AUSTIN
Independent School District

Diversity by Design Plan Overview

Introduction

Background

Research shows that students in integrated schools, despite race or socioeconomic status, benefit academically and socially. Austin Independent School District (AISD) serves diverse communities in Austin, but many individual schools remain economically segregated. Approximately 56% of all AISD students are considered economically disadvantaged, but economically disadvantaged students are concentrated in certain parts of the district. Schools located in Trustee District 1 show a particular lack of economic diversity (See Table 1). For these reasons, the AISD Board of Trustees requested a socioeconomic integration plan for AISD schools, beginning with District 1.

Table 1. District 1 campuses and Percent Economically Disadvantaged

Campus	% Economically Disadvantaged
Graham	85%
Dobie PK	97%
Hart	97%
Pickle	97%
Andrews	95%
Harris	96%
Blanton	78%
Winn	94%
Pecan Springs	96%
Overton	95%
Jordan	95%
Norman	96%
Sims	95%
Ortega	87%
Maplewood	43%
Campbell	92%
Oak Springs	98%
Blackshear	72%
Dobie	85%
Garcia YMLA	97%
Means YWLA	97%
Kealing	97%
Reagan	85%
LBJ	78%
LASA	7%
Garza	37%

District 1   76%
AISD   56%
Source: AISD, May 4, 2017

This integration plan, called the Diversity by Design Plan, was developed by AISD and partners from the University of Texas, with continued support and input from the parents, students, community members, business representatives, and AISD staff who are members of the Diversity by Design Steering Committee (DDSC). The DDSC was responsible for identifying best practices in other school districts, reviewing pertinent data, and developing possible action strategies.

Goal

The proposed Diversity by Design Plan is intended to increase the diversity of the schools in Trustee District 1. Specifically, the target is for all schools in District 1 to fall within a range of 15 percentage points around the district's percentage of economically disadvantaged students (i.e., 41% to 71%). Currently, 3 of the 26 schools in District 1 meet the target.

Process

In Years 1-4, the DDSC recommends that District 1 schools opt into the Diversity by Design program, and by Year 5 the enrollment goals will apply to all schools in District 1. Dependent upon passage of the November 2017 Bond Election, DDSC recommends including any schools being built or modernized under the Facility Master Plan in the Diversity by Design plan; this includes the proposed Northeast Middle School. The plan will be studied and refined as needed throughout the phase-in process, and ultimately may expand districtwide.

Table 2. Diversity by Design Implementation Timeline

Design and Launch Phase		Year 1		Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6
SY 16-17	SY 17-18	SY 18-19		SY 19-20	SY 20-21	SY 21-22	SY 22-23	SY 23-24
		Fall 2018	Spring 2019	Voluntary Implementation				
Begin Planning and draft plan	Update and finalize plan	Share plan with stakeholder groups	20% of District 1 schools adopt the plan to implement in SY 2019-20	20% of District 1 schools implement Diversity by Design	40% of District 1 schools implement Diversity by Design	60% of District 1 schools implement Diversity by Design	80% of District 1 schools implement Diversity by Design	
Target: All District 1 schools will fall within 15 points of AISD's percentages of economically disadvantaged students. For SY 2016-17, 3/26 schools fell in the range. For 2017-18, X/26 schools fell in the range				7/26 schools meet target	11/26 schools meet target	15/26 schools meet target	19/26 schools meet target	All District 1 schools meet target

Definition of Socioeconomic Diversity

A review of existing K-12 diversity plans (See Appendix A) shows districts use a variety of methods for defining diversity. These include factors such as student eligibility for free/reduced-price lunch, census-based neighborhood measures, and school performance. The DDSC proposes the use of AISD's existing indicator for economic disadvantage (i.e., eligibility for free/reduced-priced lunch). For reference, a student from a family of four is eligible for reduced-price meals when the combined household income is $46,435 or less (Federal Register Vol 83 (89), May 8, 2018).

This indicator has the advantage of being familiar, straightforward, and easy for the broader AISD community to understand and support. The disadvantage is that it can be an inaccurate measure of income and socioeconomic status. For example, parents and/or students may fail to complete or return the data form, the information may not be collected at all schools (i.e., community eligibility), and the indicator does not incorporate other demographics traditionally considered part of socioeconomic status (e.g., parental education, extreme poverty, racial makeup of neighborhoods). Existing plans that include such demographics typically obtain the data from census block records. However, a neighborhood-based measure is particularly challenging for Austin, given gentrification makes census block groups an inaccurate measure of 'disadvantage.' For these reasons, the DDSC has selected the economic disadvantage indicator for determining socioeconomic diversity.

II. Research on Integrated Schools

Researchers have long studied the educational and social impacts of integrated schools (Orfield & Chungmei, 2005). A multitude of studies suggests diverse school settings promote learning outcomes and prepare students for a diverse workforce and society. A vast body of relevant, rigorous research was summarized and presented by 553 social scientists to the 2007 U.S. Supreme Court in Parents v. Seattle School District and Meredith v. Jefferson County (Orfield, Frankenberg, and Garces, 2008). The social science statement supported school districts' racial integration policies with three interrelated conclusions: 1) racially integrated schools provide significant benefits to students and communities; 2) racially isolated schools have harmful educational implications for students; and 3) race-conscious policies are necessary to maintain racial integration in schools. As Clayton (2011) notes, there seems to be consistency among researchers that there are long-term benefits of racial integration for students of all races.

Studies suggest racial segregation is related to lower pass rates on state tests for black students (Borman et al., 2004 cited in Orfield & Chungmei, 2005), and assignment to a high minority urban school is detrimental to the overall learning process for both White and African-American students (Lleras, 2008). Evidence also suggests racial segregation likely contributes to achievement gaps. Some research indicates racial composition, particularly the high concentration of black students, has the greatest negative impact on the academic performance of black students at the upper end of the ability distribution (Hanushek, Kain, & Rivkin, 2002; Hanushek & Rivkin, 2008). Additionally, after controlling for other school-level factors, individual, and family background measures, one study indicates the black-white test score gap is higher in more segregated cities. Though the study suggests school segregation may not contribute beyond the effects of neighborhood segregation (Card & Rothstein, 2006), other evidence points to a clear disadvantage for students in segregated schools. For example,

research controlling for a variety of other factors found that between 1972 and 2004, increases in school segregation corresponded to significant increases in test score gaps (Berends, 2010, cited in Mickelson), and a separate study of the end of busing in Charlotte-Mecklenburg concluded the end of busing widened racial inequality, despite efforts by the school district to mitigate the impact of increased segregation (Billings, Deming, & Rockoff, 2012).

