



THEE INSTITUTE

Silicon Valley Equity in Education Institute

THE DATA BEHIND THE DIVIDE

Racial Inequities, Demographic Shifts, and the
Future of Education in Silicon Valley



Dr. Cheryl Ingram
Srishti Gojamgunde
Ed Alvarez

April 2026

| SVEEI White Paper Series

This report was developed by the Silicon Valley Equity in Education Institute (SVEEI) through a comprehensive review and synthesis of publicly available California Department of Education (CDE) data sets, including the California School Dashboard, CAASPP student achievement files, graduation and A–G completion reports, suspension and chronic absenteeism files, fiscal expenditure reports, and staffing ratio data. District-level data were analyzed and cross-referenced with regional contextual indicators, including American Community Survey data and Alameda County demographic reports. The Oakland Unified School District data profile referenced in this report was compiled using official CDE datasets and district reporting sources (California Department of Education [CDE], 2024; Silicon Valley Equity in Education Institute [SVEEI], 2025)

All analyses were conducted using the most recent available 2024–2025 reporting year to ensure consistency and comparability across districts.

Cheryl Ingram, PhD, Lead Author

Srishti Gojamgunde, Co-Author and Lead Research Analyst

Abstract	3
The Data Behind the Divide: Racial Inequities, Demographic Shifts, and the Future of Education in Silicon Valley	4
Demographic Shifts and Achievement Gaps: A Dual Equity Crisis in Oakland	4
Table A. Number of Students by Race/Ethnicity	4
Declining Enrollment and Racial Redistribution	5
Causes of Enrollment Decline	5
Table B: Oakland Demographic and Economic Indicators, 2018–2024 (ACS 5-Year Estimates)	6
Chronic Absenteeism as a Structural Indicator of Disengagement	7
Table C: Chronic Absenteeism Rates by Student Group (2021–2025)	7
Table D: Student Characteristics and Grade Levels	8
Persistent Achievement Gaps Across a Changing Student Population	9
Table E: ELA and Math Proficiency by Grade Level and Student Group (2025)	10
Table F: Change in Proficiency (2021-2025)	11
A Dual Equity Crisis: Displacement and Underperformance	11
Implications for Educational and Economic Equity	12
1. Constrained Access to Postsecondary and STEM Pathways	12
2. Workforce Exclusion in a High-Skill Regional Economy	12
3. Intergenerational Economic Inequality and Structural Stratification	13
Moving Forward: Aligning Demographics, Outcomes, and Investment	13
Advancing Equity Through Action: SVEEI’s Strategy	14
1. AI Collaboration and Strategy	14
2. AI Research in Education	15
3. Workforce Readiness Development and AI	15
References	16

Abstract

This study examines the intersection of demographic transformation and persistent educational inequities within the Oakland Unified School District, revealing a dual equity crisis. Drawing on a comprehensive analysis of California Department of Education datasets from 2020 to 2025, the study identifies two converging patterns: the disproportionate decline of Black/African American student enrollment and the sustained underperformance of Latino/a/x students, who now comprise the majority of the district's population. While overall enrollment has decreased, this decline reflects not a contraction of the student population, but a structural redistribution shaped by housing displacement, economic stratification, and shifting access to educational opportunity.

Findings further demonstrate that academic disparities across English Language Arts and mathematics remain both substantial and persistent, with gaps widening as students progress through grade levels. Chronic absenteeism emerges as a critical structural indicator, disproportionately affecting students experiencing intersecting vulnerabilities, including poverty, disability, and housing instability. These patterns underscore that educational inequities are not isolated outcomes but are embedded within broader social and economic systems that shape student access, engagement, and achievement.

This study advances a critical reframing of equity, arguing that demographic change alone does not yield improved outcomes and may, in fact, obscure deepening disparities if not accompanied by intentional, equity-centered intervention. The implications extend beyond K–12 education, positioning academic inequity as a precursor to workforce exclusion and constrained economic mobility in innovation-driven regions such as Silicon Valley. In response, this study outlines a strategic framework for systemic transformation by integrating artificial intelligence, data-driven research, and workforce-aligned educational pathways. Ultimately, the findings call for a fundamental shift from reactive equity efforts to proactive, structurally embedded solutions that align with demographic realities to ensure equitable access to opportunity.

