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Study goals

PRIMARY GOAL
Understand the impacts of open enrollment policy in terms of stratification of race, socioeconomic, “achievement,” enrollments and capacity fluctuations between the District 1 schools during the years 1999-2011.

SECONDARY GOAL
Compare District 1 to another NYC District to better understand NYC trends over the time period.
Executive findings

1/ From 1999-2011, there has been an increase of clustering of students by race and free lunch status, increasing each school’s dissimilarity from the other schools in the District. This increase has been most pronounced during the open enrollment period.

2/ From 1999-2011, there is an increase in variability between schools in terms of student achievement as measured by Math and ELA scores.

3/ Based on a comparison of 2000 and 2010 Census information, there appears to be a sharp increase in the number of children with the District 1 area attending NYC DOE schools (defined as “uptake”).

4/ When compared to other NYC schools districts that utilize zoned assignment, such as District 13 in Brooklyn which has also gentrified considerably and has a large proportion of public housing, the stratification of schools by race/ free lunch/ achievement scores and the increase in “uptake” is noteworthy.
Assignment policy context

NEIGHBORHOOD ZONES

Vancouver

CONTROLLING CHOICE

Jefferson County
Boston

NEIGHBORHOOD ZONES + CHOICE

NYC

OPEN ENROLLMENT

Cape Town
Assignment policy context

1853/ Public School Society dissolves and merges with NYC ward schools

1864/ Ward school system becomes the Board of Education district system

1911/ Woodrow Wilson endorses the School as Social Center movement

1929/ Concept of the Neighborhood Unit developed

1954/ Brown v. Board of Education

1971/ Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education

2007/ Parents Involved in Community Schools v. Seattle School District No. 1
As of Dec 2012, there are 3 **UNZONED** districts within NYC:

- Lower East Side [D1] in 2007
- South Bronx [D7] in 2012
- Ocean Hill / Brownsville [D23] in 2012
CEC1 Assignment Policy History

1991-2003
Community School Board 1 removes zones and catchments in phases while guaranteeing placement of elementary school students in a school within 0.5 mile of their home, and institutes an open enrollment policy with lotteries, using race and gender quotas in oversubscribed schools.

2003
DOE closes district offices and centralizes admissions, and the quota policy becomes unclear.

2007-2013
The DOE requires CEC1 to move to a pure open enrollment model without quotas.
In SY 1999-2000:

**15** PUBLIC ELEMENTARY AND MIDDLE SCHOOLS

**0** CHARTER SCHOOLS

**7,941** STUDENTS
4/ Study area and period

In SY 2011-2012:

23 PUBLIC ELEMENTARY AND MIDDLE SCHOOLS
2 CHARTER SCHOOLS
8,111 STUDENTS
Methodology

**SOURCES**

- Census 2000 + 2010 ➔ Demographics
- Common Core of Data (NCES) ➔ Enrollment Race Free Lunch
- NYC Department of Education ➔ Enrollment Race Free Lunch
- NYS Report Card ➔ Free Lunch
### DEFINITIONS

#### School aged children
5 to 13 years
K to Gr. 8

#### Race
Asian + Pacific Islander
Black + Two or More
Hispanic + Other + Two or More
White

#### Socioeconomic
Free Lunch

#### “Achievement”
Math and ELA assessments

#### Uptake
% of elementary aged students who attend public school within district
5/ Methodology

DATA LIMITATIONS

• Data from 2001 – 2004 is unreliable
  • Free lunch numbers are either entirely or largely missing from 2002, 2003, 2004 and 2011.
  • Race by School data is not yet available for the 2011-2012 school year.

• In some cases, % for free lunch value was over 100% and therefore, Free Lunch numbers are a hybrid from different sources
  • Schools with completely missing free lunch are simply omitted from the analysis

• NYS DOE District totals for Free Lunch include data for high schools

• Total enrollment values were taken from two sources: NYC DOE and Common Core of Data
5/ Methodology

INDICES OF DISSIMILARITY

1/ The district has an overall racial and free lunch profile that changes every year

2/ An Index of Dissimilarity measures how dissimilar the individual schools are from the district-wide average

3/ Four races (Asian, Black, Hispanic and White) and Free Lunch students are measured

