STUART BIEGEL

Consent Decree Monitor

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SAN FRANCISCO NAACP, et al, Plaintiffs, vs. SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT, et al, Defendants	No. C-78 1445 WHA (Related Case: Ho v. SFUSD, No. C-94-2418 WHA) SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT OF CONSENT DECREE MONITOR REGARDING DESEGREGATION AND ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

At the direction of this Court, I am hereby filing this Supplemental Report to document recent developments and summarize recent trends in San Francisco pertaining to the desegregation and academic achievement components of the Consent Decree.[1]

We find, at this point in time, that many of the same patterns we have documented in our reports over the past several years continue to remain in effect. While many people are working very hard and wonderful things are happening in schools across the City, resegregation of schools continues unabated, within-school segregation is widespread, and the achievement gap

[1] We note once again that this Decree, from the beginning, has mandated a dual and interrelated focus on both desegregation and academic achievement…informed by the central principle that every student deserves the highest quality education. The Defendants are obligated to address both the desegregation and the academic achievement mandates, and to comply with specific relevant guidelines set forth in the Consent Decree paragraphs. In addition, they remain subject to the requirements of Judge Orrick's October 24, 2001 order.

between the African American and Latino students and the rest of the students in the District remains a cause for great alarm.

Much of the new data, when read together with the findings of the Monitoring Team over the past several years, clearly suggests the need for additional action in a number of key areas. Therefore, we hereby incorporate by reference all the conclusions and all the recommendations from our March 2004, June 2004, July 2004, and September 2004 reports to this Court. The need for immediate action on key interrelated fronts has never been more urgent.

Part I of this Report, then, summarizes the recent resegregation trends, school-by-school. Part II addresses within-school segregation issues, focusing in particular on special education and advanced placement. Part III supplements the academic achievement data set forth by the Monitoring Team and the District in their respective Annual 2004 Reports. In particular, it examines recent Academic Performance Index (API) information released by the State, and highlights key relevant trends.

I. Resegregation Update

Our review of final Fall 2004 enrollment figures obtained from the District has revealed that the resegregation documented in our previous reports continues unabated. The number of SFUSD schools severely resegregated (60% or higher) at one or more grade levels increased again during the past year.

Table 1 - Number of SFUSD Schools Severely Resegregated At One or More Grade Levels

	01-02	02-03	03-04	04-05
# of Severely Resegregated Schools Based on Final Fall Enrollment Figures	30	34	41-43	43-45

In addition, as reflected in Appendix 1, the actual percentages of students of one race/ethnicity at these schools are higher overall than they have been at any time since

resegregation began. In the first years of resegregation after February 1999, percentages of one race/ethnicity at the resegregating schools were typically in the 60-70% range. Now, however, more than half of the resegregated schools show 70% or more of one race/ethnicity, 10 schools show 80% or more, and at least five elementary schools are moving very close to 90% of one race/ethnicity at one or more grade levels.[2]

We note in this context that all three of the new Dream Schools are currently among the most highly segregated schools in the District.[3] Of course, the hope is that these schools will improve, and will thereby be more likely to attract diverse student populations from across the City, in the same way that original "Consent Decree" schools Burton and M.L. King have done sine 1983.

II. Within-School Segregation

Since 1996-1997, the Monitoring Team has documented a recurring pattern of within-school segregation. We have noted in every Annual Report that this Consent Decree requires desegregation by school, program, and classroom, and we have indicated on numerous occasions that while the Defendants had substantially complied with the school-by-school component of this requirement by the late 1990's, we have never found them to be in compliance with either the program-by-program or the classroom-by-classroom components of the Decree.

Indeed, we have consistently found that large percentages of SFUSD students are separated out from each other within individual schools, and that this separation too often results in students of certain races being segregated from students of other races at the program and classroom levels….a separation that reflects academic performance. In particular, we have

---

[2] *See* Appendix 1.