Research indicates a variety of positive outcomes are related to school desegregation. For example, desegregation corresponded with improved dropout rates over a two-decade period (Guryan, 2004, cited in Mikelson), and after court orders were implemented, black youth experienced significantly lower homicide victimization and arrests (Weiner, Lutz, and Ludwig, 2009). Additionally, studies show long-term labor market benefits of school desegregation (Johnson, 2015; Ashenfelter, Collins, & Yoon, 2005). A study on the life trajectories of children born between 1945 and 1968 found that the reduced class sizes and increased per-pupil spending received through school desegregation significantly increased educational and occupational attainments, improved college quality and adult earnings, reduced the probability of incarceration, and improved adult health status for blacks. There were no effects on whites for these outcomes (Johnson, 2015), but other evidence does suggest academic advantages for white children in a multiracial educational environment, such as critical reasoning skills that lead to higher math scores (Mikelson & Bottia, cited in Garda, 2013). Others find no clear academic advantage for white students, but most agree placing white children in racially diverse classrooms cannot hurt them academically and may even help (Garda, 2013).

The social benefits of racial integration also have been well-studied since Gordon Allport's important contact theory was proposed over fifty years ago. Allport's theory that intergroup contact mitigates and transforms racial hostility, fear, and stereotypes has been supported by numerous studies (see meta-analyses by Tropp & Provost, 2008; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006), affirming the likely social advantages of integration. As one scholar (Poweel, J., 2000) noted, "integration is not simply a goal in terms of the schools in which students learn as a static site, but requires a transformation of the setting in which the identities of students are formed and form others."

A qualitative analysis of those directly involved in racial desegregation during the late 1970's concluded that despite its limited impact on the larger society, school desegregation fundamentally changed those who experienced it, often reducing racial prejudice and making them more comfortable around people of different backgrounds (Wells, Holme, Revilla, and Atanda, 2005). Importantly, research indicates not only do attitudes toward immediate contacts usually become more favorable through intergroup interactions, but so do attitudes toward the entire outgroup, outgroup members in other situations, and even outgroups not involved in the contact. A meta-analysis of 515 studies suggests contact theory, originally devised for racial and ethnic group encounters, can be extended to other groups. Thus, school integration based on other characteristics may result in the same critical social benefits.

Many conclude segregated schools can be viewed as institutions of concentrated disadvantage (Borman et al., 2004 cited in Orfield & Chungmei, 2005). There is a strong relationship between the concentration of minority students and the concentration of poverty in schools (Orfield & Chungmei, 2005), and "segregation by income very often moves in tandem with segregation by race" (Boser & Balfour, 2017). African-American and other minority students are almost three times as likely as white students to be low-income (Kahlenberg, 2007), and minority children are far more likely than whites to grow up in persistent poverty (Orfield &

Chungmei, 2005). Scholars note that because both individual poverty and school poverty affect academic achievement, black and Hispanic students are doubly disadvantaged (Rumberger, 2007). Socioeconomic segregation is a significant cause of educational inequity (Orfield & Chungmei, 2005), and the harms of economically segregated schools fall disproportionately on non-white children (Orfield, 2006).

Communities with segregated housing patterns that use geographic proximity for school assignment often produce racially and socioeconomically isolated schools (Civil Rights Project, Redistricting Fact Sheet). Some suggest wherever possible there should be positive plans to use assignment and choice policies to foster more diverse schools (Orfield & Chungmei, 2005), and that "special attention should be given to areas of concentrated poverty, areas with concentrations of low-achieving students, areas where linguistic minorities are segregated, and geographic diversity" (The Civil Rights Project, Still Looking to the Future: Voluntary K-12 School Integration). Due to the U.S. Supreme Court's opinion suggesting unconstitutionality of integrating schools and districts solely based on students' race or ethnicity (Parents Involved in Community Schools v. Seattle School District No. 1, United States Court of Appeals, Supreme Court Opinion, June 28, 2007, available at http://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/06pdf/05-908.pdf) schools and districts have shifted integration efforts to support economic integration, rather than racial integration (Boser & Baffour, 2017). A recent study of 60 school districts implementing voluntary integration found 78% considered socioeconomic status in their integration plans (Frankenberg, Anderson, & Taylor, 2017).

Education research has long suggested that the economic mix of a school matters more than the racial mix in determining the academic achievement of students (Kahlenberg, 2007), and even strong proponents of racial desegregation note that the basic damage inflicted by segregated education comes not from racial concentration but from the concentration of children from poor families (Orfield, 1978 as cited in Kahlenberg, 2007).

Evidence suggests segregation by poverty is related to teacher quality, test scores, and dropout rates (Lee, 2004, cited in Orfield & Chungmei, 2005). For example, poor children in middle-class schools performed much better and had greater gains than poor children in concentrated poverty schools (Boger, 2005 as cited in Orfield & Chungmei, 2005; National Center for Educational Statistics, 2006). Concentrated poverty also is related to changes in social and emotional competence. One study found greater school disadvantage predicted decreases in social competence and increases in behavioral problems during first grade (Hoglund & Leadbeater, 2004), and another found that high levels of school disadvantage in first grade increased children's risk for behavior problems in middle school, independent of family economic disadvantage and classroom levels of physical aggressiveness (Kellam, Ling, Merisca, brown, & Ialongo, 1998 as cited in Hoglund & Leadbeater, 2004).

Richard Rothstein (2004) describes numerous studies suggesting strong links between individual poverty, school poverty, race, and educational inequality, arguing it is unrealistic to expect to change schools without also addressing other issues that arise with poverty. The well-known Coleman report (1966) found socioeconomic composition of the student body was more highly predictive of reading achievement than any other school characteristic, and the study has been replicated with recent advanced statistical methodologies showing evidence attending a high-poverty school has a strong negative effect on students' achievement outcomes, above and beyond the effect of their individual level of family poverty or minority status (Borman & Dowling, 2010 and Harris, 2006, cited in Mickelson).