  • Measured by taking the Mean Absolute Percent Difference from the district-wide average for each category
  • If all schools reflect the district-wide average the index must be zero
  • If the index increases, segregation is increasing
  • if it decreases, segregation is decreasing
INDICES OF DISSIMILARITY

ADVANTAGES

- Simple to explain and understand
- Measures self-adjust to change in the district every year
- Every school is scored every year, so year-to-year changes are evident
- Each year is independent from other years

DISADVANTAGES

- All schools treated equally – size doesn’t matter *
- Some data missing, especially in the early years for race, 2002-2004 for free lunch, and the 2011-12 school year

* As a test, the study did weight schools based on size, but it is not included in the analysis.
INDICES OF SCHOOL ACHIEVEMENT DISPARITY

5/ Methodology

Goal of school achievement analysis
To measure disparity in educational achievement over the course of the study period

Challenges
No one definition or measure of school achievement; limited to those data that are publicly available for all years within the study period

Two approaches
Tracking input (resources for schooling) and output (cognitive performance of students)
1/ The index of achievement measures how dissimilar the individual schools are from the district-wide proportion of students performing at grade level

- Analyzed student performance on grades 4 and 8 English Language Arts and Mathematics assessments
- These are the only grades that participated in NYS Testing program for all years of the study period
- If all schools reflect the district-wide proportion of students meeting grade-level standards the index must be zero
- If the index increases, variability in student achievement is increasing

**Note:** The study found that there is a significant negative correlation between free lunch eligibility and student performance on the state tests. However, it is not reasonable to describe these assessments as a measure of income/poverty.
Methodology

UPTAKE AND ENROLLMENT

UNDERSTANDING “UPTAKE”

• It is important to consider all children within District 1, not just the ones going to District 1 schools (e.g. we need to balance the story by considering how many children within D1 do not attend D1 schools and what their demographics are)

ENROLLMENT FLUCTUATIONS

• It is important to consider if there are changes to enrollment that relate to changes in segregation patterns.
COMPARING TO ANOTHER DISTRICT

• We need to try to “control” for:
  • Demographic changes over time by comparing to a zoned district that has undergone similar changes (e.g. District 13)
  • “Achievement” changes over time
  • Uptake changes over time
DISTRICT 1 FINDINGS

/ Indices of dissimilarity
/ Achievement metrics
/ Capacity and uptake
/ Outstanding questions
INDICES OF DISSIMILARITY

There have been substantial changes in District 1 during the study period.

Number of Students by Race

- Asian
- Hispanic
- Unknown / Other
- Black
- White

% of Students Receiving Free Lunch

* Means there is substantial missing data this year
INDICES OF DISSIMILARITY

A school’s Segregation Index is calculated by averaging the difference between the District and the school’s racial and free lunch breakdown.

Total Racial Breakdown for District 1 from 1999-2000

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INDICES OF DISSIMILARITY

A school’s Segregation Index is calculated by averaging the difference between the District and the school’s racial and free lunch breakdown.

Total Racial Breakdown for District 1 from 1999-2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PS 140 Nathan Straus racial breakdown from 1999-2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INDICES OF DISSIMILARITY

A school’s Segregation Index is calculated by averaging the difference between the District and the school’s racial and free lunch breakdown.

Total Racial Breakdown for District 1 from 1999-2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PS 140 Nathan Straus racial breakdown from 1999-2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The absolute value of the difference between the District and PS 140 Nathan Straus school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INDICES OF DISSIMILARITY

A school’s Segregation Index is calculated by averaging the difference between the District and the school’s racial and free lunch breakdown.

Total Racial breakdown for District 1 from 1999-2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PS 140 Nathan Straus racial breakdown from 1999-2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The difference between the District and PS 140 Nathan Straus school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[7% + 4% + 16% + 4%]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average of the difference is 0.08 (rounded). This is the Index.
INDICES OF DISSIMILARITY

The Index for a District school can change if the school’s racial breakdown does not follow the overall District racial breakdown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Racial Breakdown for District 1 from 1999-2000</th>
<th>Total Racial breakdown for District 1 from 2010-2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PS 140 Nathan Straus Racial Breakdown from 1999-2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PS 140 Nathan Straus Racial Breakdown from 2010-2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The difference between the District and PS 140 Nathan Straus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The difference between the District and PS 140 Nathan Straus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INDEX = 0.08

INDEX = 0.17
INDICES OF DISSIMILARITY

Both Race and Free Lunch show an increase in segregation over time.