[3] According to the Fall 2004 CBEDS data, for example, Drew is at 80.8% in Grade 1, Twenty-First Century is at 77.1% in Grade 4, and Davis is at 73.7% in Grade 7. School site personnel at these schools, however, have

reported on the disproportionate representation of African American and Latino students in special education, and on the commensurate disproportionate underrepresentation of these students in GATE and advanced placement classes and programs.

In the following pages, we address the most recent data in this regard, and we explore additional aspects of this area to supplement the recurring findings of all our annual reports.

A. Special Education

The disproportionate representation of African Americans and Latinos in special education or the equivalent is not a new issue in San Francisco. Indeed, public records document a major concern with these issues in this City at least as far back as the 1960's.[4]

1. Findings in General

An analysis of recent data obtained from the school district reveals that African American students comprise the most students in special education of any group in the District (approximately 30%), even though they comprise only 14% of the students in the District overall. And, far and away, when compared with other racial/ethnic groups, the African American students comprise the largest percentage of the students within their ethnicity to be placed in special education.

African American students also comprise almost 37% of all the students in the separate "Special Day Classes" (SDC) District-wide, as compared with 24.5% who are Latino students, 13.5% who are White students, and 12.6% who are Chinese American. And over 44% of all

---

indicated to us that in their estimation the numbers are closer to 90% African American at these sites at this point in time.

African American students in special education are in the separate SDC classes if they are identified special ed, as compared with 28% of all Chinese American students and 26% of all White students.

2. Disproportionate Representation in Certain Categories of Special Education

In addition, we have found that an overwhelming percentage of the African American students are classified as either "emotionally disturbed" (ED) or as having a "specific learning disability (SLD)." These categories are often viewed as the most controversial in this area because they are based in great part on school site determinations that are necessarily subjective.[5]

The table below, based on the most recent data available on the California Department of Education Web site, clarifies the representation of SFUSD students, by race/ethnicity, in the "emotionally disturbed" and "specific learning disability" categories.

---

[4] For example, extensive detail in this context is set forth by Judge Peckham in the two *Larry P.* decisions. *See* Larry P. v. Riles, 343 F. Supp. 1306 (N.D. Cal. 1972); 495 F. Supp. 926 (N.D. Cal. 1979). *See also* the Ninth Circuit's opinion, 793 F.2d 969 (9th Cir. 1984).

[5] These two categories, ED and SLD, are the most controversial of all the special ed categories. While no one doubts the importance of providing additional support services for students with special needs, researchers and policymakers nationwide have highlighted problematic aspects of these categories, both in theory and in practice. A review of relevant literature reveals that (a) these categories, unlike other "disabilities" such as physical impairments, are often very imprecise, and classification by its very nature can be quite subjective, (b) they are based on school identification rather than some organicity, (c) the nebulous criteria that may be employed to identify students in this area have been compared in recent studies with substantially discredited categories of the past, such as "educable mentally retarded" (EMR), (d) red flags have been raised with regard to the fact that it is in these categories that students who may be viewed as "discipline problems" or "low performing" end up being placed, when it may be that a more adept classroom teacher can effectively work with these students in a non-special education setting, and (e) in this context, educators have been taken to task for placing a disproportionate percentage of students of color in separate classes as a result of classifying them as ED or SLD. *See, e.g.*, M. Ladner & C. Hammons, *Special But Unequal: Race and Special Education*, in C. Finn, A.J. Rotherham, & C. R. Hokanson *Rethinking Special Education for a New Century*, Progressive Policy Institute, (2001); National Research Council, *Minority Students in Special and Gifted Education*, National Academy Press (2002). See generally Daniel J. Losen & Gary Orfield, Racial Inequity in Special Education, Harvard Education Press (2002).

Table 2
Placement of SFUSD Students into "Emotionally Disturbed" and "Specific Learning Disability" Categories by Race/Ethnicity

	Afr. Am.	Latino	Asian Am.	White
# in Special Education	2037	1882	1744	1022
# "emotionally disturbed"	258	71	52	97
# w/ "specif. learning disability"	1241	1040	703	440
Percentage of the Race/Ethnicity in ED or SLD Categories	74%	59%	43%	52%

As the table shows, 74% of all the SFUSD African American students in special education are classified as either "emotionally disturbed" or with a "specific learning disability," the most controversial of all the categories. This compares with 52% of the Whites and 43% of the Asian Americans.

