For the City and County of San Francisco

THE MORE THINGS CHANGE, THE MORE THEY STAY THE SAME:

THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO AND
THE SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
ARE FAILING TO ADDRESS THE EDUCATIONAL
NEEDS OF THE BAYVIEW HUNTERS POINT
COMMUNITY

Released June 2004

Pursuant to State law, reports of the Civil Grand Jury do not identify the names or identifying
information about individuals who provided information to the Civil Grand Jury.

Departments and agencies identified in the report must respond to the Presiding Judge of the
Superior Court within the number of days specified, with a copy sent to the Board of
Supervisors. As to each finding of the Grand Jury, the response must either (1) agree with the
finding, or (2) disagree with it, wholly or partially, and explain why. Further, as to each
recommendation made by the Grand Jury, the responding party must report either (1) that the
recommendation has been implemented, with a summary explanation of how it was; (2) the
recommendation has not been implemented, but will be implemented in the future, with a
timeframe for implementation; (3) the recommendation requires further analysis, with an
explanation of the scope of that analysis and a timeframe for the officer or agency head to be
prepared to discuss it (less than six months from the release of this Report); or (4) the
recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or reasonable, with an
explanation of why that is. (Cal. Penal Code, secs. 933, 933.05.)
### Summary of Recommendations

1. SFUSD should provide the Bayview Hunters Point district with neighborhood schools commensurate to its population of eligible local students.

2. SFUSD and the Redevelopment Agency should forge a plan to build additional schools in the Bayview Hunters Point region to address the projected needs of development of housing on the Hunters Point Shipyard.

3. SFUSD should undertake greater outreach in order to insure that eligible students get enrolled in Dream Schools and that students not eligible are given every opportunity to attend their current school next year with equal or improved resources.

4. SFUSD should undertake greater outreach in order to insure that students who are eligible for free or low cost lunches are receiving them.

### GLOSSARY

SFUSD – San Francisco Unified School District  
BVHP – Bayview Hunters Point  
HP – Hunters Point  
CGJ – Civil Grand Jury

### OVERVIEW

The 2003-2004 Civil Grand Jury investigated educational resources available to residents of the Bayview Hunters Point district. Over the course of eight months, the CGJ visited over 20 SFUSD schools and facilities, interviewing SFUSD staff as well as teachers and students from BVHP.

According to the SFUSD Mission Statement (emphasis added):

The mission of the San Francisco Unified School District is to **provide each student with an equal opportunity** to succeed by promoting intellectual growth, creativity, self-discipline, cultural and linguistic sensitivity, democratic responsibility, economic competence, and physical and mental health so that each student can achieve his or her maximum potential.

The Civil Grand Jury found that SFUSD and the City of San Francisco do not “provide each student with an equal opportunity” in Bayview Hunters Point, largely due to the lack of basic educational infrastructure in this community.
Historically, BVHP has been the largest African-American neighborhood in San Francisco; its children have been subjected to busing in order to achieve educational diversity in city schools.

In 1954, the Supreme Court ruled unanimously, in Brown vs. Board of Education, that the doctrine of "separate but equal" education for blacks and whites was unconstitutional. The decision triggered much resistance in the South but marked the beginning of a civil rights movement that led to racial protections in public schools, accommodations, voting rights, housing, and employment.

In 1983, SFUSD began limiting the student population at each school to no more than 45 percent of any one racial or ethnic group. But that plan was dropped in 1999, when a federal court settlement barred the district from using race as a factor in school assignments. SFUSD was still required to maintain desegregated schools. To comply, school officials created the Diversity Index. For the purpose of student placement, this complex ranking system considers multiple factors, such as: family income, standardized test scores, preschool experience for incoming kindergartners, mother's education level, home language, and the academic ranking of a student's previous school.

SFUSD officials say that the Diversity Index goes much further than previous efforts to balance school populations by class. The Diversity Index was specifically designed to help move disadvantaged students into better schools. In SFUSD, attendance at local schools in the African American community continues to decline from 16.8% of the total school population in 1996 to 14.7% in the current year. (Appendix 1)

To achieve the goals of the Diversity Index boundary lines were drawn in specific BVHP blocks and assigning children within these boundaries to schools outside their neighborhood. While this program enabled SFUSD to achieve it diversity goals over 75% of the children in K-8 grades are required to attend schools outside their home neighborhood. The percentage of high school students is even greater.