Racial Index of Dissimilarity by Year

Free Lunch Index of Dissimilarity

1st Grade race segregation 7th Grade race segregation All Grades

* Means there is substantial missing data this year
INDICES OF DISSIMILARITY

While a two schools stand out, the overall trend is positive, meaning more there has been an increase in racial clustering over the time period.
INDICES OF DISSIMILARITY

With the two outlier schools (NEST and PS 184 Shuang Wen) removed from the data, the trend is still positive and the slope of the line is even higher.

Racial Dissimilarity Index by School by Year

- Segregation Index

Graph showing the trend from 1998 to 2012 with a positive slope.
INDICES OF DISSIMILARITY

The trend in segregation is not equal by race.
INDICES OF DISSIMILARITY

As a percentage the white population index is increasing more than others in most schools.
INDICES OF DISSIMILARITY

Removing NEST and PS 184 Shuang Wen increases the slope of the line.

SCHOOLS WITH THE HIGHEST WHITE INDEX
THE EAST VILLAGE COMMUNITY SCHOOL 25%
NEIGHBORHOOD SCHOOL 24%
CHILDREN'S WORKSHOP SCHOOL 24%
EARTH SCHOOL 21%
UNIVERSITY NEIGHBORHOOD MIDDLE SCHOOL 17%
HENRY STREET SCHOOL FOR INTERNATIONAL STUDIES 15%
INDICES OF DISSIMILARITY

NEST has a large impact on the numbers, and it is a City-wide school, so it was removed to understand its impact on the overall numbers.
ALL SCHOOLS IN DISTRICT 1 BY PERCENT WHITE
Percentages more than one standard deviation from mean in red

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Number</th>
<th>School Name</th>
<th>% White 2000</th>
<th>% White 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01M0 117</td>
<td>PS 117 MANGIN SCHOOL</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01M0 34</td>
<td>PS 034 FRANKLIN D ROOSEVELT</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01M0 56</td>
<td>JHS 56 CORLEARS JHS</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01M0 15</td>
<td>PS 196 COALITION UMBRELLA</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01M0 15</td>
<td>PS 015 ROBERTO CLEMENTE</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01M0 19</td>
<td>PS 019 ASHER LEVY</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01M0 20</td>
<td>PS 020 ANNA SILVER</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01M0 03</td>
<td>PS 063 WILLIAM MCKINLEY</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01M0 04</td>
<td>PS 064 ROBERT SIMON</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01M1 10</td>
<td>PS 110 FLORENCE NIGHTINGALE</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01M1 34</td>
<td>PS 134 HENRIETTA SZOLD</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01M1 37</td>
<td>PS 137 JOHN L BERNSTEIN</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01M1 40</td>
<td>PS 140 NATHAN Straus</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01M1 42</td>
<td>PS 142 AMALI CASTRO</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01M1 84</td>
<td>PS 184M SHUANG WEN</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01M1 88</td>
<td>PS 188 THE ISLAND SCHOOL</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01M2 92</td>
<td>HENRY STREET SCHOOL FOR INTERNATIONAL STUDIES</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01M3 01</td>
<td>TECHNOLOGY ARTS AND SCIENCES STUDIO</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01M3 15</td>
<td>THE EAST VILLAGE COMMUNITY SCHOOL</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01M3 32</td>
<td>UNIVERSITY NEIGHBORHOOD MIDDLE SCHOOL</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01M3 45</td>
<td>COLLABORATIVE ACADEMY OF SCIENCE</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01M3 01</td>
<td>CHILDREN'S WORKSHOP SCHOOL</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01M3 63</td>
<td>NEIGHBORHOOD SCHOOL</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01M3 04</td>
<td>EARTH SCHOOL</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01M3 78</td>
<td>SCHOOL FOR GLOBAL LEADERS</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01M5 39</td>
<td>NEST</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01M8 39</td>
<td>TOMPKINS SQUARE MS EXTENSION</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**District total**
- 6.4% (2000)
- 16.6% (2011)

One Standard Deviation
- 6.9% (2000)
- 15.9% (2011)
INDICES OF DISSIMILARITY

1/ There has been significant change in District 1 schools, not only has it become more diverse, but there are also many more schools in 2011 than there were in 1999.