In addition, African American students alone comprise *more than half* of all those classified as emotionally disturbed in the entire District, although they comprise only 14% of the District population as a whole.[6]

And African American and Latino students together comprise 63% of all those classified with a specific learning disability in the entire District, although together they comprise approximately 35% of the District population as a whole.[7]

---

[6] Studies show that the disproportionate placement of African American students in ED classes is not a new problem, and that it is a national problem. However, San Francisco is much worse than the national average, as is the case with suspension and expulsion of African American students. For example, nationally African American students account for 25% of those labeled emotionally disturbed, but over 50% in San Francisco. *See, e.g.*, Gwendolyn Cartledge, *Minority Overidentification and Misidentification*, President's Commission on Excellence in Special Education – Assessment and Identification Task Force, National Association for the Education of African American Children with Learning Disabilities, http://www.charityadvantage.com/aacld/cartledgepresentation.asp (visited April 10, 2005).

3. Disproportionate Representation of African Americans Within Their Ethnicity At Certain Schools

Thus African Americans in particular are disproportionately represented in special education in numerous ways. They comprise the largest number of students in SFUSD special education programs of any racial/ethnic group, they comprise the largest percentage of students within their own ethnicity to be placed in these programs, and they comprise the highest percentage of students to be placed in separate classes.

Overwhelmingly, African American students in this District are more likely than their counterparts of other races/ethnicities to be separated out into SDC classrooms for the entire school day. However, as we have found, this is not necessarily the case in every school or in every neighborhood. Indeed, we have found that a pattern of stark within-school segregation linked to special ed placement is much more prevalent at certain high-performing schools, predominantly on the Westside, than it is anywhere else.

In Appendix 2, we focus on schools where at least 35% of the African Americans enrolled are placed in special education, and we compare the enrollment percentages of African Americans with the enrollment percentages of the three other largest racial/ethnic groups in the City.[8] In examining which schools are on this list, we find that all the schools perform well, and that all have large Chinese American populations. Thus, in the following table (excerpted from Appendix 2), the percentage of African Americans in special education at these schools is compared with the percentage of Chinese Americans in these programs.

---

[7] Extensive data relating to special education and ethnicity is now available to the public at http://data1.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/SearchName.asp?rbTimeFrame=oneyear&rYear=2003-04&cReptCycle=December&cName=san+francisco&Topic=SpecEd&Level=District (visited April 8, 2005). The CA Dept. of Education does not currently report data for Asian American sub-groups, and thus we only have figures for Asian Americans as a whole.

[8] The four largest racial/ethnic groups in the City – as reflected in the enrollment figures that have been documented in our Annual Reports – continue to be the Chinese Americans, the Latinos, the African Americans, and the Whites.

Table 3 - Special Education Enrollment Comparisons

	Total Sch. Enrollment		% of Those w/in Ethnicity Who are Placed in Sp. Ed.	
	% African American: Entire School	% Chinese American: Entire School	% of Afr. Americans in Sp. Ed.	% of Chinese Am in Sp. Ed.
A.P. Giannini	5.50%	52.10%	37.10%	6.70%
A. Lincoln	5.40%	57.20%	36.40%	6.50%
Cabrillo	5.70%	32.50%	60%	0%
F.S. Key	2.20%	57.80%	58.30%	4.80%
Garfield	3.40%	72.50%	61.50%	3.30%
G. Peabody	6.50%	33.30%	76.90%	5.40%
G. Washington	6.40%	54.80%	42.20%	4.90%
H. Hoover	5.70%	41.80%	37%	5.80%
Marina	10.0%	59.90%	35.40%	6.10%
R.L.. Stevenson	3.30%	63.80%	52.90%	9.20%
Yick Wo	4.10%	60.60%	40%	11.40%
Sherman	4.70%	50.70%	47.60%	26.30%
SFUSD Overall	**13.9%**	**31.60%**	**22.70%**	**5.50%**

In most cases, the table shows almost an exact opposite pattern at these schools with regard to the two racial/ethnic groups. Large numbers of African Americans are placed in special education, while large numbers of Chinese Americans are placed in "regular education" or in advanced programs such as GATE or AP.

