



Exam School Task Force

6.28.21

Overall Simulation Assumptions

- Assumptions within simulations:
 - 1,000 invitations to distribute
 - Students attending a 6th grade school with 50%+ economically disadvantaged students receive an additional 10% of total possible points on their overall score.
- Data set for the simulation:
 - 7th grade applicants for SY20-21
 - Incorporates ISEE scores in place of MAP Growth
 - Re-calculated GPA using Fall grades only -- GPA is not rounded
- Considerations to keep in mind:
 - Simulation does not incorporate school preference
 - Does not incorporate any eligibility criteria -- if students had a GPA and test score, they are considered eligible
 - Missing census tract data for students outside of Boston (16 students in this data set)
 - Economically disadvantaged data by school is from DESE and is only available for BPS and Charter schools.
 - *NOTE: for simplicity, simulation tables shared reflect tier option 5. Results using tier options 1 and 6 are in the appendix. These three options include the variable related to English language.*

Simulations Reminders

- The simulations can only provide a sense of what may happen with proposed changes this year and should not be interpreted as definitive results.
 - The task force is proposing to include science and social studies grades, which are not incorporated into the simulations.
 - The current district assessment contract is with NWEA for MAP Growth. The simulation uses ISEE scores because MAP Growth results are not available.
 - Applicants for the next admissions cycle may not be distributed across the city in the same way applicants were for the SY20-21 admissions cycle.
 - The grades proposed to be used (SY21-22 grades) have not yet been recorded.
 - The simulations do not take into account student preference.

Correction to Previous Simulations Shared

- While the previous simulations shared incorporated ISEE and GPA at 50% each, the ISEE scores were incorrectly scaled, resulting in less differentiation between scores. This error has been corrected in all simulations shared tonight.
 - In the ISEE, there are 4 sections (reading, math, quantitative, verbal). Each section has a scaled score from 760 - 940, resulting in a total possible score of 3,760. This number was incorrectly used to determine the proportion of points earned. The correct number to use is 720, because each of the 4 sections has 180 possible points.
 - This benefitted students with lower ISEE scores.
- The impact on the simulation results is primarily in the 20% of invitations.

Correction to Previous Simulations Shared: by Economic Status

ORIGINAL FROM 6.23 -- 50/50 W/ High Poverty Indicator

Economic Status	Simulations (20% + 80% Separate)				Simulations (20% + 80% Together)		
	20%	80% Tier Option 1	80% Tier Option 5	80% Tier Option 6	20% + 80% Tier Option 1	20% + 80% Tier Option 5	20% + 80% Tier Option 6
Economically Disadvantaged	48%	57%	57%	57%	55%	55%	55%
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	52%	44%	43%	44%	45%	45%	45%

ORIGINAL FROM 6.23 -- 50/50 W/ High Poverty Indicator

Economic Status	Simulations (100% Tiers Distribution)		
	100% Tier Option 1	100% Tier Option 5	100% Tier Option 6
Economically Disadvantaged	56%	57%	57%
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	44%	43%	43%

UPDATED FROM 6.27 -- 50/50 W/ High Poverty Indicator

Economic Status	Simulations (20% + 80% Separate)				Simulations (20% + 80% Together)		
	20%	80% Tier Option 1	80% Tier Option 5	80% Tier Option 6	20% + 80% Tier Option 1	20% + 80% Tier Option 5	20% + 80% Tier Option 6
Economically Disadvantaged	36%	55%	54%	55%	51%	51%	51%
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	65%	45%	46%	45%	49%	49%	49%

UPDATED FROM 6.27 -- 50/50 W/ High Poverty Indicator

Economic Status	Simulations (100% Tiers Distribution)		
	100% Tier Option 1	100% Tier Option 5	100% Tier Option 6
Economically Disadvantaged	54%	54%	54%
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	46%	46%	46%

Correction to Previous Simulations Shared: by Zip Code (20/80)

Note: Yellow highlights indicate 2+ percentage point change in either direction.

