

A Sampling, recruitment and treatment assignment

A.1 Sampling

To construct our initial middle school sampling frame, we began with two school-level datasets from the NYCDOE: the 2014-15 Demographic Snapshot, and the LCGMS extract from March 22, 2015. The latter is a file updated daily showing all NYC schools in operation, allowing us to identify school status changes since the Demographic Snapshot was released. From these two files we identified **566** schools that enrolled a minimum of 30 students in 8th grade *or* had zero 8th graders but at least one student in 7th grade. (This second condition retained some newer schools that did not serve 8th grade in 2014-15 but may have in 2015-16). We retained charter schools but excluded District 75 (special education) schools.

All 16 schools in Staten Island were dropped from this initial set, as were 109 schools that enrolled at least one 9th grader. We excluded Staten Island middle schools because they were comparatively more advantaged than those targeted by this study. Their effective set of high school choices is also more limited due to Staten Island’s lower population density and geographic isolation. Schools that enrolled 9th graders were excluded because 8th graders in those schools frequently remain there for 9th grade. An additional three schools that served unusually high proportions of students with disabilities (>50%) or English language learners (>90%) were dropped. **438** eligible schools remained after these drops.

Geocoded student residential addresses from 2012-13 were used to calculate for each middle school the percent of 8th graders living in low-income Census tracts, defined using the population share with income below 150% of the poverty line from the American Community Survey. (2012-13 was the most recent address file available at the time this sampling frame was produced).³² The working sample of 438 schools was split into quartiles based on this poverty measure.

Schools in the top two quartiles of poverty comprised our “high-poverty” recruitment pool (N=217). We sorted these in random order and began recruiting from the top of this list (see the following subsection for details on recruitment). When it became apparent we would need schools beyond this list, we created a “mid-poverty” recruitment pool consisting of the next quartile of schools (N=108).

Table A.1 provides mean characteristics of: (1) all NYC schools that served 8th grade in 2014-15 *or* served 7th grade in 2014-15 with the potential to serve 8th grade in 2015-16 (N=592); (2) all NYC schools in the baseline sampling frame (N=438); (3) all schools in the high-poverty recruitment pool (N=217); (4) all schools in the mid-poverty recruitment pool (N=108); and (5) all schools that participated in the study (N=165). (The fifth group is described later). Notably, the recruitment pools and study sample include a greater share of

³²Schools in the working sample not observed in the 2012-13 data were geocoded to Census tracts. In place of the student average measure, we used the 5-year (2009-2013) poverty estimate for the Census tract in which the school was located.

schools located in the Bronx and Brooklyn relative to the full population of schools serving 8th graders. Study schools also enrolled a higher share of Hispanic students, English language learners, and (by design) low-income students. They also tended to be smaller, and were less likely to be charter schools than the full population.

Table A.2 provides mean outcomes of the high school admissions process in 2013-14 for the same five groups of schools. (These outcomes are observed two years prior to the study, and were the latest available at the time of sampling). The sample sizes reported in this table are smaller than those in Table A.1, as not all schools had 8th graders participating in the admissions process in 2013-14. In that year, 8th graders in our study schools applied to high schools with lower graduation rates, on average, than did students in the full population. A larger share of high schools on their application used the limited unscreened admissions method, and a smaller share of students were unmatched after the main round.

A.2 Treatment assignment

As of August 12, 2015, 167 schools had agreed to participate in the study. We dropped two schools that we learned were screened middle schools that required an exam for admission, and a third that shared a guidance counselor with another recruited school.³³ This left 164 schools: 61 in the Bronx, 58 in Brooklyn, 29 in Manhattan, and 16 in Queens (Table A.3). Of these we aimed to assign 39 to each treatment arm (117 total) and 47 to the control group. The top panel of Table A.3 shows how these counts are divided by borough.

We randomly assigned schools to treatment and control groups within matched blocks of similar schools. Blocks were formed within the eight strata shown in the bottom panel of Table A.3. These include four borough strata, a fifth stratum of eight schools in the geographically isolated Rockaways section of Queens, and three strata of schools (23 total) that participated in our 2014-15 pilot study. Because pilot schools had previously been offered a treatment, had prior interactions with our team, and agreed to participate again, they likely differ systematically from other recruited schools. We therefore blocked these schools separately within borough. We also wished to ensure these schools received a treatment as a reward for past participation, so all of them were forced into one of the three treatment groups, chosen at random. Nearest neighbor matches were drawn from the borough at large to serve as controls for the pilot schools. (This explains why the total number of schools in the pilot blocks [32] exceeds the number of pilot schools [23]).