B. Advanced Placement (AP)

In past reports, we have documented patterns of Advanced Placement (AP) enrollment at the District's high schools, disaggregated by race/ethnicity, and have also examined percentages of students of different racial/ethnic groups who have taken the AP exams. In this sub-section, we sort out the most recent data obtained from the District as it applies to within-school segregation. Advanced Placement classes, of course, are separate classes, and students who are placed in these classes stay there for core subjects every day for the entire semester.

For this report, we examined the numbers of SFUSD high school students of different races/ethnicities at each campus who were enrolled in Advanced Placement classes over a three-

year period, from 2003 to 2005.

Noteworthy increases for African American students in this context include Wallenberg (increasing from 6 African American AP students in 03 to 12 in 04 and 05) and Mission (down from 04 but still showing an increase from 5 African American AP students in 03 to 11 in 05). ISA leads in this category with 15 African American students in AP classes.

A noteworthy increase for Latino students in this context was evident in the numbers for Lincoln, which increased from 6 Latino AP students in 03 to 23 in 05.

In the following table, we compare the enrollment of African American students in AP classes with the overall enrollment at the major high schools. We have found that African American students, in particular, continue to be significantly underrepresented in these classes.

Table 4

African American Students Enrolled in Advanced Placement Courses (2003-2005)

(compared with all students of every race/ethnicity enrolled in AP courses at that school)

	AA Students in AP			Overall # of Students in AP		
	03	04	**05**	03	04	**05**
ISA	20	16	**15**	100	84	**77**
Wallenberg	6	12	**12**	93	103	**103**
Mission	5	17	**11**	158	214	**188**
Lowell	7	12	**11**	1180	1194	**1130**
Galileo	7	9	**8**	182	168	**145**
SOTA	3	5	**6**	117	126	**116**
Washington	3	5	**6**	302	385	**400**
O'Connell	2	7	**5**	70	112	**81**
Marshall	11	7	**4**	163	100	**75**
Lincoln	2	3	**3**	212	263	**238**
Balboa	6	5	**2**	105	87	**68**
Burton	5	1	**1**	129	157	**139**

The table shows the extent to which African Americans are underrepresented in District high school AP programs. Only 1 AP student at Burton, for example, out of 139, is African American (less than 1%). Only 11 out of 1130 at Lowell (less than 1%). Only 3 out of 238 at Lincoln (1.3%). And only 6 out of 400 at Washington (1.5%).

Representation of Latino students in AP classes is a bit better, particularly at Mission and O'Connell. 83 Latino students are in AP classes at Mission (out of 188), and 54 are at O'Connell (out of 81). However, significant disparities are apparent here as well. Only 7 Latino students are in AP at Washington, for example, out of 400 (1.8%). Only 36 out of 1130 at Lowell (3.2%). And only 6 out of 145 at Galileo (4.1%).[9]

****

Finally, we compared Advanced Placement and Special Education enrollment at the 12 major District high schools for the four largest ethnic groups. Particularly stark are the African American student enrollment numbers in this context. In general, an African American student is significantly more likely to be enrolled in special education than he or she is to be enrolled in advanced placement classes (with some schools lower and some considerably higher).[10]

It must be emphasized, in this context, that students who are still in special education in high school face much more limited educational opportunities. Typically, they are not afforded the option of completing the A-G requirements, and their higher ed options are limited at best. Students in the AP courses, by contrast, typically have an inside track to the best colleges and universities nationwide.[11]

---

[9] *See* 2004-2005 SFUSD AP Enrollment Chart (on file with the Monitoring Team).

[10] *See* 2004-2005 SFUSD Special Ed-AP Enrollment Comparison by Race/Ethnicity (on file with the Monitoring Team).