ORIGINAL FROM 6.23 -- 50/50 W/ High Poverty Indicator

Zip Code	Neighborhood	Simulations (20% + 80% Separate)				Simulations (20% + 80% Together)		
		20%	80% Tier Option 1	80% Tier Option 5	80% Tier Option 6	20% + 80% Tier Option 1	20% + 80% Tier Option 5	20% + 80% Tier Option 6
2108	Beacon Hill	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%
2109	Downtown	0.0%	0.4%	0.4%	0.4%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%
2110	Downtown	0.0%	0.5%	0.5%	0.5%	0.4%	0.4%	0.4%
2111	Chinatown	1.5%	1.8%	2.1%	1.9%	1.7%	2.0%	1.8%
2113	North End	0.0%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	0.5%	0.5%	0.5%
2114	Beacon Hill / West End	0.0%	1.3%	1.0%	1.4%	1.0%	0.8%	1.1%
2115	Longwood/Fenway	1.0%	2.0%	2.1%	1.8%	1.8%	1.9%	1.6%
2116	Back Bay	0.0%	1.6%	1.6%	1.6%	1.3%	1.3%	1.3%
2118	South End	2.5%	3.8%	3.8%	3.5%	3.5%	3.5%	3.3%
2119	Roxbury	2.0%	4.5%	4.6%	4.6%	4.0%	4.1%	4.1%
2120	Roxbury	1.0%	1.9%	2.3%	1.9%	1.7%	2.0%	1.7%
2121	Dorchester	4.5%	7.0%	6.3%	6.8%	6.5%	5.9%	6.3%
2122	Dorchester	12.5%	6.0%	6.6%	7.0%	7.3%	7.8%	8.1%
2124	Dorchester	14.5%	9.6%	9.3%	9.6%	10.6%	10.3%	10.6%
2125	Dorchester	7.0%	6.6%	6.5%	6.5%	6.7%	6.6%	6.6%
2126	Mattapan	3.0%	4.8%	4.5%	4.6%	4.4%	4.2%	4.3%
2127	South Boston	3.0%	2.8%	3.3%	3.0%	2.8%	3.2%	3.0%
2128	East Boston	6.0%	12.8%	12.8%	13.5%	11.4%	11.4%	12.0%
2129	Charlestown	1.5%	2.6%	2.8%	2.5%	2.4%	2.5%	2.3%
2130	Jamaica Plain	5.5%	4.4%	4.5%	4.3%	4.6%	4.7%	4.5%
2131	Roslindale	9.0%	5.1%	5.0%	5.0%	5.9%	5.8%	5.8%
2132	West Roxbury	5.5%	5.9%	6.1%	5.8%	5.8%	6.0%	5.7%
2134	Allston	3.5%	2.4%	2.4%	2.1%	2.6%	2.6%	2.4%
2135	Brighton	6.5%	4.1%	4.1%	3.9%	4.6%	4.6%	4.4%
2136	Hyde Park	10.0%	6.6%	5.9%	6.3%	7.3%	6.7%	7.0%
2163	Allston	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
2199	Back Bay	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
2210	South Boston Waterfront	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%
2215	Fenway/Kenmore	0.0%	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%
2467	Chestnut Hill	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