As of January 2003, the current racial makeup of BVHP has changed greatly from 1980, when the African American population was over 70 percent. (Appendix 2) The CGJ believes that the current system of racial diversity in SFUSD is outdated and that, finally, the children of BVHP can have quality schools in their own neighborhood.

Interestingly, given the racial mix of BVHP the desired diversity goals could have been met within this district and without requiring the wholesale busing of children if an investment had been made to construct new facilities or renovate existing ones. As a matter of record there has been no significant investments made in local educational facilities in BVHP in recent years.

**BACKGROUND**

In 1834, the land now called Bayview Hunters Point belonged to Jose Bernal and was known as Rancho Rincon de Las Salinas y Potrero ("near the salt flats and old pasture"). La Punta de Conca ("seashell point") became known as Hunters Point when
the Hunter brothers, Robert and Philip, arrived during the Gold Rush and bought the land to develop a town.

Although the Bayview Opera House and Bayview Racetrack caught on, not much else came of the Hunter brothers’ plans. The director of the California Steam Ship Navigation Co., William Ralston, spent $1 million to build granite dry-docks at the point during the 1860s. Later, shipping and cattle slaughtering dominated the area, ending when the upgraded Hunters Point U.S. Naval Shipyards became the largest shipyard on the West Coast, with 18,500 employees, many of them African-Americans from the southern United States.

With the construction of freeways in 1952, BVHP was effectively separated from the rest of the city; it became a “black Neighborhood” which consisted mainly of rickety, temporary housing. The Redevelopment Agency spent years replacing World War II-era buildings with public housing.

1966, after the slaying of a black youth by San Francisco police officers, the area erupted in a riot. This was a benchmark event that defined the future neglect of a community and shaped the area’s internal culture.

Bayview Hunters Point has the highest percentage of homeowners in the City. It also has the highest percentage of youths-to-residents in the neighborhood. BVHP is home to many family businesses, community organizations, small businesses, and churches that have thriving congregations. Despite these positive advantages, there are also deeply rooted social problems that result in part from systematic negligence dating back to World War II. The City of San Francisco has failed to invest significantly in this community for over sixty years. To its shame, negligence has led to these social problems:

- BVHP suffers from a 30% unemployment rate. The area is the location of about a third of all homicides in the City, yet it contains only an eighth of the population. CGJ tours of the nine SF County jails and interviews with the staff confirmed that over 95% of San Francisco’s County Jail population is people of color, many from the area.

- In BVHP, 91% of the population is comprised of people of color or minorities. Unemployment is 250% higher there than in the rest of the City. Twenty percent of the people earn less than $15,000 per year, versus 11% citywide. There are four times as many hazardous waste sites in BVHP than in any other part of the City.

- A 1999 study conducted by the Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now (ACORN) revealed that African-Americans in San Francisco received 254% more rejections than whites when they asked for mortgage loans.

- A May 2002 Harris Poll of 1,071 teachers supports the claim that state schooling is divided between haves and have-nots. The poll, financed by the
students' attorneys and the Rockefeller Foundation, suggests that low-income minority students are four times more likely than their wealthier white counterparts to experience high teacher turnover, and twice as likely to have old or insufficient textbooks at school. A poll of teachers at 1,018 California schools also suggests that ethnic background and family circumstances strongly predict whether students will encounter broken plumbing and even mice, rats and cockroaches in classrooms.

BVHP has been the target of systematic institutional neglect since the early 1940s. The City of San Francisco has failed to invest significantly in this community for over 60 years. It has been alleged that this neglect appears to be racially targeted, intentionally and traditionally. This neighborhood needs major investments in its infrastructure, not only to give the children who live there an equal chance at educational success, but also to show this community that it is, indeed, a part of the great city of San Francisco, with equal access to resources. It should not remain San Francisco’s “forgotten community.”

INVESTIGATIVE PROCESS
Members of the Civil Grand Jury interviewed representatives or employees of the following organizations:
San Francisco Unified School District (administrators, teachers, and social workers)
California Department of Education
Office of the City Attorney
United Educators of San Francisco
Dropout Prevention Office
Neighborhood activists
Neighborhood parents
San Francisco Redevelopment Agency