However, not all researchers agree. For example, a study of kindergarten mathematics gains found the apparent effect of high poverty concentration disappears after considering the effects of students' socioeconomic status and race/ethnicity (Hoffer & Shagle, 2012). Authors suggest resources and efforts focused on disadvantaged children and their families, rather than reassignment strategies, are necessary to reduce the achievement gaps. Another study (Hoxby & Weingarth, 2005) indicates the benefits of student reassignment may largely reflect a redistribution of lower and higher-achieving peers, rather than changes in racial, ethnic, and economic composition. The author suggests policy makers pay more attention to how they are affecting the distribution of achievement within peer groups, as opposed to racial, ethnic, or economic desegregation. Another study (Rumberger, 2007) also suggests the observed differences in achievement associated with the concentration of poverty in a school are largely explained by differences in the initial achievement levels of students. However, the author concludes that although the difference from attending the "average" high-poverty or low-poverty school does not matter much, there may be substantial differences that result from attending a particular school. For example, students who attended a high-performing, high-poverty school achieved at levels comparable to students attending an average low-poverty school. Additionally, the author acknowledges these results only pertain to academic achievement and suggests desegregation may still be a worthwhile social policy for other reasons, such as exposure to and understanding of diverse students.

Additional evidence paints a mixed picture of the impact of concentrated poverty. A recent replication of Coleman's famous study using advanced statistical methodologies found school racial composition was unrelated to high school student achievement and concluded "it is the school's socioeconomic composition, not its racial composition…that impacts student achievement" (Rumberger and Palardy, 2005). The study also found school socioeconomic status has as much impact on high school achievement as individual socioeconomic status, as much impact on advantaged as on disadvantaged students, and almost as much impact on whites as on blacks. However, the authors question the implications of integration, suggesting it would lower the achievement gap, but could also lower overall achievement levels. Additional research also has mixed implications. Although attending a high-poverty school, on average, did not adversely affect student achievement, attending a low-poverty school significantly improved student achievement (Rumberger, 2007). Thus, achievement gaps may increase for students in different school settings.

Despite some mixed evidence supporting the potential advantages of socioeconomic integration, studies have shown academic and social benefits for students who voluntarily transfer to less disadvantaged schools (Weiner, Lutz, and Ludwig, 2009; Orfield, 2006). Although socioeconomic integration programs are fairly new, results from Wake County, Charlotte, and Minneapolis show signs of success, with comparably higher passing rates and greater academic gains in reading and math for students in such programs relative to their peers in other districts or schools without socioeconomic diversity programs (Kahlenberg, 2007). Similarly, a study of voluntary transfer policies in St. Louis found higher achievement and college attendance rates for minority students who attended middle- and upper-class schools than for their peers in concentrated poverty schools (Wells & Crain, 1997, cited in Orfield & Chungmei, 2005), and studies of public school-choice lotteries in Charlotte and Chicago suggest winning a lottery greatly reduced the chances of felony arrest (Deming, 2009 and Cullen, Jacob & Levitt, 2006 as cited in Weiner, Lutz, & Ludwig, 2009). Moreover, there is no evidence that middle-class students were harmed academically by economic mixing (Kahlenberg, 2007).

Some conclude that most of the research using reasonable methods suggests expanded school choice contributes to higher levels of school integration (Greene & Winters, 2007), and choice programs that permit poor children to access high-achieving schools are among the most promising educational strategies in recent years (Orfield, 2006). However, evidence indicates white students are better able to use choice to transfer from integrated urban schools to all-white suburban schools (Holme & Richards, 2009; Poweel, 2000), and the extent to which transportation is provided under a school choice program can limit the choices of students of color and low-income students to attend the school of their choice (Poweel, 2000; Cobb & Glass, 2009). Additionally, unregulated and open-enrollment school choice plans often exacerbate the segregation of students (Cobb & Glass, 2009; Holme & Wells, 2008).

Scholars provide a variety of recommendations to alleviate these concerns. Some suggest regulated, controlled choice programs best promote integration and its related benefits (Cobb & Glass, 2009; Holme & Wells, 2008), and urge districts to provide families with information, transportation, and support (Holme & Richards, 2009). Others note the importance of anticipating the possibility of resegregation and implementing policies to prevent it (Schofield, 2001), and suggest effective policy responses must involve school improvement strategies beyond simple changes in peer racial composition and the teacher experience distribution (Hanushek & Rivkin, 2008). More specifically, a recent report from the Center for American Progress (Boser & Baffour, 2017) recommends including parents in planning, providing specialized programs that appeal to a wide range of families, implementing controlled choice programs (weighted lottery systems), encouraging transfers, redrawing attendance zone boundaries to ensure neighborhood schools pull from an economically diverse student population, partnering with county agencies to create inclusionary zoning policies for affordable housing in higher-income neighborhoods, and funding efforts to build capacity of teachers and school leaders to support diversity.

Some caution that socioeconomic integration is not, however, "just a backdoor way of achieving racial integration; it has important positive effects on academic achievement, which, in fact, exceed those associated with racial integration" (Kahlenberg, 2007). As Kahlenberg (2007) cautions, socioeconomic integration does not guarantee racial diversity. Indeed, a study of 60 districts with voluntary integration plans found that although their school income segregation declined (unlike the national trend), their school racial segregation patterns mirror the national patterns of increasing school racial segregation (Frankenberg, Anderson, & Taylor, 2017). Nevertheless, one scholar notes that when Wake County schools switched from a policy of racial integration to one emphasizing socioeconomic integration, much of the racial integration was preserved (Kahlenberg, 2007).

III. History of Integration and Educational Reform Strategies in Austin ISD

Larry Cuban's *History of school reform in Austin, Texas 1954-2008*, vividly describes the history of Austin's segregation, its impact on Austin ISD, and a series of efforts to address the resulting challenges. As Cuban notes, Austin's history includes lengthy and extensive social, economic, political, and institutional segregation of blacks, Hispanics, and whites. The city was characterized by periods of extreme racism during the early 20th century with decades of violence perpetrated by members of the Ku Klux Klan, discriminatory realtor and housing practices, an approved city plan that designated East Austin as the "negro district," and separate schools for Mexican Americans that received less money per student and had larger class sizes than white schools.

Austin ISD remained segregated with unequal conditions across schools and was slow to implement desegregation required by Brown v. Board of Education. The district eventually desegregated under court order during the 1970s, with reluctance and opposition from white parents. Some East Austin schools were closed in order to transfer black students to nearby white schools, and parents and residents of East Austin were left without community schools once busing practices ended. By 1986, the district returned to neighborhood schools, but racial segregation in Austin remained. The policy change resulted in an increase in schools with concentrated poverty and minority student populations.