[11] We note that both the expectation and the goal of this Consent Decree is that every student will graduate from high school and have the ability to attend college.

III. Academic Achievement

In this section, we report primarily on recent test score results, as reflected in the Academic Performance Index (API) figures released by the State. The emphasis on test score results should not be read as suggesting that these figures provide either a complete or a conclusive picture of student achievement.

Thus the findings in this section should be read together with our overview and analysis during the past several years of such additional objective indicators as grade point averages, attendance rates, drop-out figures, advanced placement figures, redesignation rates for English Learners, and graduation rates of various types. The data should also be examined in light of our ongoing empirical findings, documented in prior reports and derived from our systematic and continual visits to individual school sites.

Having said that, however, we note that we are required under Paragraph 44 to report on District test scores, and that it is possible to identify important patterns and trends from the range of results and indices now being provided to the public pursuant to the California Public Schools Accountability Act and the U.S. "No Child Left Behind" Act. Thus, in the following section, we examine the overall District performance on the API Base, followed by a comparative analysis of the seven major urban districts in California, an examination of African American and Latino student performance in San Francisco on the California Standards Test, and an overview of recent school-by-school and "similar school" rankings. We conclude with a brief look at recent graduation rates as they relate to these findings.

A. Overall District Performance on the Academic Performance Index

The recently released state Academic Performance Index (API) Base, an updated composite of test score results from which the most current school-by-school rankings are derived, shows that once again SFUSD – overall – has performed remarkably well. Indeed, we are pleased to report that this pattern has continued over the entire nine-year period that we have been monitoring this District. San Francisco continues to be the highest performing District when compared with the other major urban districts in California, and has improved its overall numbers once again.

This performance, while almost predictable at this point in time, should not in any way be taken for granted. It reflects an impressive and widespread level of enthusiastic, high quality teaching, a dedicated and persistent effort by school site administrators, a tremendous amount of hard work by people in the central office, and the focused diligence of students throughout the City. And the Research, Planning, & Accountability Department in particular deserves ongoing credit for facilitating the process of linking student data to site plans and ongoing reform efforts.

B. Comparative Analysis of African American Student Performance

The Consent Decree, of course, also requires us to examine the performance of the individual racial and ethnic groups within the City. In this context, in 2004, we documented in some detail the parameters of a persistent achievement gap between and among the various groups.

One aspect of this gap, which we analyzed last year for the first time, is reflected in how the African American students in the District perform when compared both with their counterparts in other major urban districts as well as with their fellow students in San Francisco.

The following table shows the most recent results in this regard, and compares the March 2005 numbers with those released one year ago.

Table 5 – Inter-District Comparison of API Base Numbers

	API Base (all races/ethnicities)		Afr. Amer. Students		Gap
	3/04	3/05	3/04	3/05	
San Diego	697	710	628	642	68 pts
Long Beach	682	694	618	631	63
Sacramento City	666	679	587	600	79
Los Angeles	622	633	573	587	46
Fresno	610	623	560	574	49
Oakland	592	601	552	558	43
SFUSD	**706**	**724**	**542**	**560**	**164**

As the table shows, while San Francisco overall continues to score higher than any of the other major urban districts on the API Base, San Francisco's African Americans score very low in comparison with the African Americans in these other districts. Last year, in fact, SFUSD African Americans were the lowest. This year, they are the second lowest among the seven groups, but only two points ahead of Oakland. However, recent state results indicate that San Francisco's African American students still score the lowest of the seven districts, when compared with their African American counterparts, on the CST "proficient or above" results for both English/Language Arts and Math.[12]

Thus the gap between African American student performance in San Francisco and African American student performance in other cities remains substantial. San Francisco improved, as a District overall and in its African American student scores. But all the other Districts improved in both categories as well.

[12] *See* 2004-2005 Summary of "Proficiency and Above" Data in SFUSD and in Comparison with Other Districts (on file with the Monitoring Team).