The Data Behind the Divide: Racial Inequities, Demographic Shifts, and the Future of Education in Silicon Valley

Demographic Shifts and Achievement Gaps: A Dual Equity Crisis in Oakland

Oakland Unified School District is not only experiencing declining enrollment but is also undergoing a significant racial and demographic transformation with direct implications for educational equity. Between the 2020–2021 and 2024–2025 school years, total student enrollment declined from 48,704 to 44,647, a reduction of more than 4,000 students. However, this decline has not been evenly distributed across racial groups (Ramos & Jani, 2025). Instead, the data reveal a pattern of racial redistribution that, when examined alongside student achievement outcomes, exposes a dual equity crisis within the district (see Table A below).

Table A. Number of Students by Race/Ethnicity

Year	Black/ AA	American Indian	Asian	Filipino	Hispanic or Latin	Not Reported	Pacific Islander	Two or More Races	White	Total
2020-21	10551	111	5620	402	23264	1072	412	2482	4790	48704
2021-22	9672	104	5024	352	22634	1438	379	2561	4436	46600
2022-23	9188	104	4608	342	22583	1551	323	2713	4329	45741
2023-24	9008	112	4252	304	22647	1178	312	2722	4551	45086
2024-25	8724	124	4061	315	22737	1198	304	2705	4479	44647

Note: The “Not Reported” column represents students whose race and ethnicity were not specified or disclosed in district reporting. Fluctuations in this group may reflect changes in data collection practices, reporting accuracy, or family self-identification rather than true demographic shifts. As such, trends within the “Not Reported” category should be interpreted with caution and are not included in comparative analyses of racial demographic changes.

Declining Enrollment and Racial Redistribution

The most significant demographic shift over this period is the sharp decline in Black/African American student enrollment. The number of Black/African American students dropped from 10,551 to 8,724, a decrease of approximately 17 percent. This represents the largest absolute and proportional decline among major racial groups and reflects broader patterns of displacement, including rising housing costs, outmigration from Oakland, and shifts toward alternative schooling options. The result is not simply a reduction in the student population, but a transformation in the district's racial composition.

At the same time, Latino/a/x students have remained relatively stable in number, declining only slightly from 23,264 to 22,737, and continue to represent the largest student group in the district. As other populations decline more sharply, Latino/a/x students are becoming an increasingly dominant share of Oakland's public school population. This shift positions Latino/a/x students at the center of the district's educational outcomes and future workforce pipeline.

Asian student enrollment has also declined substantially, falling from 5,620 to 4,061, a decrease of nearly 28 percent. While this group continues to demonstrate relatively strong academic outcomes, its shrinking presence contributes to a changing distribution of high-performing student populations within the district. White student enrollment has declined modestly, while the number of students identifying as two or more races has increased slightly, reflecting growing demographic complexity. These trends indicate that Oakland is not simply losing students; it is undergoing a reconfiguration of who remains in the system. This reconfiguration must be understood in tandem with achievement outcomes to fully assess its implications (Noguera, 2004).

Causes of Enrollment Decline

While these demographic shifts reflect who is leaving and who remains, they do not fully explain why enrollment is declining at such a sustained rate. The data point to a convergence of structural, economic, and policy-driven forces that are reshaping who is able and willing to remain in Oakland's public school system. Rising housing costs across the Bay Area have displaced families, particularly Black/African American and working-class households, out of Oakland at accelerated rates. At the same time, school closures, safety concerns, and perceptions of declining school quality have eroded trust in the district, prompting families to seek alternatives, including charter and private schools. These decisions are not isolated; they reflect broader patterns of educational sorting, where access to stable, well-resourced learning environments increasingly depends on economic mobility.