To address concerns about unequal schooling, the Austin ISD Board of Trustees approved the five-year Plan for Educational Excellence in 1987. The plan, covering 20 elementary schools with 80 percent minority enrollment, also provided additional funding and programs to 16 Priority Schools that were least likely to attract white students. The district also pursued magnet schools but remained committed to maintaining neighborhood schools. More than ten years later, the district instituted the Austin Blueprint to Leave No Child Behind (i.e., the "Blueprint") to address concerns raised by the Eastside Social Action Coalition (ESAC). Similar to the Priority Schools program, the Blueprint called for transforming the six lowest performing elementary and middle schools in East Austin, later expanding to two high schools. Shortly after that, the district implemented High School Redesign, which included additional programs targeting three low-performing poor and minority schools.

In 2010, the East Austin Schools Committee developed the East Austin Schools Plan to address the needs of schools in the LBJ, Reagan, and Eastside Memorial vertical teams. The plan focused on college readiness and differentiated support, including goals for staff recruitment and retention and quality professional development, along with literacy and numeracy plans. The East Austin Schools Plan implemented several new and innovative programs including Early college High Schools and Early College Prep schools.

In 2014, the Texas Civil Rights Project (TCRP) submitted a letter and accompanying report that claimed the district did not provide equal access to educational resources and recommended AISD conduct an equity self-assessment in accordance with guidance provided to all school districts by the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Civil Rights. The Board of Trustees established an oversight committee on Excellence through Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion, and the district began a series of steps to assess and address equity in AISD.

Additionally, the Imagine Northeast Austin Committee met from Spring 2015 to Spring 2016 to develop a proposal for school design for a potential school in the Mueller neighborhood. The committee proposed a variety of recommendations for increasing the enrollment of Northeast Austin students in magnet programs and other advanced academic programs, and also recommended providing teacher training to address cultural bias, and creating subsidized housing for teachers. In Spring 2016, the committee's scope was expanded to include the development of a comprehensive regional plan that would benefit students and the community in Northeast Austin. The subsequently established Northeast Austin Planning Team built upon the work of the previous planning teams, the East Austin Schools Plan, and the Imagine Northeast group. In December 2016, the Northeast Austin Planning Team presented the Northeast Austin Plan for review. The plan focuses on human capital, academic programming, renovation, and construction of new facilities to strengthen the academic achievement, increase enrollment, and desegregate schools in the LBJ and Reagan vertical teams and Kealing feeder pattern.

Transfer policies were revised in 2016 both to attract families from outside the district and to help manage overcrowding at certain schools. Beginning in Fall 2016, majority-to-minority transfers were not approved to certain overcrowded (i.e., frozen) schools, and starting in Fall 2017 no priority transfers (i.e., majority-to-minority, sibling, tracking) will be approved to frozen schools. The policy changes were accompanied by a variety of improved communication strategies. At the beginning of the 2016-2017 school year, more than 15,000 AISD students were currently enrolled on a transfer, and AISD staff had approved more than 90% of approximately 7,000 transfer requests received for the school year - the highest approval rate on record (Looby, Lyons, & Williams, 2016).

IV. Strategies and Examples From Other Districts

A review of five K-12 district diversity plans (See Appendix A) highlights some similarities among district plans. For example, most districts asked parents to identify their desired programming options and key concerns. Most also emphasized the importance of high-quality outreach to ensure parents understand the options that are available for their children, and most noted the importance of providing transportation to all students and/or ensuring equitable transportation time for all students to and from their schools. Best practices also included the use of diverse advisory groups to create and monitor plans, and the implementation of staff training to support cultural proficiency and inclusiveness.

Most plans include features such as revised boundary assignments, choice schools with special programming, and the use of economic disadvantage to prioritize selection into choice programs. Some also incorporated other criteria, such as the performance of the assigned home school or proximity to a school. See Table 3 for an overview of features.

Table 3. Features of Five District Diversity Plans

	Portland	Louisville	Charlotte-Mecklenburg	Cambridge	Dallas
Revised and/or eliminated school boundary assignments	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Choice schools and/or special new programs	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Priority and/or weighted acceptance based on economic disadvantage	✓		✓	✓	✓
Priority and/or weighted acceptance based on other criteria (e.g., parent education level, median income, proximity to school)		✓	✓		a
Priority and/or weighted acceptance based on assigned school performance			✓	b	

a After students are accepted, an equity review may trigger the acceptance of additional students to fulfill additional demographic equity targets.

b Low performing schools are provided additional funding.

V. District Data Analysis and Changing Demographics

At first glance, census trends indicate the population living within AISD's boundary improved socioeconomically over the 10-year period from 2006 to 2015 (AISD Campus and District Accountability, October 2016). The median household income increased by 36 percent, and the percentage of population living below the federal poverty level declined from 19.2% in 2006 to 15.6% in 2015. However, the increase in median household income did not keep pace with the dramatic increase in median monthly rent – a 46 percent increase – or the more dramatic 70 percent increase in median home value over the 10-year period.

The total population residing within AISD's boundary increased by approximately 22 percent over ten years, and the racial composition shifted to become less Hispanic (-1.7 percent) and less African American (-0.9 percent). Declining birth rates and mobility from other counties and states likely account for a comparably smaller increase in the school-aged population, which only rose by 12 percent. Notably, the AISD K-12 enrollment grew by 3 percent during this time (AISD Campus and District Accountability, October 2016). As one study indicates, the reasons for declining membership in AISD schools are varied, but it is evident some students who attend AISD schools ultimately withdraw from the district (Christian & Williams, 2016).

A study of the most common reasons students leave AISD found nearly half of the survey respondents left AISD due to a family move (Christian & Williams, 2016). Overall, data suggest almost half of the students who left AISD at the end of the 2014-2015 school year were found to be enrolled in nearby or other Texas school districts at the beginning of the 2015-2016 school year (Looby, Lyons, & Williams, 2016). Evidence from a district leaver survey suggests those who left due to a family move were the most likely to have enrolled in another public school district, and students who left for other reasons were more likely to enroll in a private or charter school. Subsequent enrollment also varied according to students' reasons for leaving.

Further examination indicates when students left AISD for reasons other than a family move, white students most frequently enrolled in private schools, Hispanic and African American students most commonly enrolled in charter schools, and other students more often enrolled in other Austin-area school districts. These findings suggest students' experiences and needs differ according to demographics.