Members of the Civil Grand Jury reviewed the following materials:
SFUSD budget
SFUSD publication, “Excellence For All,” April 4, 2001
SFUSD “Student and Parent/Guardian Handbook”
“Bayview Learns Proposal for a High School in Bayview Hunters Point”
Demographic Analyses and Enrollment Forecasts for SFUSD, 2002
San Francisco Chronicle, May 1, 2002
SFUSD Statistics: School District Summary, Fall 2003
“Dream School Overview,” January 3, 2004
SFUSD and California Department of Education websites
Student Attendance Data
BVHP Historical Data from http://www.mastamind.com/BHP.htm, a Website of Kevin Epps, Director of award-winning film, Straight Outta Hunters Point
I. **LACK OF EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR BAYVIEW HUNTERS POINT STUDENTS**

Over the course of more than eight months, the Schools Committee of the Civil Grand Jury visited over 20 SFUSD schools and facilities, interviewing administrative staff as well as teachers and students--in particular, those from BVHP. The Grand Jury found that SFUSD and the City of San Francisco do not “provide each student with an equal opportunity” in Bayview Hunters Point, largely due to the lack of basic educational infrastructure in this community.

**FINDINGS**

1.1 At present there is only one high school, Thurgood Marshall, in BVHP, and it is designated as an open-enrollment school available to students from all city districts. Of the 1005 seats available in Thurgood Marshall, 335 students are from BVHP.

1.2 As of September 2003, 1523, or 79.8%, of high school students in this neighborhood travel to get an education; 34% travel more than 2 to 3 hours. This community is unique in that almost its entire high school population must leave the neighborhood to attend school, with the result that travel times compromise students’ ability to participate in after-school activities, reduce time for sleep and homework, and limit parent involvement in their children’s schools.

An April 2003 Harris Poll indicates that a great number of high school students already suffer from poor grades due to lack of sleep. Adding a long commute to a student’s day only serves to exacerbate the problem. According to the Harris poll:

Most high school students get less than eight hours of sleep on school nights, and one-third get less than seven. Those who get enough sleep do better in school, and vice-versa. Students who get less sleep are not only much more likely to fall asleep or daydream in class and to have difficulty paying attention, they are also much more likely to get poor grades and to consider dropping out of school.

1.3 38% of high school students in BVHP drop out of school before senior year.

1.4 The Bayview Hunters Point region has the lowest ratio of school seats to student population of any San Francisco school district.

1.5 Of the total 2004 K-12 population of BVHP, which amounts to 6116 students, 75%, or 4570 children, commute to school in another neighborhood. In no other District are so many K-8 grade children are required to travel as far for a quality education. The foregoing is based on May 2004 statistics provided by SFUSD.
1.6 Within the boundaries of Bayview Hunters Point there are 4080 children in K-8, but only 1,124 attend schools in the district. In other words, 2956, or 72%, are bused to schools outside their neighborhood. The foregoing is based on May 2004 statistics provided by SFUSD.

1.7 African-American students account for 14.7% of the SFUSD population, but they make up 38.9% of enrollment in the County Schools, the placement for SFUSD’s most troubled and difficult students.

1.8 Bayview Hunters Point high school students’ average GPA of 1.84 is the lowest of any group in the SFUSD.

1.9 The 1988 National Education Longitudinal Study found that middle-income parents were four times more likely than low-income parents to belong to the PTA and twice as likely to contact their children’s schools on academic matters.

**RECOMMENDATION**
SFUSD should provide the Bayview Hunters Point district with neighborhood schools commensurate to its population of eligible local students.

**REQUIRED RESPONSES**
Board of Education – 60 days
SFUSD- 60 Days

II. **LACK OF PLANNING FOR ADDITIONAL EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES FOR BVHP STUDENTS**

The 2003-2004 Civil Grand Jury investigated educational resources available to residents of the Bayview Hunters Point district and found that BVHP has lowest ratio of school seats to student population of any San Francisco school district. Additionally, the need for schools in this region is increasing, especially with the upcoming housing development being planned for an area that was the Hunters Point Shipyard.

**FINDINGS**

2.1 The Development of Parcel A of Hunters Point Shipyard should commence in the Fall of 2004. The developer, Lennar/BVHP, plans to build 1600 housing units.

2.2 Housing units are scheduled to open in 2006. These additional units will house families with children. The CGJ could not find that SFUSD and the Redevelopment Agency currently has plans to address an increased demand for schools in this district.
2.3 According to the 2002 report, “Demographic Analyses and Enrollment Forecasts for SFUSD,” an additional 1,037 students will come to reside in BVHP between 2006-2010, yet no recommendation for additional local schools has been made, and it appears that these additional children will also be bused to existing out-of-area facilities.

**RECOMMENDATION**
SFUSD and the Redevelopment Agency should forge a plan to build additional schools in the Bayview Hunters Point region in order to address projected needs arising from development of new housing.

