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CITIZEN’S ADVISORY COMMITTEE OVERVIEW

To study the enrollment needs of FUHSD and all its aspects and to provide a report and findings in order for the FUHSD Board of Trustees to make decisions for implementation in the 2017–2018 school year

Attendance Area Percentages:
- Lynbrook High School: 41% (12 people)
- Cupertino High School: 21% (6 people)
- Fremont High School: 21% (6 people)
- Homestead High School: 10% (3 people)
- Monta Vista High School: 7% (2 people)
- Jason Heskett, Teacher’s Association

Ethnic Percentages:
- Caucasian: 32%
- All other races: 68%

Gender Percentages:
- Female: 59%
- Male: 41%

Non-Voting FUHSD Participants
- Polly Bove, Superintendent
- Graham Clark, Assoc. Superintendent
- Trudy Gross, Assistant Superintendent
- Jason Crutchfield, Director Business Services
- Julie Darwish, Mgr of Enrollment & Residency
- Maria Jackson, LHS principal
- Rachel Zlotziver, Comms Coordinator
- Other subject matter experts and student reps

COLLECTIVE VOLUNTEER HOURS SPENT BY CAC VOTING MEMBERS: 1200+ HOURS
Timing & Agenda of CAC: June–November 2016

**STUDY SESSIONS**
June

- **ENROLLMENT PROJECTION DATA**
- **DEVELOP SOLUTIONS**

**CONSENSUS FOR RECOMMENDATION**
September

- **DRAFT LANGUAGE and PROPOSAL**

**PRESENTATION to FUHSD BOARD**
November

- **FUHSD BOARD DECISION**

_STUDY SESSIONS_ to educate the CAC about the FUHSD, factors that contribute to the excellence of all the high schools.
Study Sessions Recap: To Learn And Understand FUHSD Practices

**June 8 - Fundamentals**
- Accountability
- Management practices
- Employee relations
- Comprehensive HS
- Maximizing benefits of diversity, equity and excellence

**June 22 - Funding**
- FUHSD compared with surrounding school districts
- Collaborative revenue sharing model between management, teachers and staff
- Section Allocation
- Maximize efficiency of every dollar
- Equitable allocation of sections to each of the 5 high schools

**August 3 - Ed Code Implications**
- Methods available to stabilize enrollment within the purview of the board policy
- Ramifications provided by legal counsel

**August 17 - Enrollment Projections**
- Enrollment Projection Consultant presentation
- CAC Enrollment Projection Sub-committee Report
Impact of Declining Enrollment at LHS

- In 2015–16 Lynbrook lost 15 Sections.
  
  **Core Classes**
  - 4 sections of English
  - 3 Sections of Math
  - 3 Sections of Science
  - 1 section of Social Studies

  **Electives:**
  - 1 section of World Language (French)
  - 1 section of Industrial Art (Drafting)
  - 1 section of Non Departmental (Yearbook)
  - 1 Section of Art

- In 2016–17 Lynbrook would have lost 6 Additional Sections due to enrollment drop.
  - The FUHSD board agreed to fund the 6 sections using district discretionary funds for the 2016–17 school year.

As of October 10, 2016 the 2016–17 resident enrollment at LHS was 1626 and the attending number was 1749.
Impact on Students & Staff

Fewer students mean . . .

Fewer teachers mean . . .

- Less access to teachers
- Combine Class Levels: More class schedule conflicts
- Fewer Club Advisors: Fewer events
- Limits band, choir & drama: Fewer teachers on staff & could mean more Part-time
- Reduced Funding $$: 5 classes = 1 full time teacher
- Smaller Athletics Program: Fewer sections (classes) & course options
- Fewer students mean . . . Fewer teachers mean . . .
Enrollment Sub-Committee Analysis

● Objectives
  ○ To understand the enrollment projection methodology
  ○ To analyze past trends and accuracy of the projection data

● Enrollment projection methodology study
  ○ Conclusion: Methodology is rigorous, sound and consistently applied across the 5 high school resident areas.
  ○ No second opinion is necessary

