District One School Demographics & the Need for a Controlled Choice Admissions Policy
The resolution and controlled choice in context:

• We (the CSD 1 community) all have a commitment to diversity, equity, and achievement.

• Different schools, community members, and bodies (the CEC, individual school diversity committees, the Community Board, elected officials, etc.) have done a lot of work over more than a decade to clarify what we mean by diversity, and equity, and the benefits for all.

• We have a framework of how to achieve these—Community Controlled Choice, a district-wide admission policy solution.

• The three pillars of CCC are: supporting families, improving schools, and an admissions process that better reflects the diversity of the community.

• In practice it means:
  • identifying those students and families most at risk (as measured by socio-economic factors and other unique factors such as Students in Temporary Housing)
  • aiming for a distribution within some +/- percentage of those averages across all schools
  • student assignment is still choice-driven
  • it would allow for school preferences to be about the same rate as they are now

• Any community concerns and reservations are a positive opportunity to address a common issue that a specific CCC plan would need to take into account (e.g., sibling priority, grandfathering, choice preferences).

• CCC builds in community support so questions and details of implementation can be widely and satisfactorily met.

• Each body (PTA, SLT, etc.) is being asked to work within their internal processes and timetable to arrive at their position of support or not of CCC and the specific resolution. Given all the information, support is natural as this is a means of giving voice to personal and community commitments, values, and effort.

• We are aiming to maximize the expression of solidarity around this principle. The solidarity being the support from district top to bottom to deal with the pressing issue of lack of diversity in this manner and at this time.
District One Schools

13 Pre K – 5 Schools
4 Pre K – 8 Schools
5 Middle Schools (6-8)
6 9-12 Schools
1 K – 12 School
2 6-12 Schools

Community Engagement Lab

January 11, 2014

http://cecd1.org/cec1-initiatives/community-engagement-lab/
How might we design a school for District 1 so that our kids get what they need to flourish?

Brought to you by CEC 1, Facilitated by NYCPublic.org

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Reason(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recognize that developmentally appropriate play should be an integral part of the curriculum, meeting the holistic needs of all children, and not solely relegated to Early Childhood Education.</td>
<td>Play is self-directed, accommodates learning styles and differentiation, inspires love of learning. Learning happens in many ways. Experiential learning deepens understanding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish a Pre-K dual language school that is architecturally sustainable [and] that includes multipurpose spaces for learning and community use.</td>
<td>Such a school would allow for continuity in education, it would facilitate diversity that the community values and is large enough to leverage larger spaces to include a gym, a kitchen, a garden, an art room, and a library.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure that there are many opportunities throughout the year at all grade levels for multi-disciplinary integrated instruction across curriculum areas.</td>
<td>Give our kids forward thinking skills, such as STEM/STEAM, incorporating robotics and multimedia arts which will enable them to develop critical reasoning abilities. (This will create future leaders of tomorrow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students should be reading and writing in content areas like science. They should be engaging in art, music, dance, drama, and oral and written communication. Mathematics should be taught within the “real world” and cross-curricular contexts so kids develop deep and profound understandings, not just rote knowledge. When curriculum is multi-disciplinary and integrated engagement is high and learning outcomes are real and enduring. Bringing subjects to life in this way also is more likely to appeal to students with different learning styles and needs.</td>
<td>If we teach our children to think critically about their environment and their studies, we are better preparing them to be successful adults and engaged citizens of their community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrate selection of the first instructional school leader early into the process of planning, designing, and building the new school.</td>
<td>With the students at the core: The school leader is key to the success of a new school. The selection process will embody the community values. The leader will ensure that the building, the instructional curriculum, the teacher, and school community reflect the community values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a school garden that is managed by the school, tended by the children, open for community programs, and offers opportunities for programming and connection to the school curriculum.</td>
<td>1. Process for how to garden develops executive functioning skills, planning acceptance of failures. 2. Dual accomplishment = self sufficiency by having local food, healthy eating habits. Eating what you make. 3. Natural connection to science curriculum. 4. Community building opportunity. 5. Gardening skills for recreation or career. 6. Use garden as artistic expression. 7. Overall environmental awareness. 8. Learn how grafted expresses biodiversity and natural pest control. 9. Life skills development. 10. Discipline and responsibility.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Builds confidence and independence of the individual.
2. Allows for different learning styles to be valued.
3. Integrates learning in meaningful way.
4. Allows for collaborative learning and sharing experience which demonstrates deeper learning.
1991-2002: School board removes zones/catchments and implements measures of fairness for lotteries based on gender, race, ethnicity, and eventually adding linguistic and academic diversity.

