## Presentation to <br> Controlled Choice Sulb-Committee of the Whole Cambridge School Committee

March 19, 2013

## Issues \& Concerns

- Balanced Schools

Balance ratios for J K - $5^{\text {th }}$ grade and $6-8{ }^{\text {th }}$ grade

- Balanced grade-level cohorts
+/-10\% band
K and JK
x Separate allotment of spaces
J K/K assignment and enrollment inequities
- Seat Capacities and Availability for J an Lottery
- Proximity
- East/ West enrollment vs. choices

Mandatory Assignments

- Stability

Early Transfer End Date

- Special Populations
- English Language Learners and Special Education students in separate classrooms
* Room for partial and full inclusion
- Priority for transfers and/ or reserved spaces
- Programs for students under J K eligibility age

Assignment inequities

- Hardships and Sabbaticals
- School/ Program change
- Families with siblings entering the district
- Comprehensive revision of policy

Policy Language
x Effect of terms such as "Lottery" and "Mandatory"

## Goal of Controlled Choice

- The original goal in 1981: "To ensure that all segments of the elementary school population would have equal access, in a desegregated setting, to all schools and programs offered" (Lamders \& willis, 1987, p. 41).
- Revised in 1989 and reaffirmed in 2001: To provide students with the opportunity to excel academically and to grow and accept others as their peers in an integrated and balanced learning environment (adapted from Revised Controlled Choice Plan, 1989).


## Controlled Choice Timeline

## Pre-2001

## Post-2001

- 1981: Cambridge was the first district in the Nation to adopt a voluntary "Controlled Choice" method of student assignment to desegregate its schools by race.
- 1989: Concept of flexibility introduced by creating the racial balance definition of $\pm 5 \%$ of District racial balance average.
- 1997: Expanded the definition of race balance from 2 to 3 racial categories. Allowable balance increased to $\pm 10 \%$ of District racial balance average.
- 2001: The Plan was revised, in a preemptive legal maneuver, to balance schools by SES, instead of by race.
- Since 2001: Numerous amendments have been adopted to address the various concerns surrounding the implementation of the Plan.


## Comparison of Racial Balance: 2001-2011

Grades K-8

| Year | White | Black/ African American | Asian | Native American | Nat. Hawaiian / Pacific Islander | Multi-race, nonHispanic | Hispanic |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| +10\% | 49\% | 45\% | 22\% | 11\% | 10\% | 10\% | 24\% |
| SY2001 | 39\% | 35\% | 12\% | 1\% | 0\% | 0\% | 14\% |
| -10\% | 29\% | 25\% | 2\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 4\% |
| +10\% | 49\% | 40\% | 21\% | 11\% | 10\% | 16\% | 23\% |
| SY2011 | 39\% | 30\% | 11\% | 1\% | 0\% | 6\% | 13\% |
| -10\% | 29\% | 20\% | 1\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 3\% |

## Racial Balance Comparison Grades JK-8

## SY2001-02

Following Racial Balance Policy

## SY2011-12

Following SES Balance Policy

- Using $\pm 10 \%$ criteria to meet racial balance:
- 8 out of 14 (57\%) schools were in compliance.
- 2,970 out of 4,524 (66\%) students attended a balanced school
- Using $\pm 10 \%$ criteria to meet racial balance:
- 8 out of 11 (73\%) schools were in compliance.
- 3,358 out of 3,980 (84\%) students attended a balanced schools

Note: Amigos balanced by language and is not counted in the figures above.

## SES Balance Comparison

Grades JK - 8

## SY2001-02

Following Racial Balance Policy

## SY2011-12

Following SES Balance Policy

- Using $\pm 10 \%$ criteria to meet SES balance:
- 5 out of 14 (36\%) schools were in compliance with balance definition
- 1,779 out of 4,539 (39\%) students attended a balanced school.
- Using $\pm 10 \%$ criteria to meet SES balance:
- 7 out of 11 (64\%) schools were in compliance with balance definition
- 2,730 out of 4,102 (67\%) students attended a balanced school.

Note: Amigos balanced by language and is not counted in the figures above.