UPDATED FROM 6.27 -- 50/50 W/ High Poverty Indicator

Neighborhood	Simulations (20% + 80% Separate)				Simulations (20% + 80% Together)		
	20%	80% Tier Option 1	80% Tier Option 5	80% Tier Option 6	20% + 80% Tier Option 1	20% + 80% Tier Option 5	20% + 80% Tier Option 6
Beacon Hill	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%
Downtown	0.0%	0.5%	0.5%	0.5%	0.4%	0.4%	0.4%
Downtown	0.0%	0.4%	0.5%	0.4%	0.3%	0.4%	0.3%
Chinatown	1.5%	2.1%	2.8%	2.1%	2.0%	2.5%	2.0%
North End	1.0%	0.4%	0.3%	0.4%	0.5%	0.4%	0.5%
Beacon Hill / West End	1.5%	1.1%	1.1%	1.1%	1.2%	1.2%	1.2%
Longwood/Fenway	1.0%	2.4%	2.3%	2.3%	2.1%	2.0%	2.0%
Back Bay	4.5%	1.3%	1.3%	1.3%	1.9%	1.9%	1.9%
South End	4.0%	3.6%	4.0%	3.5%	3.7%	4.0%	3.6%
Roxbury	1.0%	4.6%	5.1%	5.1%	3.9%	4.3%	4.3%
Roxbury	1.0%	2.1%	2.8%	1.9%	1.9%	2.4%	1.7%
Dorchester	1.0%	6.6%	6.3%	6.8%	5.5%	5.2%	5.6%
Dorchester	11.5%	6.4%	6.5%	6.6%	7.4%	7.5%	7.6%
Dorchester	13.5%	8.8%	9.1%	8.9%	9.7%	10.0%	9.8%
Dorchester	6.0%	6.4%	6.1%	6.4%	6.3%	6.1%	6.3%
Mattapan	2.0%	4.1%	3.8%	4.5%	3.7%	3.4%	4.0%
South Boston	2.0%	3.3%	3.6%	3.4%	3.0%	3.3%	3.1%
East Boston	3.0%	12.4%	11.3%	12.5%	10.5%	9.6%	10.6%
Charlestown	3.0%	3.0%	3.1%	3.0%	3.0%	3.1%	3.0%
Jamaica Plain	8.0%	4.5%	4.9%	4.5%	5.2%	5.5%	5.2%
Roslindale	10.0%	5.3%	5.0%	5.1%	6.2%	6.0%	6.1%
West Roxbury	9.0%	6.1%	6.3%	6.1%	6.7%	6.8%	6.7%
Allston	2.0%	2.3%	2.1%	2.1%	2.2%	2.1%	2.1%
Brighton	6.0%	4.3%	4.1%	3.8%	4.6%	4.5%	4.2%
Hyde Park	7.0%	7.4%	6.6%	7.1%	7.3%	6.7%	7.1%
Allston	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Back Bay	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
South Boston Waterfront	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%
Fenway/Kenmore	0.5%	0.8%	0.6%	0.6%	0.7%	0.6%	0.6%
Chestnut Hill	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Homeless/DCF	Not used				Not used		

Correction to Previous Simulations Shared: by Race

ORIGINAL FROM 6.23 -- 50/50 W/ High Poverty Indicator							
Race	Simulations (20% + 80% Separate)				Simulations (20% + 80% Together)		
	20%	80% Tier Option 1	80% Tier Option 5	80% Tier Option 6	20% + 80% Tier Option 1	20% + 80% Tier Option 5	20% + 80% Tier Option 6
Asian	28%	18%	18%	17%	20%	20%	19%
Black	17%	22%	22%	23%	21%	21%	22%
Latinx	23%	34%	34%	34%	32%	32%	32%
Multi-Race/Other	4%	5%	5%	4%	4%	4%	4%
White	28%	22%	22%	22%	23%	23%	23%

UPDATED FROM 6.27 -- 50/50 W/ High Poverty Indicator							
Race	Simulations (20% + 80% Separate)				Simulations (20% + 80% Together)		
	20%	80% Tier Option 1	80% Tier Option 5	80% Tier Option 6	20% + 80% Tier Option 1	20% + 80% Tier Option 5	20% + 80% Tier Option 6
Asian	33%	18%	19%	18%	21%	21%	21%
Black	11%	21%	21%	22%	19%	19%	20%
Latinx	15%	32%	32%	32%	29%	29%	29%
Multi-Race/Other	5%	5%	4%	4%	5%	4%	4%
White	38%	24%	24%	23%	27%	27%	26%

ORIGINAL FROM 6.23 -- 50/50 W/ High Poverty Indicator			
Race	Simulations (100% Tiers Distribution)		
	100% Tier Option 1	100% Tier Option 5	100% Tier Option 6
Asian	19%	20%	19%
Black	22%	22%	23%
Latinx	32%	32%	33%
Multi-Race/Other	4%	4%	4%
White	22%	22%	21%