Within each matched block we aimed to have one school assigned to each treatment arm (FF1, FF2, and FF3) and at least one school assigned to the control group. Since there were

³³Students in the two screened schools fare well in the high school choice process and a large fraction are admitted to the city's specialized high schools. We dropped these schools since they are outside the target population for this study. The third school was dropped because it would be impossible to randomly assign schools that share a guidance counselor to different treatment conditions and maintain compliance. As described later, these three schools were returned to the study sample after randomization.

more schools planned for the control group than any single treatment arm, some blocks have more than one control. In total, 39 blocks were formed, 8 of which were blocks consisting primarily of pilot schools.³⁴

Mahalanobis nearest-neighbor matching was used to form blocks of similar schools within each of the eight blocking strata listed in Table A.3. This procedure began by sorting schools randomly within strata. The first school was drawn and its three nearest neighbors identified. These four schools were removed, and the next school was drawn along with its three nearest neighbors, and so on. The school variables used in the matching procedure were as follows:

- Percent of high school applicants in 2013-14 with no main round match
- Mean graduation rate of students' top three choices in 2013-14 (main round)
- The percent of top three choices in 2013-14 (main round) that were limited unscreened schools
- Mean scale score of 8th grade students in 2013-14 in English language arts (ELA) and mathematics
- Grade 8 enrollment in 2013-14 (or if none, grade 7)
- Percent eligible for free or reduced price meals in 2013-14 (school-wide)

Means for several of these variables were reported in Table A.1-A.2. Some schools lacked 8th grade scale scores or choice outcomes from 2013-14 if they did not have an 8th grade class in that year. In these cases we imputed using the mean for other recruited schools in the same borough. After matched blocks were formed, we used the original random number to assign schools to the three treatment and control conditions. One school that was originally dropped because it shared a guidance counselor with another recruited school was added back at this point, and assigned to the same block and treatment as its companion school. This brought the total number of study schools to **165**.

After forming matched blocks, we ran several tests for balance. First, we estimated a set of regression models in which the dependent variables differed but the same set of explanatory variables were used (*mvreg* in Stata). Explanatory variables included the three treatment group indicators, an indicator for pilot study participation, and block fixed effects. A *p*-value was obtained for the joint hypothesis that coefficients on the treatment indicators were zero across all regression models. Next, in separate models we regressed treatment group assignment (FF1, FF2, or FF3) on a full set of school covariates. These covariates

³⁴The pilot study blocks consist of schools in the same borough, but not necessarily the same randomization block from the pilot study. In forming the 8 pilot study blocks we aimed to group schools that were in the same randomization block from the pilot study, or the same geographic school district when the former option was not possible.

included all of the matching variables listed above, as well as the percent English language learners, percent with disabilities, percent female, percent by race and ethnicity, percent of students scoring at the lowest level in ELA (Level 1), percent scoring at the lowest level in mathematics (Level 1), and a charter school indicator. (These same variables were used as dependent variables in the first balance test). In these regressions a p -value was obtained for the joint significance of school characteristics in explaining treatment assignment.

We had no reason to expect the first iteration of matching and blocked randomization to yield the “best” possible balance. In the interest of identifying an *ex ante* well-balanced set of treatment assignments, we executed the above blocked randomization procedure—beginning with nearest neighbor matching—50 times. We then looked for iterations with the largest p -values and few (if any) statistically significant associations between treatment assignment and school characteristics. Of the 50 iterations, we chose a randomization with $p = 0.66$ for the first balance test and $p = 0.78, 0.96,$ and 0.86 for the second balance tests. Coefficients from the latter three regression models are reported in Table A.4. The only explanatory variable that has a statistically significant association with treatment assignment is pilot study participation, which is expected given that pilot schools were purposefully assigned to a treatment. Results are similar, with p -values of $0.70, 0.99,$ and $0.82,$ when the pilot study indicator was omitted from the regressions.

Table A.5 reports the mean characteristics of schools in our study’s treatment and control groups. Three additional schools volunteered to participate in our study, and the two recruited academically selective schools that were originally dropped were added back as control schools, increasing the number of participating schools to 170. However, these five schools (2 control, 2 FF1 and 1 FF3) are not included in Tables A.4-A.5 since they were not part of the original block randomization. Only students from the 165 schools in the original blocked random assignment are used in the main results of this paper.

B Production of intervention materials

Study schools were randomized into three treatment arms and a control group. Schools in the first treatment arm (FF1) received a “Fast Facts” list of proximate high schools. Schools in the second treatment arm received Fast Facts and a supplementary list of academically non-selective “limited unscreened” schools that give priority admission to students who attend an open house. This group was also invited to receive text message reminders about these open houses. Schools in the third treatment arm received Fast Facts and a supplementary list of high school programs organized by academic interest area. All treatment schools received a one-page insert of “screened language” programs citywide that exclusively serve recent immigrants new to the English language.

The procedure we used to generate Fast Facts and supplementary lists drew from three primary data sources:

- The 2015-16 NYC High School Directory, which includes (among other things) graduation rates, program interest areas, and admissions methods. The graduation rate pertained to the cohort graduating in 2013-14, the most recent available at the time of printing.
- Imputed graduation rates for high schools that had not yet had a graduating cohort.³⁵
- Travel time by walking or public transit from every middle school to every high school in NYC, calculated using the Google Maps API during August 2015.

Our starting point for creating Fast Facts was a list of all middle-high school combinations with their travel time by public transit (N=256,082). We dropped high schools that primarily served continuing 8th graders, reducing the list to 234,986 cases. For each high school we retained information about its graduation rate (using the imputed version where necessary), admissions methods, interest areas, and directory page number.

Importantly, we produced these three lists for *all* study schools, regardless of their actual treatment assignment. Doing so provided a “counterfactual” Fast Facts list for schools that were not selected to receive one (or were assigned to receive a different version).