● Projection data analysis
  ○ Examined past 10 projections (2005–2014) on 1 to 5 year out accuracy
  ○ Recognized limitations of projection models given future uncertainty
Enrollment Sub-Committee Findings

- Higher accuracy for near term projection than longer term
- Accuracy levels not uniform across different high school areas
  - Localized factors may be at play
● 5 yr projection for Lynbrook has generally biased on the low side (i.e., underpredicts).
  ○ Suggests factors unique to Lynbrook exist.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Yr Out</td>
<td>-0.1%</td>
<td>-2.2%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Yr Out</td>
<td>-0.6%</td>
<td>-3.1%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Yr Out</td>
<td>-1.9%</td>
<td>-5.7%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Yr Out</td>
<td>-4.5%</td>
<td>-10.4%</td>
<td>-0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Yr Out</td>
<td>-6.9%</td>
<td>-11.6%</td>
<td>-2.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Apply historical bias to projections
- Think of enrollment projections as a range
- To calculate range, apply historical bias + 2 standard deviations

Projection range for LHS in 2020 within 95% confidence
- 1448–1677 Resident Enrollment*
- 1518–1747 Attending Enrollment**

Goal for LHS Attending Enrollment is 1850–1870 by 2020
- LHS enrollment deficit issue is real
- LHS enrollment deficit by 2020: 103–352
- Need flexible solutions, due to wide range

* 2015’s 5 yr LHS projection: 1461 resident enrollment for 2020
** Assumes 70 intra- and inter-district students are attending LHS
LHS Historical Enrollment Data and Section Allocation

LHS Attending Enrollment (2008-17) & 2020 Projection Impact on Class Sections

LHS Class Sections

LHS Student Enrollment

Year

Section Allocation

CAC projection (low)

CAC projection (high)

CBEDS DATA – Gr. 9-12

2008-09 1861
2009-10 330
2010-11 1827
2011-12 318
2012-13 1768
2013-14 307
2014-15 1780
2015-16 308
2016-17 314
2017-18 319
2018-19 321
2019-20 1767
2020-21 307
2021-22 1749
2022-23 304
2023-24 1850-1870
2024-25 LHS Goal

1518

1747

1800

1900
Potential Solutions including Pros and Cons

- CAC explored a series of options to address the enrollment decline at Lynbrook High
- Community comments were noted
- Perceived pros and cons listed on slides for each option are not exhaustive
- The pros and cons reflect the different opinions and/or concerns around the various options
Potential Options Discussed

1. Boundary Change

Pros:
- Clear and precise solution to declining enrollment
- Predictable in terms of how many students
- Maintains the neighborhood school philosophy
- Applicable to entire area - no adverse effects of ‘cherry picking’ on the school demographics

Cons:
- Permanent. Does not offer flexibility
- Requires community engagement and communication of clear trends over time
- Takes time to implement
Potential Options Discussed

2. Area of Choice for John Mise Park (JMP)

Pros:
- Choice (based on voluntary behavior)
- Maintains the neighborhood school philosophy
- Not permanent and offers flexibility

Cons:
- Perceived as boundary change due to communication gap
- Could not generate consensus in the community due to negative sentiment
- May not result in many students for LHS
Potential Options Discussed

3. District-wide Open Enrollment (lottery)

Pros:
- Choice (based on voluntary behavior)
- Students districtwide get an opportunity to participate

Cons:
- Difficult to anticipate the impact on other FUHSD attendance areas
- May cause negative impact on our high schools-adverse effects of ‘cherry picking’ on the school demographics
- Families with financial/transportation challenges will be less likely to apply
4. Proportional District-wide Open Enrollment (lottery)

Pros:
- Choice (based on voluntary behavior)
- Gives the option to the district to set targets for high schools based on their enrollment numbers
- Can precisely anticipate the impact on each of the FUHSD attendance areas

Cons:
- Different targets for different schools may result in legal challenges
- May cause negative impact on our high schools-adverse effects of ‘cherry picking’ on the school demographics
- Families with financial/transportation challenges will be less likely to apply
Potential Options Discussed