## School Balance: SY2006-2012

SY2006-07 to SY2011-12
Balanced at least 5 out of 6 years

SY2006-07 to SY2011-12
Unbalanced at least 5 out of 6 years

- Cambridgeport
- Haggerty
- King Open
- Morse
- Peabody
- Tobin
(5 of 6)
(5 of 6)
(6 of 6)
(5 of 6)
(6 of 6)
(5 of 6)
- Fletcher-Maynard Academy (6 of 6)
- Graham \&Parks (5 of 6)
- Kennedy-Longfellow (6 of 6)

Note: Baldwin and King were both
balanced 3 out of 6 years
*Amigos was balanced by language during these years*

## 5-Year Average of Schools-not-in-Balance School Enrollment Breakdown

## 5-Year Average <br> Enrollment

| School | F/R | Pd |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FMA | $68.0 \%$ | $32.0 \%$ |
| G\&P | $32.4 \%$ | $67.6 \%$ |
| K-Lo | $61.4 \%$ | $38.6 \%$ |
| District <br> Average | $45 \%$ | $55 \%$ |
| Range | $35 \%-55 \%$ | $45 \%-65 \%$ |

## Enrollment over Time Fletcher-Maynard Academy

# SY2006-07-K Cohort 

SY2011-12 - $5^{\text {th }}$ grade, same cohort

- 72\% F/ R Enrollment
- 28\% Pd Enrollment
- 90\% F/ R Enrollment
- 10\% Pd Enrollment


## Enrollment over Time Graham \&Parks

## SY2006-07 - K Cohort

## SY2011-12 - $5^{\text {th }}$ grade, same cohort

- 31\% F/ R Enrollment
- 69\% Pd Enrollment
- 19\% F/ R Enrollment
- 81\% Pd Enrollment


## Enrollment over Time Kennedy-Longfellow

## SY2006-07 - K Cohort

SY2011-12 - $5^{\text {th }}$ grade, same cohort

- 61\% F/R Enrollment
- 39\% Pd Enrollment
- 78\% F/R Enrollment
- 22\% Pd Enrollment


## Enrollment over Time King Open

# SY2006-07-K Cohort 

## SY2011-12-5 $5^{\text {th }}$ grade, same cohort

- 35\% F/R Enrollment
- 65\% Pd Enrollment
- 32\% F/R Enrollment
- 68\% Pd Enrollment


## J K-5th Grade Schools and Amigos J K-8th Grade Free/ Reduced and Paid Meals Oct 1, 2012



## J anuary Lottery 2012 Mandatory Assignments

| Actual 2012 <br> Lottery | Tottery Simulation with All Schools <br> Total <br> Mandatories | Following SES Balance Policy |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Band 5\% | No Band |  |
| 80 |  | 114 | 127 | 137 |

Note: When the actual lottery was run in 2012, the Immersion Programs were not balanced by SES.



## 2010 US Census Breakdown Ages: 5-17 <br> (18)

- EAST: 3809 (51\%) school-aged children
- WEST: 3693 (49\%) school-aged children


## J K/ K Seat Capacities

| School Year | East | West | Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2006-07$ | 420 | 320 | 100 |
| $2007-08$ | 440 | 348 | 92 |
| $2008-09$ | 460 | 328 | 132 |
| $2009-10$ | 520 | 344 | 176 |
| $2010-11$ | 530 | 344 | 186 |
| $2011-12$ | 540 | 324 | 216 |
| $2012-13$ | 560 | 344 | 216 |
| Net Gain | +140 | +24 |  |

## J an Lottery Applicants by Student Residence

| School <br> Year | Applicants Residing <br> East | Applicants Residing <br> West |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2010-11$ | $278(53 \%)$ | $248(47 \%)$ |
| $2011-12$ | $297(59 \%)$ | $206(41 \%)$ |

## OPEN SEATS FOR J K/K AFTER IANUARY LOTTERY

| School Year | East | West |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2006-07$ | 79 | 48 |
| $2007-08$ | 100 | 28 |
| $2008-09$ | 105 | 35 |
| $2009-10$ | 114 | 7 |
| $2010-11$ | 98 | 4 |
| $2011-12$ | 77 | 8 |
| $2012-13$ | 69 | 6 |

## $1^{\text {st }}$ Choice in J an Lottery By School Location

| School Year | School Located East | Schools Located West |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2010-11$ | $237(45 \%)$ | $289(55 \%)$ |
| $2011-12$ | $246(49 \%)$ | $257(51 \%)$ |
| $2012-13$ | $295(53 \%)$ | $261(47 \%)$ |
| Total | $778(49 \%)$ | $807(51 \%)$ |


| Seat capacities | $62 \%$ | $38 \%$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |

## $1^{\text {st }}$ choice in J an lottery by Residence: East/West

| $\underset{I}{7}$ | School Choice | East <br> Residence | West <br> Residence |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0}$ | Schools East | 199 (72\%) | 38 (15\%) |
| N | Schools West | 79 (28\%) | 210 (85\%) |
|  | subtotal | 278 | 248 |


| $\stackrel{1}{7}$ | School Choice | East <br> Residence | West <br> Residence |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| た | Schools East | 202 (68\%) | 44 (21\%) |
| N | Schools West | 95 (32\%) | 162 (79\%) |
|  | subtotal | 297 | 206 |


| 1 st choice in J an lottery breakdown <br> by SES and by Residence: East/West |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| F/R |  |  |  |  | Paid |  |  |  |
| $\underset{7}{ }$ | School Choice | East Residence | West Residence | subtotal | School Choice | $\begin{gathered} \text { East } \\ \text { Residence } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{c\|} \hline \text { West } \\ \text { Residence } \end{array}$ | subtotal |
| OU | Schools <br> Eas | 79 | 11 | 90 | Schools <br> East | 120 | 27 | 147 |
| N | Schools <br> West | 21 | 50 | 71 | Schools West | 58 | 160 | 218 |
|  | subtotal | 100 | 61 | 161 | subtotal | 178 | 187 | 365 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { N} \\ & \text {-̇ } \\ & \text { N} \\ & \text { N} \end{aligned}$ | School Choice | $\begin{gathered} \text { East } \\ \text { Residence } \end{gathered}$ | West Residence | subtotal | School Choice | East Residence | West Residence | subtotal |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Schools } \\ & \text { East } \end{aligned}$ | 76 | 15 | 91 | Schools East | 126 | 29 | 155 |
|  | Schools <br> West | 26 | 49 | 75 | Schools West | 69 | 113 | 182 |
|  | subtotal | 102 | 64 | 166 | subtotal | 195 | 142 | 337 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | p. 35 |

## Enrolled J K/ K Students

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { F } \\ & \text { ó } \\ & \text { o } \\ & \text { N} \end{aligned}$ | Schools | East Residence | West Residence | Subtotal |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Schools East | 390 | 117 | 507(60\%) |
|  | Schools West | 75 | 267 | 342 (40\%) |
|  | subtotal | 465 (55\%) | 384 (45\%) | 849 |
| $$ | Schools | East <br> Residence | West Residence | Subtotal |
|  | Schools East | 400 | 112 | 512 (62\%) |
|  | Schools West | 81 | 238 | 319 (38\%) |
|  | subtotal | 481 (58\%) | 350 (42\%) | 831 |

## Mandatorily Assigned Students J anuary lottery Breakdown

| School Year | F/R | F/R\% | Pd | Pd\% | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2006-07 | 0 | 0\% | 34 | 100\% | 34 |
| 2007-08 | 2 | 5\% | 35 | 95\% | 37 |
| 2008-09 | 2 | 3\% | 69 | 97\% | 71 |
| 2009-10 | 4 | 4\% | 91 | 96\% | 95 |
| 2010-11 | 5 | 6\% | 74 | 94\% | 79 |
| 2011-12 | 3 | 5\% | 61 | 95\% | 64 |

$1^{\text {st }}$ Choice Schools of Mandatorily Assigned Students: SY2006-12 Average


## Oct. 1 ${ }^{\text {st }}$ enrollment <br> T anuary Lottery Breakdown by Choice

Averages of School Years 2006-2012

| Assignment | Enrolled |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1st | $90 \%$ |
| 2nd | $75 \%$ |
| 3rd | $76 \%$ |
| Mandatory | $62 \%$ |

## Advisory Group

- Parent Stakeholders

J ennifer Campbell - K-Lo

- Emily Dexter - CRLS
- Esmé Green - Haggerty
- Tina Kapur - Morse
- Neely Kelley - King Open
- Toni Kim - FMA
- John Little- Tobin
- Kimberly Mancino - Morse
- Trish Marti - Baldwin
- Mary-Ann Matyas - G\&P
- Michelle Sprengnether - Amigos/ CRLS
- Richard Younger - Amigos
- Zina Gomez-Liss - SPED Parent

Advisory Committee Co-Chair

- Michelle Duval - Pre-school
- Ron Phelan - Pre-school
- CPS Stakeholders

Chris Colbath-Hess - Cambridge
Education Association President

- Robin Harris - FMA Principal
- Claire Koen - King Family Liaison
- Community Stakeholders
- Bonita Cox - Cambridge Human

Rights Commission

- Laura Fisher - Harvard University
- Charles Glenn - Boston University
- Ruby Pierce - NAACP/ retired CRLS

Administrator

- Outreach

The entire 2010 Controlled Choice Task Force Team was invited
Human Service and Head Start Preschool Programs

YOU!