B.1 Fast Facts

Fast Facts sheets were provided to students in every treatment arm (FF1, FF2, and FF3). Each consisted of a list of 30 high schools. Our procedure for creating Fast Facts was as follows. For every middle school we identified all high schools with a graduation rate of 70% or higher that were within a 45-minute commute from that middle school.³⁶ This list was sorted by travel time (ascending), graduation rate (descending), and school name (ascending, to break ties and to ensure replicability). The first 10 high schools in this ordered list were immediately flagged for inclusion on Fast Facts. We then successively added schools as long as the cumulative number of *screened* schools was ≤ 10 , the number of *new* schools was ≤ 10 , and (in select cases) the number of schools located in a different borough was ≤ 10 .³⁷ Schools that would put the Fast Facts list over these limits were skipped. Once 30 schools was reached, the list was finalized. In cases where 30 schools could not be identified with this

³⁵We predicted graduation rates for these high schools using a quadratic function of their 9th grade “on track” indicator (the percent completing 10 or more credits in 9th grade). The prediction model used all high schools with non-missing graduation rates and 9th grade “on track” indicators from 2014-15. The upper limit of the 95% prediction interval was used as the imputed graduation rate for schools lacking this information. High schools that were so new that they lacked both performance measures were omitted from the list.

³⁶For schools in the Rockaways section of Queens we relaxed the commuting time requirement to 60 minutes.

³⁷This restriction was imposed for 27 middle schools where we observed students very rarely applying to high schools outside of their own borough.

procedure, we relaxed the graduation rate and commuting time restrictions.³⁸ High schools were listed on Fast Facts in descending order by graduation rate and (in the case of ties) alphabetically by school name. The imputed graduation rate was used in the sorting order for new schools, although the imputed rate was not displayed on the sheet. (Rather, the graduation rate reads “*new school”).

To summarize, Fast Facts was a list of the closest 30 high schools within a given commute (45 minutes) that are above a graduation rate floor (70%). The list capped the number of new, screened, and (in some cases) out-of-borough schools that appeared. If necessary for producing a list of 30 schools, the maximum commuting time and/or minimum graduation rate was relaxed. A sample Fast Facts is pictured in Figure A.1.

B.2 Academically non-selective school supplement

Schools in the FF2 treatment arm were given Fast Facts and a supplementary list of academically non-selective high schools that give priority admission to students who attend an open house. The 18-25 high school programs featured on this supplement use the “limited unscreened” admissions method, which means they do not screen students using grades or other academic criteria. They do, however, give priority admission to students who attend an open house or information session. Schools on the supplement were drawn from Fast Facts or were added when Fast Facts did not generate at least 18 non-selective programs. Our procedure for creating this list was as follows. For each middle school we counted the number of limited unscreened *programs* offered by schools on Fast Facts. (We counted programs rather than schools, as some schools offered multiple programs). When there were >25 limited unscreened programs on Fast Facts, we identified 20 with the highest graduation rates and used these as the non-selective school supplement. When there were $18 \leq x \leq 25$ limited unscreened programs on Fast Facts, we retained them all for the non-selective school supplement. When there were <18 limited unscreened programs on Fast Facts, we retained these and drew additional programs until there were 20. (Schools were drawn using the same minimum criteria and sort order used for Fast Facts).

For presentation on the academically non-selective school supplement, programs were sorted in descending order by their school’s graduation rate, and (in the case of ties) alphabetically by program name. Schools that already appeared on Fast Facts were introduced with the text, “These are some of the limited unscreened schools from your Fast Facts list.” Any added schools not on Fast Facts were introduced with the text, “Here are a few more limited unscreened programs to consider.” Unlike Fast Facts, the non-selective school supplement provided the 4-character program code and program (rather than school) name. A sample non-selective school supplement is pictured in Figure A.2.

³⁸In the Rockaways, the relaxed criteria were a graduation rate of 65% and a maximum commuting time of 75 minutes. For all other schools the relaxed criteria were a graduation rate of 65% and a maximum commuting time of 60 minutes.

B.3 Schools by academic interest area

Schools in the FF3 treatment arm were given Fast Facts and a supplementary list of high schools grouped by academic theme or interest area. The 49 high school programs featured on this list were drawn from Fast Facts or were added when Fast Facts did not generate enough programs in each category. Our procedure for creating this list was as follows. For each middle school we identified seven programs in each of these categories: Academically Selective (all screened programs); Business & Communications; Health Professions; Humanities; Law, Government, Civics & History; Performing and Visual Arts; and STEM.³⁹ In each interest area we took the first seven programs that appeared after applying the same minimum criteria and sort order used for Fast Facts.⁴⁰ By using the original sort order, schools featured on Fast Facts were the first to be listed in their respective interest area. Fast Facts was often not sufficient to populate seven programs in each category. In these cases, we drew additional programs until each interest area was filled.

For presentation on the academic interest area supplement, programs were sorted in descending order by their school's graduation rate. (Again, listing first programs in schools that appeared on Fast Facts, and then added programs.) Unlike Fast Facts, the interest area supplement provided the 4-character program code, admissions method, and program name. (For example: "PPA HS: Musical Theatre," "PPA HS: Dance," and "Union Square Academy for Health: Dental"). A sample academic interest area supplement is pictured in Figure A.3.