UPDATED FROM 6.27 -- 50/50 W/ High Poverty Indicator			
Race	Simulations (100% Tiers Distribution)		
	100% Tier Option 1	100% Tier Option 5	100% Tier Option 6
Asian	20%	21%	20%
Black	21%	21%	21%
Latinx	31%	31%	32%
Multi-Race/Other	4%	4%	5%
White	24%	24%	23%

Simulation Overview

Weighting of Composite Score	Mechanism		
	20% Citywide Rank, 80% Tiers Rank	100% Tiers Rank	20% Citywide Rank, 40% Tiers Rank, 40% Tiers Lottery*
50% GPA, 50% Assessment, +10% high poverty school indicator	Simulation 3A	Simulation 4A	Simulation 5A
60% GPA, 40% Assessment, +10% high poverty school indicator	Simulation 3B	Simulation 4B	Simulation 5B
70% GPA, 30% Assessment, +10% high poverty school indicator	Simulation 3C	Simulation 4C	Simulation 5C
80% GPA, 20% Assessment, +10% high poverty school indicator	Simulation 3D	Simulation 4D	Simulation 5D

*NOTE: the 40% tiers qualified lottery is not able to be simulated at this time due to not having a cut-off composite score to determine students eligible for the lottery. Simulations that use the 20-40-40 methodology will display data for the 20% city rank and 40% tiers rank only.

Simulations Summary: By Economic Status with High Poverty Indicator

Tier Option 5

Economic Status	SY20-21 Invitees	SY21-22 Invitees		
		Overall	20%	80%
Economically Disadvantaged	35%	43%	30%	46%
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	65%	57%	70%	54%

Economic Status	A. 50% Assessment, 50% GPA			B. 40% Assessment, 60% GPA			C. 30% Assessment, 70% GPA			D. 20% Assessment, 80% GPA		
	3. 20-80	4. 100	5. 20-40	3. 20-80	4. 100	5. 20-40	3. 20-80	4. 100	5. 20-40	3. 20-80	4. 100	5. 20-40
Economically Disadvantaged	51%	54%	45%	51%	54%	46%	52%	54%	48%	53%	54%	50%
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	49%	46%	55%	49%	46%	54%	48%	46%	52%	47%	46%	50%

*NOTE: the 40% tiers qualified lottery is not able to be simulated at this time due to not having a cut-off composite score to determine students eligible for the lottery. Simulations that use the 20-40-40 methodology will display data for the 20% city rank and 40% tiers rank only.

Simulations Summary: By Zip Code with High Poverty Indicator

Tier Option 5

Zip Code	Neighborhood	SY20-21 Invitees	SY21-22 Invitees		
			Overall	20%	80%
2108	Beacon Hill	0.1%	0.6%	1.5%	0.4%
2109	Downtown	0.7%	0.2%	0.5%	0.1%
2110	Downtown	0.7%	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%
2111	Chinatown	2.3%	0.7%	0.5%	0.8%
2113	North End	0.7%	0.2%	0.0%	0.3%
2114	Beacon Hill / West End	1.9%	0.7%	1.0%	0.6%
2115	Longwood/Fenway	1.4%	1.0%	0.0%	1.3%
2116	Back Bay	2.6%	1.3%	1.5%	1.3%
2118	South End	3.5%	2.8%	1.5%	3.1%
2119	Roxbury	2.6%	5.1%	2.6%	5.8%
2120	Roxbury	1.6%	1.1%	0.0%	1.4%
2121	Dorchester	2.6%	6.9%	3.6%	7.7%
2122	Dorchester	6.1%	4.9%	7.2%	4.4%
2124	Dorchester	8.2%	11.2%	8.7%	11.8%
2125	Dorchester	4.6%	6.1%	6.7%	5.9%
2126	Mattapan	2.0%	5.2%	4.1%	5.5%
2127	South Boston	3.3%	3.6%	2.1%	4.0%
2128	East Boston	5.6%	7.7%	4.6%	8.5%
2129	Charlestown	5.5%	3.6%	6.7%	2.8%
2130	Jamaica Plain	7.5%	5.5%	8.2%	4.9%
2131	Roslindale	9.2%	6.9%	9.7%	6.2%
2132	West Roxbury	13.0%	7.1%	16.9%	4.6%
2134	Allston	1.7%	1.1%	1.0%	1.2%
2135	Brighton	5.1%	3.0%	0.5%	3.6%
2136	Hyde Park	6.5%	6.9%	4.6%	7.4%
2163	Allston	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%
2199	Back Bay	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
2210	South Boston Waterfront	0.2%	0.2%	0.5%	0.1%
2215	Fenway/Kenmore	0.8%	0.2%	0.0%	0.3%
2467	Chestnut Hill	0.3%	0.4%	1.0%	0.3%
9999	Homeless/DCF	Not used	5.4%	4.6%	5.6%