City-level Census data reinforce these structural pressures. As shown in Table B, Oakland's median household income rose from \$68,442 in 2018 to \$101,600 in 2024, an increase of nearly 48 percent, while median home values climbed from \$627,800 to \$929,900 over the same period. Poverty rates declined from 17.6 to 13.4 percent, and homeownership remained persistently low, hovering between 40 and 42 percent throughout. Taken together, these trends are consistent with patterns of neighborhood gentrification rather than broad-based economic uplift, signaling that higher-income households are entering Oakland as lower-income families are pushed out. Critically, the number of families with children under 18 remained relatively stable, ranging from approximately 37,000 to 39,000, and suggesting that the pool of potential OUSD students did not shrink substantially. This gap between a stable family population and declining enrollment further implicates displacement, school choice, and eroding institutional trust as primary drivers, rather than simple demographic contraction.

Table B: Oakland Demographic and Economic Indicators, 2018–2024 (ACS 5-Year Estimates)

	Median Household Income	Median Home Value	Unemployment Rate	Poverty Rate	Homeownership Rate	Families with Children Under 18
Year						
2018	68442	627800	6.61 %	17.63 %	40.36 %	37308
2019	73692	687400	6.07 %	16.74 %	40.74 %	37345
2020	80143	730000	5.97 %	14.63 %	40.85 %	36369
2021	85628	772400	6.19 %	13.51 %	41.29 %	38270
2022	94389	883800	5.80 %	13.21 %	42.07 %	38040
2023	97369	924700	5.99 %	13.68 %	41.71 %	38766
2024	101600	929900	6.37 %	13.38 %	42.33 %	38749

In addition to these local pressures, broader national and policy-level dynamics have also reshaped enrollment patterns. The number of newcomer students, particularly immigrant youth entering the district, has dropped dramatically, reaching its lowest level in over a decade. This decline is not simply demographic, but political. District staff attributes this shift, in part, to federal immigration policies and a growing perception

among immigrant families that they are unwelcome or unsafe. The result is a contraction of one of the few populations that has historically contributed to enrollment stability in urban districts. Taken together, these factors suggest that declining enrollment is not merely a function of population change, but a reflection of systemic conditions that influence where families feel secure, supported, and able to access opportunity.

Chronic Absenteeism as a Structural Indicator of Disengagement

Beyond enrollment decline, chronic absenteeism reveals a deeper, more immediate crisis among the students who remain. Between 2021 and 2023, absenteeism rates across all student groups surged dramatically, reflecting the destabilizing effects of the COVID-19 pandemic and its aftermath.

Table C: Chronic Absenteeism Rates by Student Group (2021–2025)

Student Group	2021	21–22	22–23	23–24	24–25	(21→25)
African American	28.9	55.6	61.8	43.1	41.3	12.4
American Indian/Alaska Native	29.6	57.9	57.5	48.3	45.2	15.6
Asian	7.5	22.7	28.5	14.7	13.1	5.6
Filipino	13.9	32.1	42.5	21.2	16	2.1
Hispanic/Latino/a/x	19.1	48.2	55.6	34.3	31.5	12.4
Pacific Islander	37.8	75.9	82.7	59.8	60.2	22.4
Two or More Races	8.9	30.3	49	24.2	21	12.1
White	5.6	21.8	44.4	19.7	16.4	10.8
Total	18.2	43.5	52.9	32.4	29.8	11.6

As shown in Table B, district-wide absenteeism more than doubled, rising from 18.2 percent in 2021 to a peak of 52.9 percent in 2022–2023 before declining slightly in subsequent years. However, this aggregate trend masks significant disparities across student populations (see Table C). A closer examination of subgroup data reveals that

absenteeism is not evenly distributed, but instead concentrated among students facing the greatest structural barriers.