## Advisory Group

- Presentations to the Advisory:
- 1/31- History and Motivations for Cambridge's Controlled Choice Policy by Michael Alves
- 1/31- Background Data
- 1/31- Entrance Age
- 2/2 - Process of Controlled Choice
- 2/2 - Availability of seats/ classrooms, choice and non-choice assignments
- 2/2 - Algorithm and the effects of ' + / - 10\%' band
- Mini-group breakouts to discuss each presentation
- Group questions:
- Do you think this issue/ process
* helps diversify our schools?
$x$ is fair to individual families?
$\times$ helps student achievement?
* is transparent and understandable?
${ }^{x}$ leads to increased or decreased district enrollment?
- Individual questions:
- What qualities should be evident in the School Department's Controlled Choice Plan?
- What would you like parents/ guardians to feel/ think as they approach and go through the process of registering their children to attend the Cambridge Public Schools?

Answers to these questions can be found in the back-up data

## Parent Surveys

## 969 surveys were sent to parents with children 2-5 years old

- 218 Responses
- 72 with CPS sibs enrolled
- 39 with sibs enrolled in non-CPS schools
- 142 - income over
\$65,001
44- income under
\$65,000
30 - no income response
- 98 - West of Harvard Sq.
- 2 - in Harvard Sq.
- 97 - East of Harvard Sq.
- 21- No area response
- 84\% - Agree/ Strongly Agree with the goal of Controlled Choice
- 42\% - Agree/ Strongly Agree that Controlled Choice is fair
- 38\% - need more information
- 46\% - Confident/Very Confident with getting an assigned to an acceptable school
- 26\% - need more information
- 94\%- Likely/ Definitely would enroll child if receives $1^{\text {st }}$ choice
- 35\% - will Likely/ Definitely enroll if child receives Mandatory assignment


## Parent Surveys

## 969 surveys were sent to

 parents with children 2-5years old

- 218 Responses
- 72 with CPS sibs enrolled
- 39 with sibs enrolled in non-CPS schools
- 142 - income over \$65,001
- 44- income under
\$65,000
30 - no income response
- 98 - West of Harvard Sq.
- 2 - in Harvard Sq.
- 97 - East of Harvard Sq.
- 21 - No area response
- Schools and Programs that families would be $\underbrace{\overline{9}-}$ to have their child(ren) attend:
- 3 schools/ programs were indicated by more than $50 \%$ of parent respondents.
- All of these schools/ programs are located West of Harvard Square
- Only 1 school/ program was chosen by more than $40 \%$ of respondents by both income groups.

East Residents
3 of the 6 schools/ programs-as indicated by more than $40 \%$ of respondents--are located West of Harvard Sq.

West Residents
No school/program that is located East of Harvard Sq. was chosen by more than $40 \%$ of respondents.

## Parent Surveys

969 surveys were sent to parents with children 2-5 years old

- 218 Responses
- 72 with CPS sibs enrolled
- 39 with sibs enrolled in non-CPS schools
- 142 - income over \$65,001
- 44 - income under \$65,000
- 30 - no income response
- 98 - West of Harvard Sq.
- 2 - in Harvard Sq.
- 97 - East of Harvard Sq.
- 21- No area response
- Schools and Programs that families would be $\stackrel{\ominus}{\check{\circ}}$ to have their child(ren) attend:
- $31 \%$ of parent respondents did not indicate a school/program.
- 4 schools/ programs were indicated by more than $30 \%$ of parent respondents
- All 4 schools/ programs are located East of Harvard Square
- 1 of these schools/ programs was indicated by more than $30 \%$ of families from every subgroup (by income and by residence).


# Parent Surveys - <br> 94\% - prefer to send child near home 

## East

4.5\% of parent surveys

## West

44\% of parent surveys
\% of parents who indicated each type of program that would motivate them to send their child to a school not near their home:

- 59\% Science Technology

Engineering \& Math

- $41 \%$ Montessori
- $27 \%$ Visual/Performing Arts
- 25\% International Baccalaureate
- $25 \%$ Intensive Music
- 22\% French Immersion
- $14 \%$ Standard Elementary
- $18 \%$ Write-in program/ school
- 8\% No Response
- 41\% Science Technology

Engineering \& Math

- 34\% Montessori
- $27 \%$ International Baccalaureate
- 26\% Intensive Music
- $21 \%$ French Immersion
- $21 \%$ Visual/Performing Arts
- 14\% Standard Elementary
- $19 \%$ Write-in program/ school
- $24 \%$ No Response




## Opportunity for 1, 2 or 3 years of Free Public Education Before $1^{\text {st }}$ grade



## Thank you

## QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS?