Neighborhood	A. 50% Assessment, 50% GPA			B. 40% Assessment, 60% GPA			C. 30% Assessment, 70% GPA			D. 20% Assessment, 80% GPA		
	3. 20-80	4. 100	5. 20-40	3. 20-80	4. 100	5. 20-40	3. 20-80	4. 100	5. 20-40	3. 20-80	4. 100	5. 20-40
Beacon Hill	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%
Downtown	0.4%	0.4%	0.5%	0.4%	0.4%	0.7%	0.4%	0.4%	0.7%	0.4%	0.4%	0.5%
Downtown	0.4%	0.3%	0.5%	0.4%	0.4%	0.5%	0.4%	0.4%	0.5%	0.4%	0.4%	0.7%
Chinatown	2.5%	2.5%	2.7%	2.3%	2.3%	2.5%	2.3%	2.2%	2.3%	2.0%	2.1%	2.2%
North End	0.4%	0.3%	0.3%	0.5%	0.4%	0.3%	0.5%	0.5%	0.5%	0.5%	0.5%	0.7%
Beacon Hill / West End	1.2%	1.1%	1.3%	1.2%	1.1%	1.3%	1.4%	0.9%	1.3%	1.3%	1.1%	1.2%
Longwood/Fenway	1.8%	2.0%	2.0%	2.0%	2.0%	2.0%	1.9%	2.0%	1.8%	1.9%	2.0%	1.7%
Back Bay	1.9%	1.6%	2.2%	1.7%	1.4%	2.2%	1.6%	1.4%	2.0%	1.5%	1.3%	2.0%
South End	4.0%	4.2%	3.8%	3.7%	3.8%	3.8%	3.4%	3.5%	3.8%	3.5%	3.4%	3.5%
Roxbury	4.3%	4.6%	3.3%	4.2%	4.5%	3.0%	4.3%	4.5%	3.5%	4.5%	4.5%	4.2%
Roxbury	2.4%	2.7%	2.2%	2.2%	2.7%	2.0%	2.2%	2.5%	1.8%	2.1%	2.4%	1.8%
Dorchester	5.2%	6.0%	4.2%	5.3%	6.0%	4.7%	5.3%	5.9%	4.8%	5.7%	6.2%	5.0%
Dorchester	7.5%	7.7%	7.3%	7.6%	7.8%	7.8%	7.7%	8.0%	8.0%	7.9%	8.3%	8.7%
Dorchester	10.0%	10.0%	9.7%	10.2%	10.0%	9.7%	10.6%	10.3%	10.5%	10.4%	10.5%	10.8%
Dorchester	6.1%	6.3%	6.8%	6.2%	6.3%	6.8%	6.5%	6.5%	7.3%	6.4%	6.5%	7.0%
Mattapan	3.4%	4.1%	2.7%	3.6%	4.1%	2.3%	3.6%	4.2%	2.5%	4.0%	4.3%	2.8%
South Boston	3.3%	3.2%	2.3%	3.1%	3.3%	2.3%	3.2%	3.6%	2.5%	3.2%	3.6%	2.7%
East Boston	9.6%	10.9%	8.3%	9.7%	11.0%	8.2%	9.9%	10.7%	8.2%	10.4%	10.7%	9.0%
Charlestown	3.1%	2.7%	3.0%	2.9%	2.6%	3.0%	2.7%	2.4%	2.8%	2.7%	2.4%	2.8%
Jamaica Plain	5.5%	5.1%	7.3%	5.5%	5.1%	7.0%	5.4%	5.3%	6.2%	5.2%	5.3%	5.5%
Roslindale	6.0%	5.3%	6.5%	6.2%	5.4%	6.8%	5.9%	5.3%	6.7%	5.7%	5.0%	6.3%
West Roxbury	6.8%	5.8%	7.7%	6.7%	6.0%	7.0%	6.6%	5.8%	6.3%	6.1%	5.6%	5.3%
Allston	2.1%	2.1%	2.5%	2.2%	2.2%	2.5%	2.3%	2.6%	2.5%	2.4%	2.5%	2.7%
Brighton	4.5%	4.2%	5.2%	4.5%	4.3%	5.2%	4.4%	4.2%	5.3%	4.5%	4.2%	4.8%
Hyde Park	6.7%	6.2%	7.0%	6.8%	6.1%	7.7%	6.6%	6.1%	7.3%	6.4%	6.0%	7.5%
Allston	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Back Bay	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
South Boston Waterfront	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%
Fenway/Kenmore	0.6%	0.6%	0.7%	0.7%	0.6%	0.7%	0.7%	0.6%	0.7%	0.6%	0.6%	0.7%
Chestnut Hill	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Homeless/DCF	Not used			Not used			Not used			Not used		