Table D: Student Characteristics and Grade Levels

Student Group	2021	21–22	22–23	23–24	24–25	(21→25)
English Learners	19.6	47.9	55.2	34.3	31.4	11.8
Students with Disabilities	25.5	54.2	62.2	42.1	39.4	13.9
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	21.9	50.1	57.1	37.1	34.3	12.4
Foster Youth	55.6	64.1	71.5	58.5	56.2	0.6
Unhoused Students	54.5	65.7	72.8	51.9	45.3	-9.2
Male	19.6	43.6	52.5	32.1	30	10.4
Female	16.7	43.3	53.3	32.7	29.8	13.1
Non-Binary	8.7	43.1	55.3	25.2	17.4	8.7
Grades 1–3	13.9	44.1	55.7	28.6	25	11.1
Grades 4–6	12.4	39.6	48.6	26.3	24.4	12
Grades 7–8	13.7	38.8	49.2	30	28.4	14.7
Grades 9–12	28.7	46	51.8	39	37	8.3

Note. Chronic absenteeism increased sharply across all student groups between 2021 and 2023, reflecting the systemic disruptions of the COVID-19 pandemic. Although rates declined in subsequent years, they remain significantly elevated relative to pre-pandemic levels, particularly among Pacific Islander students, students with disabilities, socioeconomically disadvantaged students, and unhoused students, highlighting persistent structural inequities in student access and engagement.

Students experiencing the greatest structural barriers, including Black/African American students, Pacific Islander students, students with disabilities, socioeconomically disadvantaged students, and unhoused students, consistently demonstrate the highest rates of absenteeism. Pacific Islander students experienced the largest increase, rising from 37.8 percent in 2021 to 82.7 percent in 2022–2023, one of the highest rates across all groups. Similarly, students with disabilities saw absenteeism rates increase from 25.5 percent to 62.2 percent during the same period, while socioeconomically disadvantaged students rose from 21.9 percent to 57.1 percent. Black/African American students also experienced persistently high absenteeism, peaking at 61.8 percent and remaining above 40 percent even as overall rates declined. When the data are disaggregated, a more urgent reality emerges: absenteeism is not random; it is patterned along lines of structural inequity.

Although some recovery is evident by the 2024–2025 school year, absenteeism rates remain significantly elevated compared to pre-pandemic levels, particularly among high school students and those facing compounded structural challenges. These patterns suggest that absenteeism is not simply a behavioral issue, but a structural indicator of disengagement, reflecting instability in housing, health, transportation, school climate, and access to support services. For unhoused students, whose absenteeism rates exceeded 70 percent during peak years, the data point to conditions that extend far beyond the classroom.

Chronic absenteeism serves as a leading indicator of both academic risk and systemic failure. Students cannot benefit from instruction, intervention, or opportunity if they are not present. As such, addressing absenteeism requires more than attendance policies; it requires coordinated, cross-sector solutions that address the underlying conditions shaping student participation. Without this, enrollment decline and academic underperformance will continue to reinforce one another, further entrenching inequities within the district. These reinforcing dynamics necessitate a deeper analysis of academic outcomes, where persistent achievement gaps across a changing student population come into sharper focus.

Persistent Achievement Gaps Across a Changing Student Population

Despite these demographic shifts, patterns of academic performance remain strikingly consistent (see Tables D and E). Across Grades 3, 8, and 11, Black/African American and Latino/a/x students continue to perform substantially below White and Asian students in both English Language Arts and mathematics. In Grade 3, only 20.08 percent of Black/African American students and 16.26 percent of Latino/a/x students met or exceeded ELA standards, compared to 70.43 percent of White students. In mathematics, the disparities are similarly pronounced, with only 22.49 percent of Black/African American students and 20.93 percent of Latino/a/x students meeting proficiency benchmarks, compared to 73.89 percent of White students. Longitudinal data show that these gaps are not narrowing. Black/African American student ELA proficiency declined by more than 10 percentage points between 2021 and 2025, while Latino/a/x student outcomes remained persistently low across the same period. These trends do not plateau over time; they become more pronounced as students advance through grade levels.