In 2016, AISD's formal gap analysis (Schmitt, Williams, & Christian, 2016) and equity report (Schmitt, 2016) served as the foundation for equity self-assessment work. Overall, results from both reports show performance gaps across a variety of indicators within and across AISD schools. Results from the subsequent 2016 equity self-assessment survey of district stakeholders (Hutchins, Looby, & Reach, 2016) indicate a general perception that the district is somewhat meeting its equity challenges. However, evidence from all three studies reveal some consistent findings: a) gaps between special education students and their peers have increased, b) wide gaps between white students and their Hispanic and African American peers remain, c) graduation rate gaps have narrowed between white and Hispanic students but widened between white and African American students, and d) district stakeholders acknowledge equity concerns with regard to graduation rates and student outcomes. The 2016 District Summary of Equity

Work and Action Steps for Improvement (Hutchins, Looby, & Reach) describes numerous action steps for achieving equity in student outcomes, student discipline, and program access.

VI. School Designs

The DDSC recommends that new school programs must include diversity targets and implement recruitment and enrollment strategies to ensure a diverse student population. This recommendation also applies to new school buildings or modernized schools.

VII. Diversity by Design Strategies

Strategies in Progress

Transfer Policy and Magnet School Enrollment:

The Board discussed the transfer policy at the June 11, 2018 Board Work Session. The Trustees were interested in learning whether the existing policies were meeting the stated goals to increase enrollment and balancing enrollment. They also discussed the impact of the Diversity Choice policy.

The district recently revised the magnet application criteria, and there has been an increase in the number of non-white students accepted into the Kealing and LASA magnet programs for 2018-19 school year. Kenisha Coburn, principal at Kealing Middle School, was awarded a Replicating Great Options Fellowship in the Spring of 2018 to replicate Kealing at a second site in the district with the expressed goal to increase the socioeconomic diversity of the magnet programs.

Facilities and Academic Programming

Austin ISD plans to aggressively market the new Medical High School at LBJ High School to have a diverse applicant pool. The school will also have seats dedicated to the neighborhood in order to ensure a diverse student body. The new middle school in Mueller will also be an opportunity to have a socioeconomically diverse school through the careful drawing of school boundaries.

The Montessori program at Winn launched in the 2017-18 school year, and the program will expand to another grade level for the 2018-19 school year. The district is also providing transportation district-wide to students to attend Gus Garcia YMLA in order to grow the program and increase the socioeconomic diversity.

District of Innovation and Professional Development

AISD currently has a District of Innovation plan that allows campuses to apply for waivers from portions of the state education code. All District One campuses have approved District of Innovation plans providing for additional days of professional development for the 2018-19 school year.

Twelve campuses (one in District One) took part in a book study on Zaretta Hammond's book *Culturally Responsive Teaching and the Brain* in 2017-18. Also, the SEL department will include two new Cultural Proficiency and Inclusiveness specialists for the 2018-19 school year.

The district was awarded a grant from TEA in January 2018 to form a Transformation Zone, which is a group of campuses given autonomy over their budgets, staffing, curriculum, and resources. The goal of the Transformation Zone is to improve student outcomes by empowering educators who work closest to the students to make informed decisions to best meet their students' needs.

In April 2018, Leadership Austin reached out to the Austin community to invite people to attend Beyond Diversity Training. The two-day workshop was held multiple times during June and July 2018 at full capacity. The organization will host additional workshops throughout the Fall 2018 and Spring 2019.

Strategies in Development

Transfer Policy and Selection Criteria

For existing campuses, the proposal is to change the transfer system in District 1 schools to give the following priority to students for available spaces in schools:

First priority: Neighborhood/zoned students. Priority goes to students living in the school's attendance zone.

Second priority: Students who improve the socioeconomic balance of school. After neighborhood /zoned slots are filled, any available slots are given to students who improve the socioeconomic balance of the school.

Third priority: Any extra seats filled regardless of socioeconomic status. Any available remaining spots go to any other student regardless of socioeconomic status.

Tables 4 and 5 provide examples of how the plan might work for schools that are under-enrolled and schools that are currently at capacity. For schools that are under-enrolled (Table 4), socioeconomic targets would be achieved through the admission of additional students who improve the socioeconomic balance of the school. Any extra seats would be filled regardless of socioeconomic status.

Table 4. Example application of diversity enrollment priorities at under-enrolled schools to achieve target percentage of 41% to 71% economically disadvantaged.

Under-enrolled School

	Student Category	Current Enrollment	School Capacity	Available Capacity
Blanton Elementary	Economically disadvantaged	387 (78%)	505 (71%)	118
	Non-economically disadvantaged	108 (22%)	206 (29%)	98
	Total	495	711	216
Norman Elementary	Economically disadvantaged	256 (96%)	345 (71%)	89

	11 (4%)	141 (29%)	130
Non-economically disadvantaged			
Total	267	486	219

For schools that are at capacity (Table 5), current transfers would be grandfathered in, and the long-term goal would be to recruit more transfers who improve the socioeconomic balance of the school or to manage transfers, so the balance does not fall outside the target range.

Table 5. Example application of diversity enrollment priorities at schools at capacity to achieve target percentage of 41% to 71% economically disadvantaged.

At Capacity School

	Student Category	Current Enrollment (including transfers in)	Neighborhood Enrollment	Current Transfers In
Jordan Elementary	Economically disadvantaged	656 (95%)	609 (95%)	47 (90%)
	Non-economically disadvantaged	35 (5%)	30 (5%)	5 (10%)
	Total	691	639	52
Maplewood Elementary	Economically disadvantaged	213 (43%)	107 (34%)	106 (57%)
	Non-economically disadvantaged	282 (57%)	203 (66%)	79 (43%)
	Total	495	310	185

Priority Programming - Waiver for District of Innovation, New Choice Programs

DDSC recommends that the first schools to implement Diversity by Design may choose to adopt/implement a new academic program (e.g., STEAM) and receive additional district support for programming, staff development, marketing, etc. Schools volunteering should demonstrate support from both staff and the school community. It is recommended that District Administration select 1-2 new programs each year through a competitive process.

Application Process

The committee proposes that the district form a Diversity by Design team to oversee the implementation of the diversity plan as campuses opt-in to new programming. Their duties would include monitoring the application and selection process of new choice programs. Under the Diversity by Design Plan, the committee recommends that admission requirements for any school or program (e.g., no academic criteria) be limited and used to support the fidelity of the school or program. Students should be admitted via centrally

processed lottery using applications made as easy as possible (text, email, web, paper) and available in multiple languages.

Attendance Zones

The DDSC recommends that the district consider revising board policy to address boundary lines and vertical team alignment, specifically with regard to apartment complexes and proximity to schools. The district should also examine existing policy to consider socioeconomic diversity when creating new attendance boundary lines.

