

March 15, 2000

TO: Board of Education

FROM: Jack McLaughlin

SUBJECT: Approval of Methodology to use in the K-5 2000-2001 Student Assignment Plan; and revised guidelines to be considered for use in the K-8 2001-2002 Student Assignment Plan

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Approval of Methodology for the Berkeley Unified School District K-5 Student Assignment Plan as follows:

3-2
Passed

1. For the 2000-2001 school year, students will be assigned using the same methodology and guidelines as for the 1999-2000 school year.

5-0
Passed

2. Alternative K-5 Student Assignment Plans will be developed by the Student Assignment Advisory Committee for the 2001-2002 school year and beyond for consideration by the Board no later than November, 2000 as follows:

NBW

2nd meeting in Nov.

- a. A plan with multiple factors that includes the use of race.
- b. A plan with factors excluding the use of race.

A staff committee
5-0
Passed
NBW

3. Committee formation and process will adhere to the following guidelines:

- a. Committee will be appointed by May 1, 2000.
- b. The committee will include parent representation from each of the affected elementary and middle schools.
K-5
- c. The committee will develop the alternate student assignment plans by October 31, 2000.
- d. In developing the above alternative plans, the committee will take into consideration the following staff recommendations:

Issues:

d. At less than one community forum

~~1. Plan for the use of exceptions such as proximity, hardship and educational programs.~~

~~2. Extend the + or minus 5% requirement stipulated in assignment guidelines to + or -15% of those assigned after the initial March notification period.~~

~~3. Establish a waiting list based on the date the complete application is received and students will be placed in openings without regard to race.~~

NSW
Person
4.

4. In receiving its charge, the Committee will be provided with all relevant law affecting the legal parameters within which the committee must make its recommendations so as to comply with existing law.

5. Query the schools re: plans

DISCUSSION

At the November 17, 1999 meeting, the Board of Directors approved the 2000-2001 Student Assignment Plan as follows:

1. The student application and District administrative processes will continue to be implemented in the same manner as for the 1999-2000 school year in preparation for the student assignment process in March 2000.
2. Prior to the final elementary student assignment for the 2000-2001 school year, the incoming K-5 student assignment lottery shall be run using both the current criteria (magnet and non-magnet combination) and using magnet criteria only unless other options are proposed by the Student Assignment Advisory Committee. The Board of Directors will consider the results at the March 15, 2000 Board Meeting.
3. Columbus, Franklin, Malcolm X and Longfellow Magnet Schools continue to use the criteria of geographical bands, described in the Desegregation Plan, as amended May 21, 1998. The lottery for these magnet schools will be held earlier than the lottery for the non-magnet schools, with all assignments mailed at the same time.
4. A Student Assignment Advisory Committee will be appointed by the Board. The composition and charge shall be submitted to the Board on December 1, 1999 for approval.
5. Northwest and Central zone families will be made aware of the option of choosing The City of Franklin MicroSociety Magnet School.

6. Students choosing Longfellow Arts and Technology Magnet School will be asked to complete a Personal Profile, which will not be used as a basis for acceptance or rejection but will help familiarization with the school's theme and allow students to express their interests and goals.

Staff was directed to run a trial assignment plan for FY01 incoming-Kindergartner's using first the current criteria and then the criteria used for the Federal Magnet Schools Assistance Program. Such a run was completed and is attached. An observation of the results is as follows:

Pros for Geobands:

1. same % of whites are assigned either way
2. 95% of whites got 1st or second choice
3. 99% African Americans received 1st or 2nd choice
4. 81% 'others' got 1st choice
5. 95% 'others' others got 1st of 2nd choice
6. Emerson and Whittier increased white student population
7. Oxford, Cragmont and Washington remains essentially the
8. Malcolm X and Columbus are able to attract a diverse population with this method

Cons for Geobands:

1. Muir, LeConte lose white students to Emerson
2. Whittier gains whites at the expense of other central zone schools
3. TO loses 7 white students (14%)
4. Cragmont loses 2 white students
5. Using geobands now does not allow staff time to run a parallel assignment system through all the assignment runs in order to determine reliability
6. 24 students were not assigned because their geoband capacity is filled
7. Franklin was not able to attract a diverse population

Pros for standard method:

1. With the exception of Whittier and Emerson all non-magnets increase white Student population
2. 77.7% of whites get their 1st choice
3. 95% of whites get 1st or 2nd choice
4. African Americans get 1st choice
5. 100% of African Americans get 1st or 2nd choice
6. 88% of 'others' get 1st choice
7. 95% of 'others' get 1st or second choice
8. uses a familiar and modifiable assignment system

Cons of the standard method

1. increases legal liability in light of budget constraints
2. 5% of all applicants get their 3rd choice
3. Whittier and Emerson get more white using geobands than the standard method

JMcL:q