Table E: ELA and Math Proficiency by Grade Level and Student Group (2025)

Student Group	Grade 3 ELA	Grade 3 Math	Grade 8 ELA	Grade 8 Math	Grade 11 ELA	Grade 11 Math
All Students	31.3	35.8	33.6	21	36.2	19.6
Black/African American	20.1	22.5	19.7	8.5	24.7	6.3
Hispanic/Latino/a/x	16.3	20.9	25	13.4	27.9	9
Asian	43.9	56	52.8	44.4	65.1	52.3
White	70.4	73.9	77.4	59.7	70.2	55.1
Socioeconomically Disadvantaged	18.4	23.4	24.9	14	31.1	14.7
Students with Disabilities	14.6	22.5	10.6	6.7	10.6	4.6
Unhoused Students	8.5	16.7	12	8.6	17.9	3

By middle school, these disparities deepen. In Grade 8 mathematics, only 8.50 percent of Black/African American students and 13.39 percent of Latino/a/x students met or exceeded standards, while nearly 60 percent of all students and over two-thirds of Latino/a/x students failed to meet expectations. White students, by contrast, achieved nearly 60 percent proficiency in math. These gaps widen further in high school. By Grade 11, only 6.31 percent of Black/African American students and 9.05 percent of Latino/a/x students met or exceeded math standards, compared to more than half of White students. These disparities are further amplified when examined through the lens of intersecting structural barriers.

As shown in Table F, changes in proficiency from 2021 to 2025 reveal a deeply uneven and concerning trajectory across student groups and grade levels. While overall outcomes for all students remained relatively stable in Grade 3, with only slight increases in ELA (+1.7) and Math (+0.1), this stability masks significant declines as students progress through the system. By middle school, proficiency drops sharply, with Grade 8 ELA declining by 13.1 percentage points and Math by 13.5, trends that continue into high school, where Grade 11 ELA fell by 14.6 points and Math by 5.6. These declines are not experienced equally. Black/African American students saw consistent and substantial decreases across nearly all categories, including steep drops in Grade 3 Math (-14.5), Grade 8 Math (-16.3), and Grade 11 Math (-13.1). Hispanic/Latino students showed relative stability in early grades but experienced

pronounced declines in high school, particularly in Grade 11 ELA (-20.6). Asian students, despite higher overall performance levels, experienced some of the largest declines across both middle and high school, including a 25.2-point drop in Grade 8 Math. In contrast, White students were the only group to demonstrate early gains, with significant increases in Grade 3 ELA (+31.9) and Math (+20.0), and modest improvements in Grade 8, though these gains reverse by Grade 11, where notable declines emerge. Taken together, these patterns indicate that while early academic recovery or stability may be present for some groups, the system is not sustaining progress over time, and in many cases, disparities are widening as students advance, particularly for Black and Latino/a/x students.

Table F: Change in Proficiency (2021-2025)

Student Group	G3 ELA	G3 Math	G8 ELA	G8 Math	G11 ELA	G11 Math
All Students	1.7	0.1	-13.1	-13.5	-14.6	-5.6
Black/African American	-10.7	-14.5	-15.1	-16.3	-5.9	-13.1
Hispanic/Latino/a/x	0	0.3	-4.4	-5.5	-20.6	-10.2
Asian	-12.1	-15.4	-23.8	-25.2	-6.8	-12.3
White	31.9	20	5.7	5.2	-22.7	-18.2

These outcomes are even more severe for students experiencing overlapping structural barriers. Students who are socioeconomically disadvantaged, homeless, or living with disabilities consistently show the lowest levels of achievement across all grades. In Grade 11 mathematics, only 4.64 percent of students with disabilities and 3.01 percent of homeless students met proficiency standards, underscoring the compounded impact of race, poverty, and instability. These converging patterns move beyond isolated disparities, exposing a dual equity crisis in which systemic displacement and sustained underperformance operate in tandem to reinforce inequity.

A Dual Equity Crisis: Displacement and Underperformance

When demographic trends and achievement outcomes are examined together, a more complex picture emerges. Oakland is facing not one, but two interconnected equity challenges. First, the district is experiencing the continued displacement and decline of Black/African American students, a group that has historically faced systemic educational inequities and continues to demonstrate low academic outcomes. As the population of Black/African American students shrinks, there is a risk that targeted

supports and resources may also diminish, further exacerbating inequities for those who remain. Second, Latino/a/x students, now the largest and most stable population in the district, continue to experience persistently low levels of academic achievement, particularly in mathematics. This means that the majority of students in the district are not being adequately prepared for postsecondary success or participation in the region's innovation-driven economy. These two dynamics, declining representation of one historically underserved group and persistent underperformance and underserving of another, create a dual equity crisis.