2/ With this change has also come more clustering of students by race and free lunch status increasing each school's dissimilarity from the others in the District.

3/ District 1 schools have become more segregated during the study period. Early increases are tied to the openings of PS184 and NEST, which attracted populations different than the district-wide mean. Later increases were more broad-based. The increase in clustering is most easily seen in the White population and to a lesser degree the Hispanic population and those receiving free lunch.

4/ The hypothesis that open enrollment has exacerbated segregation can be supported by this work.
SCHOOL ACHIEVEMENT METRICS

Achievement Variability Index by Year, Grade 4

- 4th Grade ELA Variability
- 4th Grade Math Variability
SCHOOL ACHIEVEMENT METRICS

Achievement Variability Index by Year, Grade 8
FINDINGS

1/ There are significant increases in the stratification between schools between higher and lower performing schools (based on State-administered assessments in English Language Arts and Mathematics) during the study period.

2/ Increased stratification observed for both 4th grade and 8th grade students.

3/ The observed stratification between schools cannot necessarily be causally linked to the enrollment policy change. Other possible reasons are structure and makeup of standardized tests or changing district demographic.
INDICES OF SCHOOL ACHIEVEMENT DISPARITY

NEXT STEP

A future study could use a matching procedure to find the best comparison schools across the city for each of the District 1 schools. Then model the distribution of achievement scores as a function of the mother district's assignment policy, controlling for a variety of demographic/socioeconomic factors.
NYC CAPACITY AND UPTAKE

There has been an increase in uptake of NYC schools during this time period as the number of children overall has fallen. The overall number of K-8 students in NYC DOE schools has stayed about the same.

- In 2000, there were 988,913 children aged 5 - 13.
  - 33% not in NYC DOE Schools: [330,092 students]
  - 67% uptake: [658,821 students]
  - Hispanic 38%
  - White 16%
  - Black 33%
  - Asian 12%
  - Native Am. 0.3%

- In 2010, there were 843,362 children aged 5 - 13.
  - 24% not in NYC DOE Schools: [203,805 students]
  - 76% uptake: [639,557 students]
  - Hispanic 41%
  - White 16%
  - Black 27%
  - Asian 16%
  - Native Am. 0.5%
NYC CAPACITY AND UPTAKE

White students make up over ½ of the students not in NYC DOE schools in 2010.

33% not in NYC DOE Schools
[330,092 students]

24% not in NYC DOE Schools
[203,805 students]
Since 2000, there has been a decrease in 5 – 13 aged children in District 1, which is similar to the overall NYC trend, but there has been a rise in students attending District 1 schools.

**2000**
- 11,310 children aged 5 - 13
- Hispanic 58%
- Black 17%
- Asian 17%
- White 6%
- Native Am. 0.8%

**2010**
- 8,465 children aged 5 - 13
- Hispanic 52%
- Asian 19%
- Black 18%
- White 11%
- Native Am. 0.9%

**District 1 Capacity and Uptake**

- **39% not in District**
  - [4,460 students]
- **61% uptake* (67% NYC avg.)**
  - [6,850 students]
- **16% not in District**
  - [1,328 students]
- **84% uptake* (76% NYC avg.)**
  - [7,137 students]

*District uptake is subject to "leakage" to other Districts, where NYC is not.
DISTRICT 1 CAPACITY AND UPTAKE

While the overall number of District 1 students has decreased, there has been an increase in number of White, Asian, and Black students enrolled.

### White Students
- **2000**: 11,310 children aged 5 - 13
- **2010**: 8,465 children aged 5 - 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Not in District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>11,310</td>
<td>751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>8,465</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **2000**
  - 435 in District
  - 37%
  - 63% in District

- **2010**
  - 470 not in District
  - 38%
  - 62% in District

### Hispanic Students
- **2000**: 11,310 children aged 5 - 13
- **2010**: 8,465 children aged 5 - 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Not in District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>11,310</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>8,465</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **2000**
  - 1,809 not in District
  - 0%
  - 99% in District