Most significant in this context is the fact that while all the cities show a gap between their overall scores and the scores of their African American students, the gap between San Francisco's overall score and its score for its African American students remains 164 points, far and away *the widest achievement gap of the seven major urban districts.* This gap is 85 points higher than the gap in Sacramento City, 96 points higher than the gap in San Diego, and a full 118 points higher than the gap in Los Angeles.

C. African American and Latino Student Performance Within San Francisco

Another aspect of the achievement gap, which we also analyzed for the first time last year, is reflected in an analysis of California Standards Test results, for the District overall and for its various sub-groups.

The California Standards Test, administered pursuant to the "No Child Left Behind" (NCLB) Act, yields results in five different categories: Advanced, Proficient, Basic, Below Basic, and Far Below Basic. We continue to monitor and report on student performance at all levels of the California Standards Test. Indeed, the API Base discussed above is actually a composite summary of student performance that includes results at all five levels.[13]

1. Performance on the California Standards Test in General

Appendix 3 of this Supplemental Report contains a comparative picture of African American and Latino student performance over the past two years across all five levels. Examining data recently obtained from the District, we report on "matched scores" for SFUSD African American and Latino students on the California Standards Test over the past two years.

---

[13] *See* June 2004 Response of Monitoring Team to Parties' Joint Response, at Pages 8-9.

We have found that in 2004 sizable numbers of these students moved up from their 2003 levels, particularly those who scored at the lowest possible level (Far Below Basic) in 2003. Indeed, more than half of the African American students at Far Below Basic on the Math portion, and more than half of the Latino students at Far Below Basic on both portions, moved up from that lowest level in 2004. This movement is certainly a positive development.

However, the tables also show a surprising drop for a very large number of students who had scored at the highest level (Advanced) in 2003. 47% of the African American students at Advanced in English-Language Arts, 62% of the Latino students at Advanced in Math, and a full 74% of the African American students at Advanced in Math dropped down at least one level the following year.

In addition, at the three middle levels (Proficient, Basic, and Below Basic) – where students can go either up or down in a subsequent year – the number of African American and Latino students who went down during 2004 exceeded the number of those who went up, often by very large amounts. And we found that a very large percentage of these students remained at the exact same levels in both years.

In sum, the combination of both positive and negative movement, and the concurrent lack of movement by a great percentage of the students, constitutes a pattern of little change overall from the data for African American and Latino students that we reported last year. This is reflected in the overall results on the recent Academic Performance Index rankings, documented below in Part III-D, where we find a combination of positive developments, negative developments, and recurring patterns.

2. Analysis of "Proficient and Above" Results

As documented by the Monitoring Team last year, we highlight the "proficiency" category because that is the NCLB benchmark, the stated goal for all public school students. It

has been described in the relevant literature as the functional equivalent of scoring at grade level, and every school district is thus obligated to report its results in this way.[14]

In the March 2004 Supplemental Report, we compared African American and Latino Student "proficiency or above" performance at specific schools with school-wide and District-wide "proficiency or above" performance across all races and ethnicities. We do the same here, in 2005, beginning with the Appendix 4 table that shows eight campuses which have made noteworthy strides in closing their within-school achievement gaps. These campuses include Alvarado (for its African American students), and Ortega, Alice Fong Yu, Lillienthal, Rooftop, SOTA, Leadership, and Wallenberg (for their Latino students).

Also, following the same format as last year's Supplemental Report, we include in Appendix 5 lists of other schools where significant disparities on the CST are apparent within their individual campuses. We note once again that middle schools are the most heavily represented on these achievement gap tables. In particular, Visitacion Valley Middle School, which appeared on three of the tables last year, appears on all four this year. Gloria R. Davis Middle School shows up on three of the four, as it did last year. And James Lick Middle School, which had not appeared on any of the tables last year, appears on three in 2005.

D. Academic Performance Index (API) School Rankings Derived from March 2005 API Base Report

On March 15, 2005, the State released its annual 1-10 rankings of schools, rankings that are derived from the API Base discussed above. It also released "similar school" rankings for each public school campus.[15] In this section, we provide an overview and analysis of these results, which include positive developments, negative developments, and recurring patterns.