According to Trujillo et al. (2020), the system is functioning as designed rather than failing accidentally. The system is simultaneously losing students who have long been marginalized while failing to improve outcomes for those who now comprise the majority. As these patterns converge, their consequences extend far beyond K–12 systems, shaping trajectories of educational access, economic mobility, and workforce inclusion.

Implications for Educational and Economic Equity

The implications of these trends extend far beyond K–12 education. Mathematics proficiency, in particular, is a key predictor of access to advanced coursework, A–G completion, STEM pathways, and long-term career mobility. When fewer than one in ten Black/African American and Latino/a/x high school students meet math standards, the consequences are not limited to academic performance. Here are three concrete implications that require consideration:

1. Constrained Access to Postsecondary and STEM Pathways

The persistently low mathematics proficiency rates among Black/African American and Latino/a/x students, particularly at the high school level, where fewer than 10 percent meet standards, significantly restrict access to advanced coursework, A–G eligibility, and STEM-aligned postsecondary pathways. As a result, large segments of the district's student population are systematically excluded from college-readiness pipelines, limiting their ability to compete for admission to four-year institutions and high-growth technical fields.

2. Workforce Exclusion in a High-Skill Regional Economy

In a region where economic growth is driven by technology and data-intensive industries, the observed achievement gaps translate directly into workforce disparities. Students who do not achieve proficiency in literacy and mathematics are less likely to access careers in Silicon Valley's innovation economy, resulting in a workforce pipeline that disproportionately excludes Black and Latino/a/x students. This dynamic not only

reinforces racial inequities in employment and income but also limits the diversity of talent entering industries that shape the future of the region.

3. Intergenerational Economic Inequality and Structural Stratification

The convergence of persistent academic underperformance and demographic shifts contributes to the reproduction of intergenerational inequality. As students from historically marginalized and socioeconomically disadvantaged backgrounds remain concentrated in lower-performing academic trajectories, their access to stable, high-wage employment is constrained, reinforcing cycles of poverty and economic exclusion. Without targeted intervention, these patterns risk solidifying a structurally stratified system in which educational outcomes continue to predict and reproduce economic inequality across generations. These implications underscore that educational inequity is not an isolated system failure, but a primary mechanism through which economic inequality is produced and sustained. They shape access to college, career opportunities, and economic stability.

In a region like Silicon Valley, where economic growth is increasingly tied to technical and analytical skills, these disparities translate directly into inequities in workforce participation. Students who are not adequately prepared in literacy and mathematics are less likely to access the very industries that define the region's economy. As a result, educational inequity becomes economic inequity, reinforcing cycles of exclusion across generations.

Moving Forward: Aligning Demographics, Outcomes, and Investment

Addressing these challenges requires a shift in how educational systems respond to both demographic change and persistent inequities. Strategies must account for the growing number of socioeconomically disadvantaged populations in the region. The data reveal that this increase is disproportionately concentrated among Latino/a/x and Black/African American students, requiring intentional, targeted interventions that address both the expanding Latino/a/x population and the persistent needs of Black/African American students who remain in the district. At the same time, targeted interventions must address the compounded challenges faced by socioeconomically disadvantaged, homeless, and disabled students.

This will require sustained investment in early literacy, strengthened math pathways, expanded access to experienced educators, and integrated supports that address the broader conditions affecting student learning. It will also require accountability systems that track not only overall performance but also outcomes by race, income, and student circumstances. Educational systems are not neutral; they

reflect and reproduce broader social and political structures, shaping not only what students learn but how they understand their position within society (Robinson, 2020).

Oakland's data make one reality clear: demographic change alone will not produce equitable outcomes. Without intentional and targeted intervention, the patterns observed in early grades will continue to widen, shaping who has access to opportunity in one of the most economically dynamic regions in the world. Without intentional and targeted intervention, the patterns observed in early grades will continue to widen, shaping who has access to opportunity in one of the most economically dynamic regions in the world. Addressing this reality requires more than awareness; it demands a fundamentally different approach to equity, one that SVEEI is built to deliver.

