Options Policy Scenarios

Scenario	Pros	Cons & Challenges
Scenario A 1. 10% Program Improvement 2. Neighborhood siblings 3. Neighborhood & re-directed students within megaboundary (equal priority) 4. Non-neighborhood siblings 5. Lottery	• Values equitable access for students in PI neighborhoods • Prioritizes access to nearby schools for families that get redirected away from their neighborhood school	• PI status of schools changes from year to year • Places a low value on siblings • Neighborhood students from high demand areas could be sent all over the megaboundary – potentially displacing a neighborhood student from their home school for a choice that wasn't their top choice
Scenario B: LOW Mobility Neighborhoods 1. 10% Program Improvement a. Non-neighborhood siblings first 2. Neighborhood siblings 3. Neighborhood 4. Redirected students within megaboundary 5. Non Neighborhood siblings 6. Lottery **Scenario B: HIGH Mobility Neighborhoods** 1. 10% Program Improvement a. Non-neighborhood siblings first 2. Neighborhood siblings 3. Non Neighborhood siblings 4. Neighborhood 5. Re-directed students within megaboundary 6. Lottery	• Different policies for Low and High mobility neighborhoods • Biggest emphasis in high mobility: siblings • Biggest emphasis in low mobility: neighborhood • Prioritizing PI seats for non-neighborhood students could accomplish two goals at the same time (minimizing the number of "dissatisfied non-neighborhood siblings)	• PI status of schools changes from year to year • Some neighborhood students will be redirected
Scenario C 1. Neighborhood siblings 2. Neighborhood 3. Non-neighborhood siblings 4. Redirected students within megaboundary 5. Program Improvement 6. Lottery	• Likely minimizes the amount of redirects from the neighborhood • Values neighborhood access • Most siblings remain together (all K's in 2008-2009 lottery)	• Siblings may be separated • Less emphasis on access for PI students
Scenario D 1. Neighborhood siblings 2. Non-neighborhood siblings 3. Neighborhood 4. Redirected students within megaboundary 5. Program Improvement 6. Lottery	• Emphasis on siblings • Values neighborhood access	• Less emphasis on access for PI students • Could lead to re-direction in some neighborhoods – may not be enough space within the megaboundary
Scenario E: Current Scenario * 1. Neighborhood siblings 2. Neighborhood (non-siblings) 3. Non-neighborhood Siblings 4. Program Improvement 5. Lottery	• Values neighborhood access • Maintains consistency in enrollment policy	• Re-directed students from overcrowded areas may be sent to schools far away from their neighborhoods • Siblings in high mobility areas may be separated • Less equitable access for students from PI neighborhoods

* The 2008-2009 lottery was run in accordance with the Board Resolution passed on December 19th which mandated that families within any OUSD overcrowded attendance area not placed at their home school would be redirected to their next closest neighborhood school. As currently written, this Board Resolution will not be in effect for the 2009-2010 year.

General Issues impacting multiple scenarios

- How will megaboundaries be defined?
  PROPOSED → five closest schools to the neighborhood school (therefore will be DIFFERENT list for each school)

- What happens if a PI student doesn't show up? Does their seat need to be refilled with another PI student?
  PROPOSED → 10% PI only applies for initial lottery. No show seats are filled based on the wait list

- Does 10% PI refer to the entire school or each incoming Kindergarten class?
  PROPOSED → 10% PI for each incoming Kindergarten class

- What, if any, role should middle school feeder patterns play in the definition of megaboundaries?
  PROPOSED → Feeder patterns should not impact definition of megaboundaries (?). 50% of middle school students choose outside their attendance area

- If a student is redirected away from their neighborhood school (assuming their neighborhood school was their first choice), is their sibling considered "neighborhood sibling" or "non-neighborhood sibling" at the school they end up being assigned to?
  PROPOSED → The family should have neighborhood sibling "rights" at this NEW school (since it wasn't their choice to be reassigned to the school and keeping families together is a critical value heard from all community meetings)