- **2010**
  - 3,703 in District
  - 0%
  - 100% in District

### Black Students
- **2000**: 11,310 children aged 5 - 13
- **2010**: 8,465 children aged 5 - 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Not in District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>11,310</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>8,465</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **2000**
  - 357 not in District
  - 23%
  - 77% in District

- **2010**
  - 6 not in District
  - 0%
  - 100% in District

### Asian Students
- **2000**: 11,310 children aged 5 - 13
- **2010**: 8,465 children aged 5 - 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Not in District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>11,310</td>
<td>1,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>8,465</td>
<td>1,269</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **2000**
  - 1,184 in District
  - 43%
  - 57% in District

- **2010**
  - 1,543 not in District
  - 39%
  - 61% in District
DISTRICT 1 CAPACITY AND UPTAKE

The makeup of students who do not attend District 1 schools has changed: in 2010, the White and Asian population largely make up the students not in District.

**Total Aged 5-13 who live within District 1**
- Asian 24%
- Black 14%
- Hispanic 51%
- White 10%
- Am. Indian 1%

**39% not in District**
- 4,460 students

**Total Aged 5-13 who live within District 1**
- Asian 26%
- Black 15%
- Hispanic 44%
- White 14%
- Am. Indian 1%

**16% not in District**
- 1,328 students

---

**District 1 findings**

The makeup of students who do not attend District 1 schools has changed: in 2010, the White and Asian population largely make up the students not in District.
OUTSTANDING QUESTIONS

1/ Is the stratification reflective of the assignment policy change? Or is this reflective of trends associated with gentrification and larger white populations?

2/ Are these trends reflective of neighborhood segregation trends, which generally show that non-Hispanic white populations tend to cluster in predominantly white neighborhoods? (John Logan and Brian Stults, The Persistence of Segregation in the Metropolis: New Findings from the 2010 Census)

3/ Is the increased uptake being driven by the assignment policy, the changing demographics, or the improving achievement levels?
DISTRICT 1 + 13 COMPARISON

/ Why compare District 1 + 13?
/ Indices of dissimilarity
/ Achievement metrics
/ Capacity and uptake
/ Outstanding questions
WHY COMPARE DISTRICT 1 + 13

In 2000, Average Median Household income was $32,381 and $39,011 in District 1 and 13, respectively.
WHY COMPARE DISTRICT 1 + 13

Between 2000 – 2010, median household income rose by 57% and 55%, respectively.
WHY COMPARE DISTRICT 1 + 13

In District 1, 18% of residents live in NYCHA housing developments, compared to 8% in District 13.
WHY COMPARE DISTRICT 1 + 13

The percentage of white population was 32% and 23% in District 1 and 13, respectively.

% of Total Population, White

- Less than 25%
- 25% – 50%
- 50% – 75%
- Over 75%

Map showing the distribution of white population in different districts.
WHY COMPARE DISTRICT 1 + 13

Between 2000 – 2010, the total white population rose by 93% and 90%, respectively.
District 1 + 13 findings

INDICES OF DISSIMILARITY

District 13 is notable for its decline in enrollment.
7/1
District 1 + 13
INDICES OF DISSIMILARITY
findings

Racial Segregation Index by Year, District 1 + 13

Free Lunch Index, District 1 + 13
INDICES OF DISSIMILARITY

Findings

Segregation Index by Race, District 13
ACHIEVEMENT METRICS

The distribution of 4th grade achievement is comparatively stable for District 13 schools.

4th Grade ELA Achievement Variability, District 1 + 13

4th Grade Math Achievement Variability, District 1 + 13
District 1 + 13 findings

Stratification of 8th grade achievement scores actually declines over the study period for District 13 schools.

8th Grade ELA Achievement Variability, District 1 + 13

8th Grade Math Achievement Variability, District 1 + 13
District 1 and 13 have had similar trajectories with respect to the proportion of students meeting the Grade 4 ELA and Math standards.
ACHIEVEMENT METRICS

On both the 8th grade ELA and Math assessments, District 1 students outperform their District 13 counterparts and the gulf between the districts has widened over the study period.

Comparison of District 1 and District 13, 8th Grade Achievement Trajectories - ELA

Comparison of District 1 and District 13, 8th Grade Achievement Trajectories - Math
DISTRICT 13 CAPACITY AND UPTAKE

Uptake has remained the same, even as overall numbers have declined.