B.4 Screened language insert

All treatment schools received a one-page insert identifying 42 higher-performing schools citywide that offered "screened language" programs for English language learners and recent immigrants. This insert was the same for all treatment schools, with schools listed separately by borough. School names were listed, along with program names (e.g., Bilingual Haitian Creole Institute), 4-character program code, language of instruction, and directory page number. All of these schools had a 6-year graduation rate of 70% or higher. The front of the insert was printed in English, while the back was printed in Spanish. A sample screened language insert is pictured in Figure A.4.

³⁹The categories were consolidated from a larger number of interest areas used by the NYCDOE in its High School Directory. "Academically Selective" is not an interest area *per se*, but a way to distinguish schools that screen on the basis of grades, test scores, or other criteria.

⁴⁰For the academic interest area supplement we relaxed the maximum commute time to 80 minutes, or 90 minutes in the Rockaways. This was done to ensure a minimum number of schools in each interest area. We also modified the sort order so that programs that screened for English language learners were listed last in the case of ties.

B.5 Fast Facts and supplementary list descriptives

Tables B.1-B.3 report descriptive statistics for the high schools appearing on our intervention materials. Table B.1 summarizes the Fast Facts lists given to all treatment schools in the study. Table B.2 summarizes the (pooled) Fast Facts list and academically non-selective school supplement; FF2 was the only group of schools that actually received both of these lists. Table B.3 summarizes the (pooled) Fast Facts list and academic interest area supplement; FF3 was the only group of schools that actually received both of these lists. Again, we generated Fast Facts—and the two supplementary lists—for *all* study schools, regardless of treatment assignment. Doing so provided “counterfactual” lists that characterize information a school would have received, had they been in a particular treatment group.

Table B.1 shows that the typical Fast Facts list consisted of 30 high schools with an average graduation rate of 81.5% and average commuting time (middle school to high school) of 25.3 minutes. An average of 57.4% of schools on Fast Facts offered a limited unscreened program, 25.1% offered a screened program, and 23.3% offered *only* screened programs.⁴¹ An average of 26.3% were new schools that as of 2015-16 had not had a published graduation rate, and 78.9% of listed high schools were located in the same borough as the middle school.

Tables B.2 and B.3 show how the materials produced for the FF2 and FF3 schools compare to the typical Fast Facts lists. The combined Fast Facts and academically non-selective school supplement included an average of 32.4 unique schools (versus 30 on Fast Facts alone), while the combined Fast Facts and academic interest area supplement included an average of 42.9 schools. The average graduation rate of schools on the former (81.2%) was comparable to Fast Facts alone, while the latter (82.6%) was higher. (The interest area supplement required drawing more schools onto the list, including a minimum of seven screened programs, which tend to have higher graduation rates). As expected, the combined Fast Facts and academically non-selective school supplement included a higher share of schools offering limited unscreened programs than Fast Facts alone (61.2% vs. 57.4%). The average travel time on the two set of materials was higher (26.1 and 31.6 minutes, respectively) and a smaller share of schools was located in the same borough as the middle school (76.7% and 65.3%). (These differences reflect the need to draw additional schools onto the supplementary lists).

As a test for whether the intervention materials produced were balanced across treatment and control groups, the rightmost column in Tables B.1-B.3 report the p -value from a regression of the listed high school characteristic on a set of treatment group indicators and randomization block fixed effects. In only one case is the p -value less than 0.05, providing confidence that the schools appearing on the intervention materials are comparable, on average, across middle schools in the experiment.

⁴¹Admissions methods used by a school are not mutually exclusive. A school can offer, for example, a screened program and a limited unscreened program.

B.6 Open house data and text message reminders

Our master list of open houses was compiled from the 2015-16 High School Directory, the NYCDOE online calendar, visits to tables at the city and borough-wide school fairs, and weekly calls by our research team to limited unscreened high schools. Because open house dates were regularly added, canceled, and re-scheduled, this data collection continued until the last batch of text messages were sent. By that time we had assembled a list of **762** open house dates. The number of open houses varied by high school; some offered as few as one open house during the fall semester, for example, while others held weekly or bi-weekly open houses.

We scheduled **11 weeks** of text messaging, with information about **two** high schools sent to participants every Sunday evening. The first batch of messages was sent on September 20, 2015, and the last on November 29, 2015 (Table B.4). The content of the messages changed weekly and was customized to each receiving middle school. Our weekly procedure for selecting high schools for inclusion in the text message reminders was as follows.

For each middle school we identified all limited unscreened high schools that met our original criteria for inclusion on Fast Facts.⁴² From this set we flagged schools with *scheduled* open house dates as of that week. Based on these dates we allocated open house reminders to 22 available slots (over 11 weeks), prioritizing high schools with fewer total open house opportunities and with higher graduation rates. For example, if a high school had a total of *one* scheduled open house, we assigned a text message reminder for it on the Sunday before the open house. Up to two of these could be scheduled in one week. If more than two such open houses were identified in a single week, we prioritized school(s) with higher graduation rates. When high schools had *two or more* scheduled open houses, we attempted to assign a text message reminder for the first of these. If that week was full, we attempted to schedule a message for the week of the second open house, and so on. Finally, after all schools with scheduled open houses were assigned a text message slot (subject to the limit of 2 per week), we filled unassigned slots with a general message with information about a limited unscreened high school not already covered above (again prioritizing higher graduation rates).