*NOTE: the 40% tiers qualified lottery is not able to be simulated at this time due to not having a cut-off composite score to determine students eligible for the lottery. Simulations that use the 20-40-40 methodology will display data for the 20% city rank and 40% tiers rank only.

Simulations Summary: By Race with High Poverty Indicator

Tier Option 5

Race	SY20-21 Invitees	SY21-22 Invitees		
		Overall	20%	80%
Asian	21%	18%	15%	18%
Black	13%	23%	14%	25%
Latinx	21%	23%	18%	24%
Multi-Race/Other	5%	6%	7%	5%
White	40%	31%	46%	27%

Race	A. 50% Assessment, 50% GPA			B. 40% Assessment, 60% GPA			C. 30% Assessment, 70% GPA			D. 20% Assessment, 80% GPA		
	3. 20-80	4. 100	5. 20-40	3. 20-80	4. 100	5. 20-40	3. 20-80	4. 100	5. 20-40	3. 20-80	4. 100	5. 20-40
Asian	21%	21%	25%	21%	21%	24%	21%	21%	24%	20%	20%	22%
Black	19%	21%	17%	20%	20%	18%	20%	21%	19%	20%	21%	19%
Latinx	29%	31%	24%	28%	31%	25%	30%	31%	25%	31%	32%	27%
Multi-Race/Other	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%	5%
White	27%	24%	30%	26%	24%	29%	26%	24%	29%	25%	24%	27%

*NOTE: the 40% tiers qualified lottery is not able to be simulated at this time due to not having a cut-off composite score to determine students eligible for the lottery. Simulations that use the 20-40-40 methodology will display data for the 20% city rank and 40% tiers rank only.

Simulations Reminders

- The simulations can only provide a sense of what may happen with proposed changes this year and should not be interpreted as definitive results.
 - The task force is proposing to include science and social studies grades, which are not incorporated into the simulations.
 - The current district assessment contract is with NWEA for MAP Growth. The simulation uses ISEE scores because MAP Growth results are not available.
 - Applicants for the next admissions cycle may not be distributed across the city in the same way applicants were for the SY20-21 admissions cycle.
 - The grades proposed to be used (SY21-22 grades) have not yet been recorded.
 - The simulations do not take into account student preference.