---

[14] *See* March 2004 Supplemental Report at Page 3, Footnote 9.

[15] See California Department of Education Academic Performance Index rankings for SFUSD schools (March 2005), http://api.cde.ca.gov/API2005/2004Base_Dst.aspx?cYear=&cSelect=3868478&cChoice=2004BDst (visited April 10, 2005).

For the first time in the six years that the State has produced these rankings, the number of schools at a "1" (the lowest possible ranking) in San Francisco actually decreased. The numbers reflected some level of fluctuation, however, with many schools going up in ranking, a sizable number remaining the same, but more than just a few going down.

1. Positive Developments in the API Rankings

On the positive side, several schools that we have been monitoring closely in recent years improved their ranking. Balboa moved from a 1 to a 2 in overall ranking for the first time. Mission moved from a 1-1 to a 1-2 for the first time. And Golden Gate moved from a 1 last year to a 5 this year, a very sizable jump and its highest ranking ever.

In particular, we note that Golden Gate not only increased its overall API significantly, but that its API Growth for its African American students went up 166 points in one year.[16]

District-wide, there were noticeable improvements at many of the sites in the similar schools rankings. This is a very positive trend, reflecting the fact that when compared with other sites throughout the state that have similar demographics, these schools overall are performing very well. For example, Flynn's similar schools' rank went up to a 6. Marshall Elementary's to a 7. Glen Park's similar schools rank went up to an 8. Starr King to a 9. Alvarado to a 9. Schools that improved to a 10 (the highest possible) on the similar schools ranking this past year include Gordon J. Lau, Ulloa, and Presidio.

---

[16] We recognize that as of today (April 11, 2005), Golden Gate is on a short list of schools the District is considering for possible closure. While the Monitoring Team does not take a position on these policy decisions, it is important to note that many would question the efficacy of closing an educational institution that has been able to succeed in accomplishing such positive change for its African American students while so many other educational institutions throughout the District (including those with the highest rankings on the API) have been struggling in this context.

Presidio joined Lowell as the only 10-10 schools in the District, the highest possible rankings on both.

And Galileo's improvement from a "3" to a "6" was particularly noteworthy, and reflects the positive developments we have been seeing at that site during our most recent visits.

2. Developments That Are Cause for Concern

On the other hand, the new API rankings highlight areas that are cause for concern. These include the elementary schools in Bayview-Hunters Point, and the District's Grade 6-8 middle schools in general.

With Bret Harte dropping to a "1" on its overall ranking, all the elementary schools in Bayview-Hunters Point that have a predominantly African American enrollment – with the notable exception of Carver – are now at a "1", the lowest possible ranking. The other schools that have remained at a "1" include Drew, Malcolm X, and Twenty-First Century.

With James Lick dropping to a 1-1, and Horace Mann dropping to a 2 (their lowest respective rankings in 6 years), the Grade 6-8 middle schools numbers not only reflect significant gaps between higher performing and lower performing schools, but a disproportionate percentage of schools at the lowest rankings of 1 or 2.

Table 6 – Middle School API Comparison Chart

- Top-Performing Middle Schools – Giannini (9), Hoover (9), Presidio (10)
- Substantially Performing Middle Schools – Aptos (7), Marina (7), Roosevelt (8)
- Mid-Range Middle Schools – Francisco (4), Denman (5), ML King (5), Vis. Valley (3)
- Low-Performing Middle Schools – Burbank (2), Davis (1), Everett (2), Franklin (1), Lick (1), Mann (2), Maxwell (1)

These numbers and groupings are consistent with our empirical findings at individual school sites. Indeed, we have expressed major concerns regarding the District's middle schools in general for some time, and in our Annual 2001 Report included an entire 40-page examination of this problem area.

We also note on the negative side that both Cleveland Elementary and Fairmount Elementary dropped to a 1-1 for the first time, and that ISA High School dropped to a 1-2 for the first time.