Because the open house calendar was dynamic, this weekly routine sometimes led to repeat messages. To see this, suppose high school K123 had one open house scheduled as of October 25. Given its limited open house opportunities at the time, we would have prioritized a text message reminder for that week. If K123 later scheduled more open houses, it would re-appear on our list (with regularity if it is a high graduation rate school). We therefore monitored the results of our algorithm to minimize duplication. When we observed a middle school was scheduled to receive a repeat text message reminder for the same high

⁴²For most middle schools this included high schools with a graduation rate of 70% or higher and a maximum commuting time of 45 minutes. For schools in the Rockaways, we included high schools with a graduation rate of 70% or higher and a maximum commuting time of 70 minutes. The latter is relaxed somewhat from the Fast Facts criteria to ensure a sufficient number of schools.

school, we often manually forced them to receive a different reminder (for the next school in their text message priority list). We were less likely to do this in the first few weeks of text messaging, since most users had not yet signed up for the service.

Table B.4 reports the number of open house and general text message reminders sent in each week of the study. In the early weeks (1-3), the two messages tended to include one open house reminder and one general school message. In later weeks—during the peak open house period—both weekly text messages were open house reminders.

Examples of the open house reminder and general text messages are shown below. (These were sent in English or Spanish, depending on user preferences). When recipients wanted more information about a school, they were given the opportunity to text back “1” for information about the first school and “2” for information about the second school. The examples below include the responses to these requests.

Open House this week @ Urban Assembly School for Law & Justice on Sat 12/12
@ 11am txt 1 for more info

UALaw&Just is @ 283 Adams St, Brooklyn, 718-858-1160; bus: B103 B25 B26
B38 B41 B45 B54 B57 B61 B62 B63 B65 B67 B69; train: G, 2 3 4 5 R, M, A C
F, B Q

Interested in Bronx River HS? Call 718-904-4210 to schedule a visit txt 1
for more info

Bx River is @ 3000 East Tremont Ave, Bronx, 718-904-4210; bus: Bx21 Bx24
Bx31 Bx4 Bx40 Bx42 Bx4A Bx8; train: 6

When a school offered multiple open houses in one week, our text message accommodated this. For example:

Open House this week @ Murray Hill Academy on Thur 11/12, Sat 11/14 @ Thur
4-5:30pm; Sat 9:30-11am & 11:30am-1:00pm txt 2 for more info

As we did with the Fast Facts and supplementary school lists, we generated “counterfactual” text messages for middle schools that were not assigned to the non-selective school supplement treatment group (FF2). These were generated using the same rules as those used to produce the actual text messages sent to participating families in the FF2 treatment arm.

[Middle school name here]

FAST FACTS

ABOUT HIGH SCHOOL OPTIONS NEAR YOU

This table shows 4-year graduation rates, admissions methods, and page number in the 2015-16 Directory of NYC Public High Schools for 30 high schools that are a short trip from your middle school on public transportation. Note: Newer schools do not yet have high school graduation rates.

School Name	Borough	Grad. Rate	Minutes by MTA	Page #	Admission Methods
Bard High School Early College	Manhattan	100	7	353	Screened
Barratt College Campus High School	Manhattan	100	18	355	Screened
Manhattan Village Academy	Manhattan	99	18	435	Screened
Milkenium High School	Manhattan	99	16	437	Screened
NYC Museum School	Manhattan	97	20	446	Screened
High School for Dual Language and Asian Studies	Manhattan	96	11	393	Screened; Lang.
NYC Lab School for Collaborative Studies and Math High School	Manhattan	96	20	445	Screened
New Explorations into Science, Technology and Math High School	Manhattan	95	8	448	Screened
Pace High School	Manhattan	94	14	450	Lim. unscreened
The High School of Fashion Industries	Manhattan	92	20	410	Audition
Urban Assembly Institute of Math and Science for Young Women	Brooklyn	91	17	329	Lim. unscreened
High School for Health Professions and Human Services	Manhattan	90	16	398	Ed. Opt., Screened
Urban Assembly School for Law and Justice	Brooklyn	88	17	333	Lim. unscreened
Harvest Collegiate High School	Manhattan	*new	17	389	Lim. unscreened
Urban Assembly Academy of Government and Law	Manhattan	87	11	474	Lim. unscreened
High School of Economics and Finance	Manhattan	82	19	409	Ed. Opt.
New Design High School	Manhattan	82	11	447	Ed. Opt.
University Neighborhood High School	Manhattan	80	13	472	Ed. Opt., Screened, Screened; Lang.
George Westinghouse Career and Technical Education High School	Brooklyn	79	18	254	Ed. Opt., Screened
City Polytechnic High School of Engineering, Architecture, and Technology	Brooklyn	78	18	224	Lim. unscreened
Urban Assembly School of Business for Young Women	Manhattan	77	17	484	Lim. unscreened
Urban Assembly School for Emergency Management	Manhattan	*new	18	479	Lim. unscreened
Cobble Hill School of American Studies	Brooklyn	73	18	227	Ed. Opt.
Lower Manhattan Arts Academy	Manhattan	72	11	424	Lim. unscreened
Essex Street Academy	Manhattan	71	11	375	Lim. unscreened
Richard R. Green High School of Teaching	Manhattan	71	17	459	Ed. Opt.
Brooklyn Frontiers High School	Brooklyn	*new	17	197	Lim. unscreened
The Clinton School for Writers and Artists	Manhattan	*new	19	363	Screened
Manhattan Early College School for Advertising	Manhattan	*new	17	432	Lim. unscreened
Urban Assembly Maker Academy	Manhattan	*new	15	477	Lim. unscreened