5. Eighth Graders from Cupertino High Attendance Area (lottery)

Pros:
- Choice (based on voluntary behavior)
- Includes John Mise Park area
- Likely to result in required number of students for LHS
- Adjacent area to LHS

Cons:
- Lawson students feed into 4 different high schools; which may create confusion, uncertainty and stress
- May cause negative impact on CHS - adverse effects of ‘cherry picking’ on the school demographics
- CHS affected adversely; potential to be treated as consolation school
6. Eighth Graders from Hyde Middle School Attendance Area (lottery)

Pros:
● Choice (based on voluntary behavior)
● Less impact on CHS attendance area
● Maintains the neighborhood school philosophy
● Includes John Mise Park area

Cons:
● May not generate enough students to stabilize enrollment for Lynbrook
Potential Options Discussed

7. All 8th Graders from Miller Middle School who do not reside in the LHS attendance area would have the option to apply to attend LHS. If the number of applications exceed the available slots, a lottery would be held.

7G. All 8th graders from Miller would have the option to choose to attend LHS. All requests would be accepted.

Pros:
- Miller Middle School is the primary feeder school to Lynbrook
- Maintains the neighborhood school philosophy

Cons:
- Too small alone to generate enough students to stabilize enrollment for LHS
- There could be concern that a CUSD alternative program gets to benefit from this transfer
8. All 8th Graders from McAuliffe who do not reside in the LHS attendance area have the option to apply to attend LHS. If the number of applications exceed the available slots, a lottery would be held.

8G. All 8th Graders at McAuliffe who do not reside in the LHS attendance area have the option to apply to attend LHS. All requests would be accepted.

Pros:
- Maintains the neighborhood school philosophy
- Equitable treatment to include McAuliffe if Miller and Hyde are included

Cons:
- Too small alone to generate enough students to stabilize enrollment for LHS
- There could be concern that a CUSD alternative program gets to benefit from this transfer
From Potential Options To CAC Recommendation

Potential Options

1. Boundary Change (no choice)
2. Area of Choice for John Mise Park (choice)
3. District-wide Open Enrollment (lottery)
4. Proportional District-wide Open Enrollment (lottery)
5. 8th Grade Cupertino High Area (lottery)
6. 8th Grade Hyde Middle Area (lottery)
7. 8th Grade Miller Middle, not in LHS Area (lottery)
8. 8th Grade McAuliffe, not in LHS Area (lottery)

CAC Proposals

A = 6
B = 1
C = 6
D = 6
E = 5
F = 6
G = 1
H = 5

Voting (2 rounds)

Compromise (3rd round of voting)

CAC Recommendation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposals* (as defined in previous slide)</th>
<th>1st Round Vote (Preliminary before consensus advocacy)</th>
<th>2nd Round Vote (Seeking consensus, 2 votes/member)</th>
<th>3rd Round Vote** (Final round, aiming for total consensus)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A → Hyde Area (lottery) + Miller (choice) + McAuliffe (choice)</td>
<td>35% (10 votes)</td>
<td>60% (34 votes)</td>
<td>76% (22 votes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B → Boundary change (no choice)</td>
<td>52% (15)</td>
<td>14% (8)</td>
<td>3% (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C → Hyde Area (lottery) + Miller (lottery)</td>
<td>3% (1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D → Hyde Area (lottery) + Miller (lottery) + McAuliffe (lottery)</td>
<td>7% (2)</td>
<td>24% (14)</td>
<td>7% (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E → Cupertino High Area (lottery)</td>
<td>3% (1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F → Hyde Area (lottery)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G → Boundary change (no choice) + AOC for JMP (choice)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2% (1)</td>
<td>3% (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H → Cupertino High Area (lottery) + Miller (lottery)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Miller: 8th graders from Miller who are in FUHSD area but not in LHS attendance area
McAuliffe: 8th graders from McAuliffe who are in FUHSD area but not in LHS attendance area

** 10% abstain (3 votes)
Proposal A

- All 8th Graders at Miller Middle School and McAuliffe School who reside in the FUHSD attendance area but not within the LHS attendance area have the option to choose to attend LHS.
- All 8th Graders who reside in the Hyde Middle School attendance area have the option to apply to attend LHS. Lottery will be used in the case of more Hyde Middle School attendance area applicants than available slots.