**REQUIRED RESPONSES**
Board of Education – 60 days  
SFUSD- 60 Days  
San Francisco Redevelopment Agency – 60 days

### III. LACK OF OUTREACH FOR BVHP’S MOST CHALLENGED STUDENTS: WILL THEY BE LEFT BEHIND?

SFUSD has implemented a new educational program, Dream Schools, modeled after the successful Harlem, New York, plan. The District will implement this program in three poorly performing schools in BVHP—the first school to open in Fall 2004. These new schools have hand-picked, motivated teachers and principals; and students who attend them must have signed parental-support contracts, guaranteeing parental involvement. Many children in BVHP do not have traditional parental support.

**FINDINGS**

3.1 The 2003-2004 Civil Grand Jury investigated educational resources available to residents of the Bayview Hunters Point district. Over the course of eight months, the CGJ visited over 20 SFUSD schools and facilities, interviewing SFUSD staff as well as teachers and students from BVHP.

3.2 In January 2004, SFUSD announced a new program to improve academic achievement in three poorly performing BVHP schools; the new program, named Dream Schools, is described on the SFUSD website as (emphasis added):

Three Bayview-Hunter’s Point schools--Dr. Charles R. Drew, Gloria R. Davis and Twenty-First Century Academy--will mark the first of several sites for cutting-edge learning meant to boost students’ academic potential.
Dubbed “Dream Schools,” the rigorous, pre-school to college program is meant to accelerate the academic growth of students with high expectations, individualized academic plans, staff development and meaningful parental and community involvement.

The high-achieving schools are built around comprehensive instruction tied to standards and safe, structured learning environments, uniforms and nightly homework. The schools are modeled on the successful Frederick Douglass Academy created by Dr. Lorraine Monroe and featured on CBS’s 60 Minutes. Monroe took a Harlem, N.Y. school infamous for violence, low achievement and poor attendance and turned it into a scholastic powerhouse.

The San Francisco Dream Schools are rooted in the district’s strategic plan, “Excellence for All,” which is focused on creating excellent and equitable opportunities for all students throughout the city. The first three schools are expected to open in August 2004.

3.3 The CGJ found that in BVHP’s existing elementary and middle schools, as many as 80% of the children qualified for free or reduced-cost lunch programs. For example 86.8% at Gloria R. Davis qualify, but staff has identified that as many as 20-30% of their eligible students (equally true for other BVHP schools) do not return appropriate documentation and, therefore, are denied free or reduced-cost lunches, lack of parental support being cited in most cases. These students also are most likely to be low-performing students.

3.4 Children in these target Dream Schools have to have a “signed parental participation contract” in order to attend the converted Dream Schools next fall.

3.5 CGJ interviews with staff in these schools produced information that the same 20-30% of the children who’s parents aren’t signing up for free/reduced cost lunches are also not doing the paperwork necessary to enroll their children in the new Dream Schools. These are the children who will be left behind—the ones who most need a Dream School.

3.6 According to staff interviews, this 20-30% of BVHP students often come from the most troubled and dysfunctional families. A number of parents are incarcerated or are drug users. These children do not have the family support structure that allows for “a signed parental participation contract”. Hence, most of these children will not be attending the newly converted Dream School but will, in fact, be assigned or reassigned to other unenriched schools. The CGJ could find no specific plan for relocation of these children.

3.7 While the CGJ finds that Dream Schools offer a marked improvement over existing programs in present BVHP schools, the CGJ has great concern about the estimated 20-30% of children that will not be able to attend even their current
schools. The CGJ realizes that it is most likely that test scores for these schools will greatly improve, but accomplishing improvement by replacing lower performing students only improves the SFUSD’s overall test scores and fails to address the needs of children most in want.

3.8 Staff interviews in BVHP schools found that there is little outreach, via mail, telephone or home visits, to insure that students’ caretakers understand Dream Schools and can make enlightened decisions as to whether or not to enroll their children. Being transferred out of their schools due to a lack of custodial response is hardly fair to the children.

3.9 The CGJ holds the opinion that repurposing an existing BVHP school into a Dream School has little effect on the lack of educational resources in the BVHP region. The Dream Schools plan does not change the fact that Bayview Hunters Point will continue to have the lowest ratio of school seats to student population of any San Francisco school district.

**RECOMMENDATION**

SFUSD should undertake greater outreach in order to insure that eligible students get enrolled in Dream Schools and that students not eligible are given every opportunity to attend their current school next year with equal or improved resources.