12

You may list up to 12 schools on your High School Application form. Fill out ALL 12 CHOICES to increase your chances of getting a match!

For more details about these schools and programs, and other schools and programs not on this list, see the New York City High School Directory and <http://schools.nyc.gov/ChoicesEnrollment/High/Resources/default.htm>

ADMISSIONS METHODS

METHOD	DESCRIPTION	WHAT DO I NEED TO DO?
AUDITION	Students are ranked by the school based on an audition (for example, art, design, and performing arts programs) and a review of their academic record.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Compare your grades and test scores to those used by the school to rank students. Schedule an audition! Find out what else is required to apply, if anything (essay, interview, etc.).
SCREENED	Students are ranked by the school based on their 7th grade math and ELA test scores, grades, and/or attendance. Schools may have additional criteria like an interview or essay.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Compare your grades and test scores to those used by the school to rank students. Find out what else is required to apply, if anything (essay, interview, etc.).
EDUCATIONAL OPTION	Seats are reserved for students with low, middle, and high 7th grade ELA test scores. Half of students are admitted randomly and half are ranked by the school.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Find out whether students in your borough or school district receive priority admission.
SCREENED: LANGUAGE	These programs specialize in serving students who are learning English.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Be sure that you meet the language requirements to attend.
LIMITED UNSCREENED	Priority is given to students who attend a school information session or open house event, or visit the school's table at a High School Fair. Students must sign in at these events in order to receive admissions priority.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Find out how the school awards admissions priority (like attending an info session or open house). Be sure to sign in at an event! Find out whether students in your borough or school district receive priority admission.
ZONED	Students living within a specific geographic area are given priority.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Find out whether students in your borough or school district receive priority admission.
UNSCREENED	Students are admitted randomly.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Find out whether students in your borough or school district receive priority admission.

Source: New York City Department of Education



Figure A.1: Sample Fast Facts (front and back)

WHY OPEN HOUSES ARE IMPORTANT

"Limited unscreened" high school programs **don't** review your grades and test scores, but **do** give admissions priority to students who attend **and sign in** at an open house or high school fair. This means you have a **better chance** of getting into this type of school if you visit and sign in. You and your parent or guardian can keep track of open houses using this calendar, and our **text message reminders**. We will text a short message letting you know when and where these open houses will take place. When we text you or your parent or open house date, **add it to your calendar!** Some limited unscreened schools have regular visiting hours, or let you make an appointment to visit the school. **Call the high schools you are interested in to find out!**

Parents can **text 251 to 917-426-0188** to start receiving weekly reminder texts right away! (Participants must be 13 or older to receive text messages).



Don't forget to sign in at an Open House or High School Fair!

These are the limited unscreened schools from your Fast Facts list:

School/Program Name	Borough	Program Code	Directory Page #
South Bronx Prep: A College Board School	Bronx	X11X	146
Knowledge & Power Prep Academy, Int'l HS	Bronx	Y32A	116
HERO High (Health, Education, & Research Occupations HS)	Bronx	X37A	95
East Bronx Academy for the Future	Bronx	X83X	85
Bronx HS for Law & Community Service: Law Enforcement	Bronx	X53A	49
Global Learning Collaborative	Manhattan	A17A	385
Urban Assembly School for Careers in Sports	Bronx	X31A	156
Urban Assembly School for Global Commerce	Manhattan	M48A	480
High School for Excellence and Innovation	Manhattan	A24A	396
Inwood Early College for Health & Information Tech	Manhattan	A16A	418
Murray Hill Academy	Manhattan	A19A	440
Here are a few more limited unscreened programs to consider:			
Academy of Finance and Enterprise	Queens	Q08R	496
Stephen T. Mather Building Arts & Craftsmanship HS	Manhattan	M88A	464
Urban Assembly Gateway School for Tech	Manhattan	A29A	475
HS for Arts, Imagination & Inquiry	Manhattan	M19R	392
HS for Teaching & the Professions	Bronx	X34A	103
Bronx Theatre HS: Theatre Design & Tech	Bronx	X38A	67
Bronx Theatre HS: Performance & Production	Bronx	X38R	67
High School of Applied Communication	Queens	Q07R	543
School for Tourism and Hospitality	Bronx	Y59A	144

10 | OCTOBER

S	M	T	W	T	F	S
				1	2	3
4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11	12	13	14	15	16	Borough High School Fairs
Borough High School Fairs	18	19	20	21	22	23
25	26	27	28	29	30	
11 NOVEMBER						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30	HS Apps Due!				