2004-2007 Community School Board is dissolved and regional structure is implemented. Move toward centralization is finalized in the March of 2007, making all lotteries blind. Gifted and Talented programming introduced late summer 2007 without follow up on policy for early childhood/elementary. Strong community advocacy through working groups is established to advocate for continuity between Pre-K—K, and sibling priority. Summer of 2007, Supreme Court rules that diversity can be used as compelling education goal as long as it can be defined and achieved with markers other than race alone.

2008-2010: Enrollment is centralized for K admissions, but DoE grants policy giving preference to returning Pre-K students selecting their returning school as well as sibling priority. Advocacy continues. Deputy Chancellor John King endorses equitable and diversity based admissions plan as mechanism for improving school achievement.

2011 – 2012: Spring 2011 Chancellor Walcott appears at CEC, responding to request for mechanisms of fairness regarding equitable and diverse admissions by saying that choice is equity. Advocacy efforts increase through speak-outs and educational workshops with Michael Alves on the permissibility of diversity based admissions. CEC 1 partners with D3 for community forum to discuss the effects of the DoE changing district’s controlled choice to pure choice and the ensuing segregation. Summer 2012, Office of Civil Rights complaint filed claiming discriminatory admissions against 3 gentrifying schools in D1.

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.

http://cecd1.org/district-1/school-diversity-equity-data-study/
Students in Temporary Housing make up 11% of enrollment in 25 K-8th grade schools. In 6 schools, Students in Temporary Housing make up 20%-44% (up to 4 times the district average) of the schools’ demographics. On the other end of the spectrum, in 6 schools fewer than 5% of students live in temporary housing.

Students in Poverty make up 70% of enrollment in 25 K-8th grade schools. 11 of these schools serve over 90% Students in Poverty. While 5 schools serve 100% Students in Poverty, 5 schools serve fewer than 50%.

1. "NYC DOE “Poverty” counts are based on the number of students with families who have qualified for free or reduced price lunch, or are eligible for Human Resources Administration (HRA) benefits. The poverty indicator also includes students enrolled in a Universal Meal School (where all students automatically qualify). During the 2014-15 school year, all students in middle schools were eligible for free lunch. In order to better reflect free and reduced price lunch status, Universal Meal School (USM) status for middle schools is based on their 2013-14 USM status." From Local Law 59 School Diversity Accountability Act at http://schools.nyc.gov/community/city/public-affairs/Key-Documents/default.htm
English Language Learners make up 9% of enrollment in 25 D1 K-8th grade schools. 9 schools serve 5% or fewer English Language Learners, while 4 schools serve 3 or more times as many English Language Learners (15-18%).

District 1 serves a high number of students with special needs and as a result, our District Leadership Team has always tracked for equitable distribution of students with special needs in our community schools. Removing 3 schools that have historically and structurally underserved Students with Disabilities—all with Gifted and Talented or Dual Language programs—schools serve an average of 30% Students with Disabilities. The remaining schools are relatively evenly distributed around the mean of 30%.

Students with Disabilities

District 1 Demographics
K-8th Grade, 2014-2015

- Hispanic: 43%
- Black: 15%
- Asian: 20%
- White: 19%
- Other: 3%

From Local Law 59 School Diversity Accountability Act at [http://schools.nyc.gov/community/city/publicaffairs/KeyDocuments/default.htm](http://schools.nyc.gov/community/city/publicaffairs/KeyDocuments/default.htm). “Black” and “Hispanic” are the terms used in this data set.
Predominantly Black and Hispanic Students

Average % Served by 25 D1 Schools: 69%¹

1. Calculated as the average of proportion of Black students enrolled + the average of proportion of Hispanic students enrolled at 25 D1 Pre-K-8 schools. From 2014-2015: Annual Enrollment Snapshots at http://schools.nyc.gov/Accountability/data/default.htm. “Black” and “Hispanic” are the terms used by the NYC DOE in this data set.
Higher Percentage of White Students\(^1\) than District 1 K-8 Average of 19%
Higher Percentage of Asian Students\(^1\) than District 1 K-8 Average of 20%
From 2014-2015: Local Law 59 School Diversity Accountability Act at 
http://schools.nyc.gov/community/city/publicaffairs/KeyDocuments/default.htm