- **2000**: 22,807 children aged 5 - 13
  - 43% not in District
    - Native Am. 0.8%
    - White 2%
    - Asian 2%
  - Hispanic 17%
  - Black 79%
  - 57% uptake (67% NYC avg.)
    - [9,723 students]

- **2010**: 17,176 children aged 5 - 13
  - 41% not in District
    - Native Am. 0.5%
    - White 7%
    - Asian 4%
  - Hispanic 18%
  - Black 71%
  - 59% uptake (76% NYC avg.)
    - [10,043 students]
DISTRICT 13 CAPACITY AND UPTAKE

Between 2000 – 2010, a significant number of Black families left the area, while White families moved in but chose not to attend District schools.
OUTSTANDING QUESTIONS

1/ Can we determine a causal relationship between D1’s stratification and the change in assignment policy?

2/ Can we determine a causal relationship between D1’s uptake increase and the change in assignment policy?

3/ Based on the comparison to D13, does unzoned assignment policy provide greater encouragement for uptake than zoned schools? Does this have anything to do with the nature of the school “achievement” or diversity of those neighborhoods?

4/ How does an assignment policy have different effects in different “kinds” of neighborhoods – gentrifying, gentrified, non-gentrified?
NEXT STEPS: FORMING AN APPROACH

DIVERSITY
- racial & socio-economic student diversity

QUALITY
- test scores & other indicators
- predictability

SCHOOL CAPACITY
- student supply & seat demand match
- access to specialized programs
- walkability & neighborhood coherence

TRANSPORTATION
NEXT STEPS: FORMING AN APPROACH

NEIGHBORHOOD DIVERSITY
- racial & socio-economic student diversity

PARTICIPATION RATES
- predictability

AFFORDABILITY
- geographic uniqueness
- property value stability

TRANSPORTATION
- walkability

social cohesion
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District 23 Capacity and Uptake

**District 23 Comparison**

- **2000**
  - 41% not in District
  - Hispanic 17%
  - Black 79%
  - [7,938 students]

- **2010**
  - 59% uptake (67% NYC avg.)
  - Hispanic 18%
  - Black 71%
  - [11,753 students]

- **2000**
  - 39% not in District
  - Hispanic 17%
  - Black 79%
  - [7,133 students]

- **2010**
  - 61% uptake (76% NYC avg.)
  - Hispanic 18%
  - Black 71%
  - [9,409 students]

19,691 children aged 5 - 13
15,515 children aged 5 - 13
DISTRICT 2 CAPACITY AND UPTAKE

Between 2000 to 2010, District 2 increased in number of schools from 39 to 108.

- 853 students over the local student population
  - 0% not in District
  - 43% not in District

- 22,703 students
  - 57% uptake (76% NYC avg.)

- 19,275 children aged 5 - 13
- 39,501 children aged 5 - 13

- 2000: 19,275 children aged 5 - 13
- 2010: 39,501 children aged 5 - 13

- 104% uptake (67% NYC avg.)

- Native Am. 0.3%
- Black 12%
- Hispanic 19%
- White 34%
- Asian 35%

- Native Am. 0.9%
- Black 9%
- Hispanic 19%
- Asian 33%
- White 39%
DISTRICT 2 CAPACITY AND UPTAKE

Between 2000 to 2010, District 2 increased in number of schools from 39 to 108.

0% not in District
853 students over the local student population

104% uptake (67% NYC avg.)
[20,128 students]

43% not in District
16,798 students

57% uptake (76% NYC avg.)
22,703 students

2000
19,275 children aged 5 - 13

2010
39,501 children aged 5 - 13
## Appendix/Community + School District Racial Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>9,738</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>887</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
<td>10,153</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>1,184</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>7,895</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>1,809</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>3,223</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>2,098</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>2,845</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>1,198</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>2,344</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>1,450</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
<td>15,966</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
<td>6,481</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>11,722</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
<td>3,981</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
<td>8,177</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
<td>3,943</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>3,108</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>2,631</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>2,930</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>1,442</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>32,114</td>
<td>10,015</td>
<td>27,399</td>
<td>6,850</td>
<td>21,387</td>
<td>8,718</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ^1New York City Department of City Planning, Total Population Under 18 by Mutually Exclusive Race

^2National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data