Marketing

The DDSC recommends the district use strong outreach and recruitment efforts to inform all parents about the plan. The district should allocate resources for the redesign of campus websites for all District 1 schools to make them attractive, informative, and accessible. The district should also create a Diversity by Design website to be transparent about the plan and to monitor and evaluate district diversity goals. Other potential marketing and outreach strategies include:

- Strengthen vertical team outreach through posters/advertisements at feeder schools, feeder school students at former schools for Back to School Nights, Senior Walks, etc.
- Provide information sessions at private daycare centers and surrounding businesses about District 1 schools
- Develop letters to District 1 businesses highlighting neighborhood schools
- Circulate "enrollment bus" to neighborhoods and district events to automatically enroll families
- Facilitate school tours with Austin Board of Realtors and other organizations
- Partner with property management companies distribute information about District 1 schools
- Conduct training session for area realtors on what school ratings can and cannot tell someone about the quality of the school
- Distribute a hard-copy of school choice options sent to new homeowners and other community locations
- Market District 1 schools to regional employers
- Post outdoor billboards near target campuses
- Evaluate current marketing plan

Transportation

Building upon the district-wide transportation for Gus Garcia Young Men's Leadership Academy, the DDSC proposed that free transportation be provided (at least within District 1) to all students, to all programs. The district should also explore the development of transportation hubs, zones, or utilizing city transportation to support this initiative.

Staff PD

As schools become more intentionally diverse, teachers and administrators will need ongoing professional development to address equity and diversity. The DDSC recommends additional opportunities for staff to engage in critical reflections on race, racism, and how to create an inclusive, diverse, and culturally responsive learning environment. Staff should

also receive training in cultural proficiency such as Beyond Diversity, Undoing Racism, training from the Center for the Elimination of Disproportionality & Disparities, poverty simulation, and Restorative Practices. The district should also identify key higher education partners such as Huston-Tillotson, University of Texas, Southwestern, and Texas State and other outside consultants to deliver professional development.

VIII. Parent and Community Engagement

In March of 2017, Austin Mayor Adler convened an Institutional Racism and Systemic Inequities Task Force that developed recommendations around education; real estate and housing; finance, banking, and industry; and civil and criminal justice. The recommendations for education clustered around hiring, staffing, and representation; curriculum, instruction, and accountability; education, admission, and access; and leadership and capacity building. The DDSC proposes that the district review these recommendations and develop a timeline to implement those strategies that would decrease socioeconomic segregation in AISD schools. See Appendix C for list of trainings.

Appendices

Appendix A: Research Briefs on Other Districts

Appendix B: Diversity by Design Steering Committee

Appendix C: Diversity by Design Scorecard Update, 9/07/18

References

Ashenfelter, O., Collins, W., & Yoon, A. (2005). Evaluating the role of Brown vs. Board of Education in school equalization, desegregation, and the income of African Americans. NBER Working Paper 11394. National Bureau of Economic Research. Cambridge, MA.

Benner, A. & Graham, S. (2007). Navigating the transition to multi-ethnic urban high schools: Changing ethnic congruence and adolescents' school-related affect.

Billings, S., Deming, D., & Rockoff, J. (2012). School segregation, educational attainment and crime: Evidence from the end of busing in Charlotte-Mecklenburg. NBER WOrking Paper 18487. National Bureau of Economic Research, Cambridge, MA.

Boser, U. & Baffour, P. (2017). Isolated and Segregated: A new look at the income divide in our nation's schooling system. Center for American Progress.

Card, D. & Rothstein, J. (2006). Racial segregation and the black-white test score gap. NBER Working Paper 12078. National Bureau of Economic Research. Cambridge, MA.

AISD Campus and District Accountability (October 28, 2016). *American Community Survey (ACS) and enrollment data for AISD, 2006-2015*. Austin, TX: Austin Independent School District.

Christian, C., & Williams, H. (2016). *Austin Independent School District 2015 family leaver survey: 2014-2015 leavers* (DRE Publication #15.25 RB). Austin, TX: Austin Independent School District.

Clayton, J. (2011). Changing diversity in U.S. schools: The impact on elementary student performance and achievement. Education and Urban Society, 43(6), 671-695.

Cobb, C & Glass, G. (2009). School choice in a post-desegregation world. Peabody Journal of Education, 84, 262-278.

Cuban, L. (2008). School reform in Austin, Texas 1954-2008. Stanford University LEADS Network and Austin Independent School District.

Federal Register Vol. 82, No. 67 (April 10, 2017).

Frankenberg, E., Anderson, J., & Taylor, K (2017). Voluntary Integration in U.S. School Districts, 2000-2015. Center for Education and Civil Rights. Penn State College of Education.

Garda, R (2013). The white interest in school integration; Florida Law Review, 63(3)

Gottfredson, N., Panter, A, Daye, C., Wightman, L., Allen, W., Deo, M. (2008). Does diversity at undergraduate institutions influence student outcomes? Journal of Diversity in Higher Education, 1, 2, 80-94.

Greene, J. & Winters, M. (2007). An evaluation of the effect of DC's voucher program on public school achievement and racial integration after one year. Catholic Education: A Journal of Inquiry and Practice, vol 11, 1, 83-101.

Hanushek, E., Kain, J., & Rivkin, S. (2002). New evidence about Brown v. Board of Education: The complex effects of school racial composition on achievement. NBER Working Paper 8741. National Bureau of Economic Research, Cambridge, MA.

Hanushek, E. & Rivkin, S. (2008). Harming the best: How schools affect the black-white achievement gap. NBER Working Paper 14211. National Bureau of Economic Research, Cambridge, MA.

Hoffer, T. & Shagle, S. (2012). School poverty concentration and kindergarten students' numerial skills. Working Paper 2012-004. Human Capital and Economic Opportunity Working Group Economic Research Center, University of Chicago, Chicago, IL.

Hoglund, W. & Leadbeater, B. (2004). The effects of family, school, and classroom ecologies on changes in children's social competence and emotional and behavioral problems in first grade. Developmental Psychology, 40, 4, 533-544.

Hoxby, C. & Weingarth, G. (2005). Taking race out of the equation: School reassignment and the structure of peer effects.

Hutchins, S., Looby, K., & Reach, J. (2016). *Equity in Austin Independent School District: District summary of equity work and action steps for improvement* (DRE Publication #16.11). Austin, TX: Austin Independent School District.

Johnson, R. (2011, revised 2015). Long-run impacts of school desegregation & school quality on adult attainments. NBER Working Paper 16664. National Bureau of Economic Research, Cambridge, MA.

Kahlenberg, R. (2007). Socioeconomic school integration. North Carolina Law Review, 85 (5). UNC School of Law. Available at http://scholarship.law.unc.edu/nclr/vol85/iss5/9.