Key considerations for this recommendation:

- Flexible solution
- Minimize impact to other schools
- Maintaining neighborhood school philosophy
Implicit in the CAC recommendations for stabilizing enrollment at Lynbrook is the recognition that these measures may be temporary.

Some CAC members, while reaching the compromise solution, would like to send a message to the decision makers and the community regarding the possibility of needing a LHS boundary revision in the future. There were others who had the opinion that transfer measures recommended by this committee will successfully stabilize enrollment for Lynbrook High School in the next few years.

A final vote was taken by the members of the CAC on the three alternatives of wording which is listed on the next slide.
L1. “We believe that the enrollment decline will become more serious in the future, and recommend that after two-three years of the temporary measures, district management and the board should proceed with a boundary revision for the Lynbrook High School area.” (11 out of 30 votes)

L2. “If the intra-district transfer measures are not effective in stabilizing enrollment for LHS or continue to be required beyond 2020 to stabilize enrollment for Lynbrook High School, or if the measures produce unacceptable consequences, CAC members acknowledge the fact that district management and the board have the authority and the responsibility to consider more definitive solutions, which may include a boundary revision for LHS.” (11 out of 30 votes)

L3. “There is hope that the transfer measures recommended by this committee will successfully stabilize enrollment for Lynbrook High School in the next few years. Naturally, it would be wise for all stakeholders to continue to monitor the situation, and for district management and the Board to inform and communicate with the community about any progress or lack thereof, and address any enrollment challenges in an open and collaborative way with community members.” (8 out of 30 votes)
Regarding Communication

The perception that the ‘area of choice’ proposed by the District earlier in the year was a precursor to boundary change. This belief was disruptive to many people living in Lynbrook residency area.

- **Subsequent communication efforts** by the Board, District and school administrators have helped, and the work of the CAC has clearly identified a great deal of useful information that should be shared with the community.

- **Recognizing the fact** that the information and understanding gap is still quite large based on the comments and questions submitted by community members, the **CAC included three elements** to its compromise solution recommendation.
1. A **communication effort** should be made to inform, update and educate the residents of the school district on the legal, ethical, financial, operational and managerial responsibilities of the school district.

1. An ongoing effort should be made by the school district to **collect, analyze and disseminate information about the actual impact of the temporary measures** which are used to address the issue of declining enrollment. In addition to the usual information about how many students take advantage of various options and where they are from, the community should also know about the concrete consequences of any short-term actions that are taken.

1. There should be a continued effort on the part of the school district to **share with the community the updated enrollment data, the accuracy of past projections and projections for future forecast periods**. This is extremely important to help community members understand whether the enrollment decline is a short-term, medium-term or a long-term problem.
THANK YOU

ANY QUESTIONS?
Appendix / Q&A Slides:
Current Enrollment at Lynbrook High

Current (2016–17) LHS Student Enrollment Data:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESIDENT ENROLLMENT</th>
<th>ATTENDING ENROLLMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● Projected: 1632 total</td>
<td>● Projected: 1734 total¹)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Actual: 1626 total</td>
<td>● Actual: 1749 total²)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) Target enrollment range that will support optimal programming/scheduling sections at LHS is **1850–1870**

2) Includes 14 students going to middle college and **1729** attending LHS campus
Breakdown of 8th Graders at Miller Middle School not in LHS attendance area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2015–16 Miller Middle 8th Graders Not Living in Lynbrook Area (As of 02/16)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home School</td>
<td>Non-CLIP</td>
<td>CLIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHS</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MVHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-District</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2016–17 Miller Middle Transfers to Lynbrook High School</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home School</td>
<td>Non-CLIP</td>
<td>CLIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHS</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MVHS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-District Transfer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>