3. Other Recurring Patterns

We note that these recent API rankings also reflect additional recurring patterns that we have been seeing over time.[17] In particular, at the high school level, with the possible exception of Galileo (significant improvement) and ISA (drop to a "1"), the scores continue to reflect a major gap between the District's "haves" and "have-nots." The top-performing schools continue to do well, the mid-range schools continue to perform at the mid-range, and the low-performing schools continue to score at the lowest end of the scale.

---

[17] For example, Chavez, Sanchez, and Everett all moved up from their overall ranking of "1" last year, but this movement is consistent with patterns of fluctuation that all three schools have shown in the six years of the API:

Overall API Rank (1999-2005)
Chavez - 2, 2, 3, 2, 1, 3
Sanchez - 2, 2, 1, 2, 1, 2
Everett - 2, 2, 1, 1, 1, 2

Of course, everyone's hope is that the most recent increases at these schools are the beginning of a change in these overall patterns.

Table 7
Academic Performance Index (API) Rank
of Major San Francisco High Schools Over Time

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Lowell	10	10	10	10	10	10
SOTA	10	9	9	10	9	9
Washington	8	8	7	8	9	9
Lincoln	8	8	7	7	8	9
Wallenberg	7	7	7	8	8	7
Marshall	5	4	4	4	3	3
Burton	4	4	3	6	4	5
Galileo	3	4	3	3	3	6
ISA	3	4	3	2	3	1
O'Connell	2	1	2	2	1	2
Mission	1	1	1	1	1	1
Balboa	NR	1	1	1	1	2

E. Rates at Which Students Are Graduating UC/CSU Eligible

Finally, for this Supplemental Report, we have examined the percentages of SFUSD students at each high school who graduated UC eligible and/or CSU eligible in June 2004.

Overall, Leadership's numbers were the highest, with 100% of its students graduating UC/CSU eligible. Lowell was second at 88%, followed by Gateway at 80%, Thurgood Marshall at 73%, and Burton at 67% overall.

On the other hand, the schools with the lowest overall percentages of students graduating UC/CSU eligible include ISA at 43%, Lincoln at 42%, O'Connell at 38%, Balboa at 35%, and Mission at 27% overall.

With regard to the percentage of African American students graduating UC/CSU eligible, as the following table shows, Leadership was far and away the best, at 100%.

Table 8
Percentages of SFUSD African American Students (within their ethnicity)
Graduating UC/CSU Eligible – June 2004

Leadership – 100%
Gateway – 77%
Marshall – 61%
Burton – 45%
SOTA – 38%
ISA – 33%
Lowell – 25%
Galileo – 21%
Wallenberg – 21%
Lincoln – 17%
Balboa – 15%
Washington – 13%
Mission – 6%
O'Connell – 0%

It is important to note that the three highest performing high schools in the City overall were among the lowest with regard to percentages of African Americans who graduated UC/CSU eligible at their school sites: Lowell at 25%, Lincoln at 17%, and Washington at only 13%.

The following table shows the percentage of Latino students graduating UC/CSU eligible.

Table 9
Percentages of SFUSD Latino Students (within their ethnicity)
Graduating UC/CSU Eligible – June 2004

Leadership – 100%
Lowell – 87%
Gateway – 86%
SOTA – 64%
Marshall – 56%
Burton – 54%
Washington – 42%
Wallenberg – 40%
SOTA – 38%
O'Connell – 31%
Balboa – 29%
ISA – 25%
Mission – 20%
Galileo – 17%
Lincoln – 14%

The numbers for Latino students are a bit higher, but major disparities remain. Galileo and Lincoln have particularly low numbers in this context, both under 20%, and Lincoln at only 14% of its Latino students graduating UC/CSU eligible.

Leadership, however, is to be highly commended for setting the pace among SFUSD high schools…graduating all of its students – *of every race/ethnicity* – UC/CSU eligible.[18]

Dated: April 11, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

STUART BIEGEL
Consent Decree Monitor

[18] *See* SFUSD June 2004 Graduation Rates - Disaggregated by Race/Ethnicity (on file with the Monitoring Team).