When we text an Open House date, **ADD IT TO YOUR CALENDAR!**

Figure A.2: Sample academically non-selective school supplement

FIND SCHOOLS WITH THEMES THAT MATCH YOUR INTERESTS!

PERFORMING & VISUAL ARTS

School/Program Name	Borough	Program Code	Admissions Method
School for Classics: Performance	Brooklyn	L63A	Lim. unscreened
School for Classics: Production	Brooklyn	L63B	Lim. unscreened
New Design HS	Manhattan	M62A	Ed. Opt.
Brooklyn HS of the Arts: Art Program	Brooklyn	K47J	Audition
Brooklyn HS of the Arts: Dance	Brooklyn	K47L	Audition
Brooklyn HS of the Arts: Drama	Brooklyn	K47R	Audition
Brooklyn HS of the Arts: Instrumental Music	Brooklyn	K47K	Audition

Don't forget to schedule an audition, if required!

HEALTH PROFESSIONS

School/Program Name	Borough	Program Code	Admissions Method
HS for Medical Professions	Brooklyn	L49A	Lim. unscreened
HS for Health & Human Services: Medical Tech	Manhattan	M70B	Ed. Opt.
Academy for Health Careers	Brooklyn	L64A	Lim. unscreened
Urban Assembly School for Collaborative Healthcare	Brooklyn	K60A	Lim. unscreened
It Takes A Village Academy: Science	Brooklyn	L46C	Ed. Opt.
Union Square Academy for Health: Dental	Manhattan	A33B	Lim. unscreened
Union Square Academy for Health: Pharm Tech	Manhattan	A33A	Lim. unscreened

ACADEMICALLY SELECTIVE

School/Program Name	Borough	Program Code	Admissions Method
Bedford Academy HS: Health Professions	Brooklyn	K65B	Screned
Bedford Academy HS: Technology	Brooklyn	K65A	Screned
HS for Health & Human Services: Medical Research	Manhattan	M70A	Screned
Brooklyn HS for Law & Tech: Social Justice	Brooklyn	K47B	Screned
Young Women's Leadership School of Brooklyn	Brooklyn	L66A	Screned
HS for Enterprise, Business & Tech: Math & Science	Brooklyn	R88C	Screned
Clinton School Writers & Artists	Manhattan	M64A	Screned

Don't forget to check the requirements for these screened programs!

SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY, ENGINEERING & MATH

School/Program Name	Borough	Program Code	Admissions Method
Williamsburg HS for Architecture and Design	Brooklyn	K09X	Lim. unscreened
Urban Assembly Math & Science for Young Women	Brooklyn	L64A	Lim. unscreened
Brooklyn HS for Law & Tech: Computer Tech	Brooklyn	K49D	Ed. Opt.
HS for Enterprise, Business & Tech: Computer Science	Brooklyn	R88A	Ed. Opt.
Performing Arts and Tech HS: Technology	Brooklyn	K61R	Ed. Opt.
Pathways in Tech Early College HS (P-TECH)	Brooklyn	L67A	Lim. unscreened
Brooklyn School for Math, Research & Humanities	Brooklyn	L68A	Lim. unscreened

HUMANITIES & GLOBAL STUDIES

School/Program Name	Borough	Program Code	Admissions Method
HS for Dual Language & Asian Studies	Manhattan	M59A	Screned; Lang
Williamsburg Prep School	Brooklyn	K39X	Lim. unscreened
Harvest Collegiate HS	Manhattan	A53A	Lim. unscreened
Brooklyn Prep HS	Brooklyn	K07X	Lim. unscreened
Essex Street Academy	Manhattan	M37X	Lim. unscreened
Khalil Gibran International Academy	Brooklyn	L04A	Lim. unscreened
Brooklyn Frontiers HS	Brooklyn	L09A	Lim. unscreened

LAW, GOVERNMENT, CIVICS, & HISTORY

School/Program Name	Borough	Program Code	Admissions Method
Urban Assembly School for Law & Justice	Brooklyn	K08X	Lim. unscreened
Urban Assembly Academy of Government & Law	Manhattan	M65R	Lim. unscreened
FDNY HS for Fire & Life Safety	Brooklyn	K62X	Lim. unscreened
Nelson Mandela School for Social Justice	Brooklyn	K15A	Lim. unscreened
Urban Assembly School for Emergency Management	Manhattan	M48A	Lim. unscreened
Cobble Hill School of American Studies	Brooklyn	K91A	Ed. Opt.
Cobble Hill School of American Studies: Pre-Law	Brooklyn	K91B	Ed. Opt.

BUSINESS & COMMUNICATIONS

School/Program Name	Borough	Program Code	Admissions Method
HS for Enterprise, Business & Tech: Finance	Brooklyn	R88B	Ed. Opt.
Robert H. Goddard HS of Communication Arts & Tech	Queens	Q02A	Lim. unscreened
Academy of Finance and Entrepreneurship	Queens	Q08R	Lim. unscreened
Manhattan Business Academy	Manhattan	A12A	Lim. unscreened
HS of Economics & Finance	Manhattan	M79A	Ed. Opt.
University Neighborhood: HS Bilingual Mandarin	Manhattan	M65B	Screned; Lang
Westinghouse HS: Culinary Arts	Brooklyn	K70D	Ed. Opt.

