottery
- Amount of weights to be applied to each category/set/subset
- Rationale/justification for amount of weight to be applied to each category/set/subset (the amount of weight proposed needs to be based on actual circumstances of the school/district and include an explanation and justification of how that particular weight is decided/justified)

Considerations for Board Policy (cont.)

- Description of mechanisms and/or processes that will be utilized to carry out weighted lottery, including district oversight of process
- Sign-off from district and school certifying description provided adequately captures mechanisms that will be used to carry out the weighted lottery

Considerations on finding what is right for MVWSD

- Student population and future projects
 - What will the demographics of students look like in 5 years? 10 years? How does this impact the way we craft policy around the enrollment lottery?
- Short- and long-term goals of district related to school integration
 - As we look at future growth, what kind of integration are we looking for in our schools? How does this impact the way we craft policy around the enrollment lottery?
- Flexibility
 - What kind of flexibility do we want to have in our lottery? Do we want the lottery to be responsive to shifting demographics and needs yearly? Every 5 years?

Next Steps

- Stakeholder analysis and community engagement planning to ensure policy changes are informed by parent and community feedback
- Setting goals for new enrollment process (e.g. demographic changes in applicant pool and ultimately in the incoming Kindergarten class)
- Options and recommendations for enrollment policy and process changes (e.g. options for implementing a weighted lottery, process changes to create equitable access to the process)
- Technical recommendations for implementation: Suggest a path forward to implement policy changes such as a tool or software to manage the lottery