Advancing Equity Through Action: SVEEI's Strategy

The data are clear. Oakland is experiencing both a demographic transformation and persistent, widening achievement gaps, particularly for Black, Latino, socioeconomically disadvantaged, homeless, and disabled students. These inequities are not inevitable. They are the result of systemic conditions that can be addressed through intentional design, strategic investment, and cross-sector collaboration. At the Silicon Valley Equity in Education Institute, closing these gaps requires more than incremental change. It requires a reimagining of how education systems leverage innovation, research, and workforce alignment to create equitable pathways for all students. To meet this moment, SVEEI is advancing a three-pillar strategy focused on AI collaboration, research, and workforce readiness.

1. AI Collaboration and Strategy

SVEEI is working to ensure that students who have been historically excluded from opportunity are not left behind in the rapidly evolving AI economy. Through partnerships with technology innovators, school systems, and community organizations, we are developing and implementing AI-informed strategies that expand access to learning, exposure, and opportunity.

This includes building AI literacy programs in K–12 systems serving socioeconomically disadvantaged students, co-designing tools that support differentiated learning, and creating innovation labs where students can engage directly with emerging technologies. By embedding AI into the educational experience in equitable ways, we aim to close early learning gaps and spark interest in high-growth fields before disparities become entrenched.

2. AI Research in Education

Data must do more than diagnose inequity. It must guide solutions. SVEEI's research pillar is focused on generating rigorous, actionable evidence on how AI can improve learning outcomes and educational access for historically underserved students. We are partnering with researchers, educators, and practitioners to develop and test new curricular models, evaluate interventions, and produce policy-relevant insights that inform decision-making at the district, state, and national levels. This work is grounded in a commitment to translating research into practice, ensuring that findings are not only published but implemented in ways that directly benefit students and educators. By aligning research with real-world application, SVEEI is building a knowledge base that supports more equitable, data-driven education systems.

3. Workforce Readiness Development and AI

Educational equity must ultimately translate into economic mobility. SVEEI's workforce-readiness pillar focuses on preparing students, particularly those from socioeconomically disadvantaged backgrounds, for a labor market rapidly reshaped by automation and artificial intelligence. This includes developing career pathways that connect K–12 education to postsecondary opportunities and emerging industries, building partnerships with employers to create internships and mentorship pipelines, and equipping students with the skills necessary to navigate an AI-driven workforce. As traditional white-collar roles evolve or disappear, it is critical that students are prepared not only to participate in the future of work but also to lead within it. By aligning education with workforce demand, SVEEI seeks to ensure that opportunity is not determined by race, income, or circumstance.

Behind every data point is a student whose future is being shaped in real time, not just by potential, but also by access. SVEEI exists to disrupt that pattern, ensuring that talent is not overlooked and that opportunity is not reserved for the few. This work requires partnership, courage, and sustained investment, but the return is undeniable: stronger schools, a more equitable workforce, and a future where every student has a real chance to thrive. This is not just a strategy; it is a commitment to who we choose to become as a community.

References

- California Department of Education. (2024). *California School Dashboard and related accountability datasets*. <https://www.cde.ca.gov>
- Noguera, P. A. (2004). Racial isolation, poverty, and the limits of local control in Oakland. *Teachers College Record*, 106(11), 2146-2170.
- Ramos, F. F., & Jani, N. (2025). Reclaiming racial justice and building solidarity in Oakland's educational justice movement. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 23(1), 47-62.
- Robinson, R. P. (2020). Until the revolution: Analyzing the politics, pedagogy, and curriculum of the Oakland Community School. *Espacio, Tiempo y Educación*, 7(1), 181-203.
- Silicon Valley Equity in Education Institute. (2025). *Oakland Unified School District equity and opportunity data profile*.
- Trujillo, T. M., Hernández, L. E., Jarrell, T., & Kissell, R. (2014). Community schools as urban district reform: Analyzing Oakland's policy landscape through oral histories. *Urban Education*, 49(8), 895-929.