Liu, G., & Taylor, W. (2005 School choice to achieve desegregation. 74 Fordham L. Rev. 791 Available at: http://ir.lawnet.fordham.edu/flr/vol74/iss2/16.

Lleras, C. (2008). Race, racial concentration, and the dynamics of educational inequality across urban and suburban schools. American Educational Research Journal, 45, 4, 886-912.

Looby, K., Lyons, A., & Williams, H. (2016). *Enrollment from Fall 2015 to Fall 2016: Trends by grade level and student group* (DRE Publication #16.07 RB). Austin, TX: Austin Independent School District.

Mickelson, R. (2008). Twenty-first century social science on school racial diversity and educational outcomes. Ohio State Law Journal, vol. 69, no. 6 (2008), 1173-1227.

Orfield, G., Frankenberg, E., & Garces, L. (2008). Statement of American Social Scientists of Research on School Desegregation to the U.S. Supreme Court in Parents v. Seattle School District and Meredith v. Jefferson County. Urban Rev 40:96-136

Orfield, G. and Chungmei, L (2005). Why segregation matters: Poverty and educational inequality. The Civil Rights Project. Retrieved from http://escholarship.org/uc/item/4xr8z4wb.

Orfield, M. (2006). Choice, equal protection, and metropolitan integration: The hope of the Minneapolis desegregation settlement, 24, Law & Inequality, 269. Available at http://scholarship.law.umn.edu/lawineq/vol24/iss2/2.

Park, J., Denson, N., Bowman, N. (2013). Does socioeconomic diversity make a difference? Examining the effects of racial and socioeconomic diversity on the campus climate for diversity. American Education Research Journal, 50, 3, 466-496.

Pettigrew, T. & Tropp, L. (2006). A meta-analytic test of intergroup contact theory. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 90, 5, 751-783.

Poweel, J. (2000). The tensions between integration and school reform, 28 Hastings Contst. L.Q. 655 available at http://scholarship.law.berkeley.edu/facpubs/648.

Rumberger, R. (2007). Parsing the Data on Student Achievement in high-poverty schools, 85 N.C. L. Rev. 1293. Available at http://scholarship.law.unc.edu/nclr/vol85/iss5/3.

Rumberger, R. & Palardy, G. (2005). Does segregation still matter? The impact of student composition on academic achievement in high school. Teachers College Record, 107, 9, 1999-2045.

Schmitt, L. (2016). *Equity in Austin Independent School District: Elementary, middle, and high school performance in 2014-2015* (DRE Publication #15.37). Austin, TX: Austin Independent School District.

Schmitt, L., Williams, H., & Christian, C. (2016). *Analysis of performance gaps: Austin Independent School District, 2012-2013 through 2014-2015* (DRE Publication #15.39). Austin, TX: Austin Independent School District.

Schofield, J. (2001). Maximizing the benefits of student diversity: Lessons from school desegregation research. In Orfield, Gary, Ed., Diversity Challenged: Evidence on the Impact of Affirmative Action. Cambridge, Harvard Education Publishing Group, pp99-109.

Tefera, A., Siegel-Hawley, G., Frankenberg, E. (2010). School integration efforts three years after "Parents Involved." The Civil Rights Project available at http://civilrightsproject.ucla.edu.

Wells, A., Holme, J., Revilla, A., & Atanda, A. (2005). How desegregation changed us: The effects of racially mixed schools on students and society. In Search of Brown, Harvard University Press.

Weiner, D., Lutz, B., Ludwig, J. (2009). The effect of school desegregation on crime. NBER Working Paper 15380, National Bureau of Economic Research, Cambridge, MA.

Appendix C

Diversity by Design
Scorecard Update

The Diversity by Design plan provided several strategies the district could address to increase the socioeconomic diversity of Austin ISD, beginning with Trustee District One.

The plan stated that new school programs or new school buildings must include diversity targets and implement recruitment and enrollment strategies to ensure a diverse student population. Austin ISD plans to aggressively market the new Medical High School to have a diverse applicant pool. The school will also have seats dedicated to the neighborhood in order to ensure a diverse student body. The new middle school in Mueller will also be an opportunity to have a socioeconomically diverse school through the careful drawing of school boundaries.

Another proposal in the plan was to examine the transfer policy in the district and develop strategies to strategically allow transfers to increase the socioeconomic diversity. The district has not begun to implement a system to address student transfers; however, the Board discussed the transfer policy at the June 11, 2018 Board Work Session. The Trustees were interested in learning whether the existing policies were meeting the stated goals to increase enrollment and balancing enrollment. They also discussed the impact of the Diversity Choice policy.

The plan proposed the development of new academic programs for District One that would also provide additional district support for programming, staff development, marketing, etc. The Montessori program at Winn launched in 2017-18 school year, and the program will expand to another grade level for the 2018-19 school year. Kenisha Coburn, principal at Kealing Middle School, was awarded a Replicating Great Options Fellowship in Spring of 2018 to replicate Kealing at a second site in the district with the expressed goal to increase the socioeconomic diversity of the magnet programs. AISD currently has a District of Innovation plan that allows campuses to apply for waivers from portions of the state education code around requirements for the first and last day of school, length of school day, teacher certification for CTE courses for high school credit, and the 90% rule for attendance. All District One campuses have approved District of Innovation plans providing for additional days of professional development for the 2018-19 school year.

The LBJ Vertical Team is using September 24, January 3, January 4, and February 15 as professional learning days for the 2018-19 school year. These days would serve as data analysis days for all grade levels. Kinder-2nd would access MOY and progress monitoring data in reading and math to analyze, reflect, plan and set the stage for implementation. 3rd-5th would access MOY Benchmark data and progress monitoring data to analyze, reflect, plan and set the stage for implementation. Providing these dates would allow for each grade level to meet both days as a team. This will allow for teams to engage in focused and relevant conversations about student progress, best instructional practice, curriculum/resources needs, and prepare for effective implementation. The extra time will also allow the campuses to continue their efforts in their Vertical Team alignment in the areas of Restorative Practices, SEL, Trust-Based campus practices, STEM learning experiences, and transformative technology practices.