**REQUIRED RESPONSES**

Board of Education – 60 days
SFUSD- 60 Days

**IV. LACK OF OUTREACH: MANY OF BVHP’S NEEDY CHILDREN CAN’T PARTICIPATE IN MEALS PROGRAMS**

BVHP schools have the highest percentage of children who qualify for free or reduced-fee lunch programs. A large portion of these children-- SFUSD staff estimate up to 30%--do not return the required paperwork, and there is very little outreach to assist them and their families.

**FINDINGS**

4.2 In BVHP’s existing elementary and middle schools, as many as 80% of the children qualify for free or reduced-cost lunch programs. For example, 86.8% at Gloria R. Davis qualify, but staff has identified that as many as 20-30% of the eligible students do not return appropriate documentation and, therefore, are denied free or reduced-cost lunches. In most cases, lack of parental support is cited as the root of the problem. These students also are most likely to be low-performing students.
4.3 Staff interviews gave the impression that there is little outreach, via mail, telephone or home visits, to insure that students’ caretakers or guardians are returning the very simple forms requesting free or reduced lunches.

**RECOMMENDATION**
SFUSD should undertake greater outreach in order to insure that students who are eligible for free or low-cost lunches are receiving them.

**REQUIRED RESPONSES**
Board of Education – 60 days
SFUSD- 60 Days
## Appendix 1

### Source: SFUSD web site statistics

#### 2003-2004 STUDENT ETHNIC REPRESENTATION by GRADE LEVEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(%) - Percent</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>OW</th>
<th>AA</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>A1</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>ONW</th>
<th>DS</th>
<th>MF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kgn</td>
<td>4235</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>52.7/47.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 01</td>
<td>4310</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>51.7/48.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 02</td>
<td>4326</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>52.4/47.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 03</td>
<td>4504</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>52.3/47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 04</td>
<td>4383</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>50.6/49.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 05</td>
<td>4515</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>50.7/49.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 06</td>
<td>4298</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>51.7/48.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 07</td>
<td>4406</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>52.4/47.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 08</td>
<td>4385</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>52.6/47.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 09</td>
<td>5353</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>52.5/47.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 10</td>
<td>4954</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>50.8/49.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 11</td>
<td>4396</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>52.3/47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 12</td>
<td>4151</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>49.2/50.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total %</strong></td>
<td><strong>21.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>10.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>14.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>31.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>11.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>51.7/48.3</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total #</strong></td>
<td>58216</td>
<td>12459</td>
<td>5830</td>
<td>8550</td>
<td>18021</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>3840</td>
<td>6868</td>
<td>1233</td>
<td>30100/28116</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1996 STUDENT ETHNIC REPRESENTATION by GRADE LEVEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(%) - Percent</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>OW</th>
<th>AA</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>A1</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>ONW</th>
<th>DS</th>
<th>MF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total %</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total #</td>
<td>61198</td>
<td>12796</td>
<td>7763</td>
<td>10278</td>
<td>16682</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>4626</td>
<td>7301</td>
<td>31533/29695</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2003-2004 COUNTY SCHOOLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(%) - Percent</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>OW</th>
<th>AA</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>A1</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>ONW</th>
<th>DS</th>
<th>MF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1210</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>62.0/38.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **L** = Latino
- **OW** = Other White
- **AA** = African American
- **C** = Chinese
- **J** = Japanese
- **K** = Korean
- **A1** = American Indian
- **F** = Filipino
- **ONW** = Other Non-White
- **DS** = did not disclose
- **MF** = Male/Female
### Appendix 2

**Historical Racial Composition of BVHP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian, Eskimo,</td>
<td>0.42%</td>
<td>0.39%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aleut Population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>24.63%</td>
<td>19.90%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Population</td>
<td>47.73%</td>
<td>63.63%</td>
<td>74.9%</td>
<td>69.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian and Other</td>
<td>3.51%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander Alone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Population</td>
<td>9.99%</td>
<td>4.52%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Population</td>
<td>9.66%</td>
<td>11.54%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>4.07%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Ethnicity</td>
<td>16.73%</td>
<td>9.47%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>83.27%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Population</strong></td>
<td>33,355</td>
<td>27,295</td>
<td>20,652</td>
<td>29,079</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Census data from different decades tracked different categories, for example prior to 2000, the Pacific Islander and Native Hawaiian were combined with the Asian category.