Data for individual schools from Annual Enrollment Snapshots at 
http://schools.nyc.gov/Accountability/data/default.htm
District-Wide Diversity Workshops

This yearlong workshop series defined and built a consensus around diversity-conscious admissions in CSD1 and a more equitable school admissions policy.
Below is a list of the **top 8 controlled choice admissions priorities** identified by workshop participants:

1. Socio-Economic Status
2. Race and Ethnicity
3. Students with Disabilities
4. Student Achievement
5. Siblings
6. Students in Temporary Housing
7. English Language Learners
8. Grandfathering
Controlled Choice

A Choice of Schools & Equitable Demographics

Controlled Choice is an equity-driven school assignment process with the goal of providing equal access to an array of excellent schools.

What is “Choice”?
When registering your child, you are asked to list your school choices, providing opportunities for your child to be matched to a school.

What is “Controlled” about the “Choice”?
The Controlled Choice assignment process involves using socio-economic indicators, such as family income, parental educational attainment, the number of children in the household, or community-defined at-risk factors, to help school enrollment reflect the makeup of the school district as a whole. The impartial computerized assignment system would take into account your choices and these socio-economic factors. The “Control” is the re-introduction of these factors for equity and fairness in student assignment.

Why do we need this?
Research shows that choice, unfettered by any fairness or equity factors or controls, segregates (including market-based choice, charters, magnets, etc.) and that not all student and families have equal access to information, choice and schools. This has led to increasing segregation in CSD1 schools, NYC as a whole, and NYS. NYC has the third most segregated city school system in the country.

How is this achieved?
Much as they do now, families would be asked to disclose information during the registration process, confidentially and optionally. Identification of those students most at-risk (as measured by socio-economic factors and any other unique at-risk factors), allows for a distribution within some +/- percentage of district averages across all schools. Student assignment would still be choice-driven and assignment preferences would still be granted at about the same rate as they are now.
District 1 Presidents Council
Resolution in Support of a Controlled Choice Admission Policy, 1/8/2016

WHEREAS, from September 2014-June 2015, Community School District 1 has engaged in a public process, involving large segments of the CSD1 community, varying from administrators, teachers, students, parents, community members, and representative members of D1 Presidents Council, to address inequitable access to student resources in CSD1; and

WHEREAS, this public process followed years of community efforts to address persistent admissions inequities in schools in CSD1; and

WHEREAS, community efforts included forums, workshops, protests, town halls, legislative breakfasts, data studies, reports, letters of support from elected officials, workgroups, grants, petitions, and sign-on letters and support from local education bodies (Parents’ Associations and Parent-Teacher Associations, Presidents Council, School Leadership Teams, District Leadership Teams) all requesting support and collaboration from the DoE in developing a more equitable admissions policy; and
District 1 Presidents Council
Resolution in Support of a Controlled Choice Admission Policy, 1/8/2016

WHEREAS, as a result of the public process and the years of community efforts, community consensus has developed for a fair and equitable district-wide diversity-conscious admissions policy known as controlled choice; and

WHEREAS, the benefits of diversity are well-documented by research and include increased academic achievement, increased exposure throughout school and work-life to individuals from diverse backgrounds, and a greater ability to consider diverse perspectives; and

WHEREAS, controlled choice is a time-proven framework for managing student enrollment that promotes equity of access and aims to improve academic achievement by ensuring that students most at-risk are equally served by all schools; so

THEREFORE, be it resolved that, D1 Presidents Council supports the institution of controlled choice in CSD1 at future enrollment cycles, and beginning to take effect with the current pre-K admissions cycle so that by Fall 2016 the NYC DoE will have a community-supported pilot for improving entry grade level diversity.
Please join CEC1 for a

Town Hall with Schools Chancellor Carmen Fariña

February 23, 2016
6:30-7:30pm*, PS 20, 166 Essex St

What questions do you have for the Chancellor?
What pressing issues do you hope she addresses?

*During CEC1’s Calendar and Business Meeting, 2/23/16 from 6:00 – 8:30pm, PS 20, 166 Essex St