The Regan Vertical Team is using October 5, January 3, January 4, and February 15. These days will serve as a professional development days to provide follow up from the beginning of the year professional development sequence by focusing on the areas of Restorative Practices, SEL, Trust-Based campus practices, Response to Intervention, data collection, progress monitoring, and implementation of intervention services in the classroom. Another focus area for the team will be on Literacy Plan implementation and support year 3. These days would also serve professional development to support our Vertical Team Professional Development on College Readiness-Early College and Carreer Launch. By adding an additional PD day, the campuses can provide the time to continue their efforts in our Vertical alignment in the areas, college readiness, AVID strategies, development of literacy, STEAM learning experiences and transformative technology practice.Kealing Middle School will use their professional development day to learn about new instructional approaches through exemplar lessons and receiving ongoing training on Facing History and Ourselves in ELA and Social Studies instruction. Other days will be used for data driven decisions and planning and McCallum Vertical Team collaboration and alignment.

Other campuses in the Kealing feeder patter will use their District of Innovation days to learn about SEL Self Care and stress management for students and collaborative learning sessions focused on CLI, SEL, BLEND, Technology, and vertical team alignment.

The Diversity by Design plan proposed that the district form a Diversity by Design team to oversee the implementation of the diversity plan as campuses opt-in to new programming. A team has not yet been developed, but there have been discussions to form a group to examine student programming and enrollment demographics to develop strategies to increase the socioeconomic diversity of existing district programs. The plan also recommended that admission requirements for any school or program be limited and used to support the fidelity of the school or program. The district revised the magnet application criteria, and there has been an increase in the number of non-white students accepted into the Kealing and LASA magnet programs for 2018-19 school year.

The plan recommended the district consider revising board policy to address boundary lines and vertical team alignment, and explore a new policy to consider socioeconomic diversity when creating new attendance boundary lines. At this time, the district has not discussed any changes to attendance boundaries or policy. However, as new schools and modernized schools are built as part of the 2017 Bond, changes to attendance boundaries will be necessary.

The plan called for the allocating of marketing resources and support for all District One schools to make them attractive, informative, and accessible. Schools that were identified as TUP campuses received the additional marketing support.
The plan proposed that free transportation be provided (at least within District One) to all students, to all programs. The district is providing transportation district-wide to students to attend Gus Garcia YMLA in order to grow the program and increase the socioeconomic diversity.

The Diversity by Design plan recommended the district provide opportunities for staff to engage in critical reflections on race, racism, and how to create an inclusive, diverse, and culturally-responsive learning environment. Twelve campuses (one in District One) took part in a book study on Zaretta Hammond's book *Culturally Responsive Teaching and the Brain* in 2017-18. Also, the SEL department will include two new Cultural Proficiency and Inclusiveness (CP&I) specialists for the 2018-19 school year. Table 1 lists CP& I professional development opportunities delivered during the 2017-18 school year and documented in our Human Capital Platform. Over 700 individual teachers, school

administrators, and central office staff members have documented participation in CP&I professional learning during the 2017-18 school year.

Table 1. Professional Development Opportunities 2017-2018

CP&I Capacity Building Cohorts
CP & I Capacity Building Cohorts: Cohort 3 Meetings Sessions 1-4
CP&I Capacity Building Foundations: Isolating Race
CP&I Capacity Building Foundations: Isolating Race
Culturally Responsive Teaching and the Brain-Book Study
Culturally Responsive Teaching and the Brain-Book Study: Perez
Culturally Responsive Teaching and the Brain-Book Study: Widen
Dynamic Stories
Dynamic Stories: Ethnic Studies Spring 2018, Writing Session 1
Dynamic Stories: Ethnic Studies Spring 2018, Writing Session 2
Dynamic Stories: Ethnic Studies Summer 2018 Session
Dynamic Stories: Teaching Asian American History with Smithsonian Learning Lab Resources
Dynamic Stories: UT Urban Teachers Lecture and Lesson Plan Workshop
Dyslexia Middle School Project-Professional Development
Dyslexia Middle School Project Professional Development Summer 2018
NAPE/Freescale Micromessaging to Reach and Teach Every Student Academy
NAPE/Freescale Micromessaging to Reach and Teach Every Student Academy: Setting the Stage and Micromessaging
SEL Symposium
SEL Symposium: Re:Connection - the Link to Social Well-being
TLC University
TLC University: 64 Things to Do Instead of Writing an Office Referral
TLC University: ADA, 90% Rule, Chronic Absenteeism/Truancy
TLC University: Challenge Chamber and Problem Solving
TLC University: Coaching for Equity
TLC University: College and Career Readiness for All: AVID & GEAR UP Overview
TLC University: Creative Learning Initiative Professional Development for Support Staff and Academic Team
TLC University: Dyslexia Across Content Areas
TLC University: Dyslexia and Language Arts
TLC University: Dyslexia and Math Implications
TLC University: eCST Database PD
TLC University: GoNoodle
TLC University: GT Update: Equity, Access, and Academic Resources
TLC University: Honing Your Skills as a Coach
TLC University: How is Teaching for Biliteracy Different from Teaching for Monoliteracy?
TLC University: Integrating Professional Articles into Blend PD
TLC University: Intentional Inclusion: How Do We Support?
TLC University: Intro to Mindfulness in the Schools
TLC University: Istation Training
TLC University: Literacy Plan Overview: Inside and Throughout the School Day
TLC University: Numeracy Plan Preview
TLC University: Outdoor Learning and Sustainability Education
TLC University: PPfT Overview
TLC University: Preparing Teachers and Students for Digital Citizenship Decisions

TLC University: Research & Evaluation
TLC University: Restorative Practices and School Mental Health Centers at the Elementary Level: Grants
TLC University: Restorative Practices Update
TLC University: Scaffolding Behavior/ PBIS Workshop
TLC University: SEL 2.0
TLC University: Seven Steps to a Language-Rich Interactive Classroom: An Overview
TLC University: Sheltered Instruction Strategies within the Social Studies Classroom
TLC University: Supporting Students with Behavior Needs
TLC University: TBRI: Trauma Brain Science and the Connecting Principle
TLC University: The Ins and Outs of 504 and Special Education
TLC University: The Practice of Formative Assessment
TLC University: TLC BLEND
TLC University: Using BLEND for Teacher Learning and Collaboration
TLC University: What's New in Social Studies

In March of 2017, Austin Mayor Adler convened an Institutional Racism and Systemic Inequities Task Force that developed recommendations around education; real estate and housing; finance, banking, and industry; and civil and criminal justice. The recommendations for education clustered around hiring, staffing, and representation; curriculum, instruction, and accountability; education, admission, and access; and leadership and capacity building. The plan proposed that the district review these recommendations and develop a timeline to implement those strategies that would decrease socioeconomic segregation in AISD schools. At this time, the district continues to review the recommendations and will be developing a timeline for implementation.