Figure A.3: Sample academic interest area supplement

Figure A.4: Screened language insert

FAST FACTS || SCREENED: LANGUAGE

Below is a list of New York City high school programs especially designed for students who are learning English. These Screened: Language programs admit students who are learning English and may also require students to be living in the United States for 4 years or fewer. Some of these programs (marked with a *) have course grade and other academic requirements as well. Go to the program's page in the Directory of New York City High Schools to find out about any additional requirements the program may have. At the end of this flyer you will find explanations of some of the additional requirements.

	SCHOOL NAME	PROGRAMNAME	CODE	PAGE	LANGUAGE
BRONX	Academy for Language and Technology	Media Communications	Y31B	21	Spanish
		Institute for Computer Technology	Y31C	21	Spanish
		Computer Networking	Y31D	21	Spanish
	Alfred E. Smith Career and Technical Education HS	Bilingual Spanish NATEF Automotive Technology	X69D	24	Spanish
	Bronx Aerospace HS	Dual Language Spanish Program	X30B	35	Spanish
	Bronx Bridges HS	Bronx Bridges HS	Y47A	37	Spanish, Bengali, Arabic, French
	Bronx Int'l HS	Bronx Int'l HS	X36A	58	Any
	Claremont Int'l HS	Claremont Int'l HS	X69D	74	Any
	Crotona Int'l HS	Digital Media Entertainment Technology	Y56A	79	Spanish
	HS of Language and Innovation	High School of Language and Innovation	Y52A	108	Many; See directory
	International School for Liberal Arts	International School for Liberal Arts	Y24A	114	Spanish
	M.S. 223 Lab School of Finance and Technology	Dual Language Spanish Program	Y72A	118	Spanish
	Marble Hill HS for International Studies	International Academy	X43B	120	Any
	New World HS	New World HS	X87R	134	Any
	Pan American Int'l HS at Monroe	Pan American Int'l HS at Monroe	Y26A	136	Spanish
	World View HS	Spanish Transitional Bilingual	X89B	165	Spanish
	BROOKLYN	Brooklyn Int'l High School	Brooklyn Int'l High School	K53A	204
Clara Barton HS		Bilingual Haitian Creole Program	K50B	226	Haitian Creole
		Dual Language Russian Program	K50C	226	Russian
Edward R. Murrow HS		Bilingual Mandarin Communication Arts	K57B	239	Mandarin Chinese
		Bilingual Spanish Communication Arts	K57C	239	Spanish
Green School: Acad. for Environmental Careers		Transitional Bilingual	L27C	257	Spanish
Int'l HS at Prospect Heights		Int'l High School at Prospect Heights	K98X	273	Any
John Dewey HS		Bilingual Mandarin College Prep Program	K56B	278	Mandarin Chinese
Midwood HS		Bilingual Haitian Creole Institute*	K56B	291	Haitian Creole
MANHATTAN		A. Philip Randolph Campus High School	Dual Language Spanish Program	M19L	346
	Esperanza Preparatory Academy	Esperanza Preparatory Academy	A37A	388	Spanish
	Gregorio Luperon HS for Science and Math	Gregorio Luperon HS for Science and Math*	M62A	388	Spanish
	High School for Dual Language and Asian Studies	HS for Dual Language and Asian Studies*	M59A	393	Mandarin Chinese
	Queens High School for Language Studies	Queens HS for Language Studies	Q62A	581	Mandarin Chinese
	Manhattan Bridges HS	Bilingual Spanish IT and Computer Science*	M57B	427	Spanish
		Bilingual Spanish Pre-Engineering*	M57B	427	Spanish
		Dual Lang. Spanish Pre-Engineering*	M57D	427	Spanish
		Dual Lang. Spanish IT and Comp. Science	M57E	427	Spanish
	Manhattan Center for Science and Mathematics	Bilingual Spanish Science and Math*	M16K	430	Spanish
	Manhattan Int'l HS	Humanities and Interdisciplinary	M93A	434	Any
University Neighborhood HS	Bilingual Mandarin	M35B	472	Mandarin Chinese	
QUEENS	Flushing Int'l HS	Flushing Int'l HS	Q25X	525	Any
	Int'l HS at LaGuardia Community College	Int'l HS at LaGuardia Community College	Q27J	552	Any
	Int'l HS for Health Sciences	Int'l HS for Health Sciences	Q63A	554	Any
	Newcomers HS	Newcomers HS	Q98A	569	Any
	Queens HS for Language Studies	Queens HS for Language Studies	Q62A	581	Mandarin Chinese

INFORMATION ABOUT PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS

Some Screened: Language programs have additional requirements for admission. If you are interested in a program, go to the page in the Directory of New York City High Schools and look under Admissions Priorities and Eligibility to determine if there are specific requirements such as:

Home Language Spanish: The language spoken most often in your home is Spanish.

New York City Residents Who Have Lived in the United States 4 Years or Fewer: You arrived in the United States from another country within the last four years.

English Language Learner or Limited English Proficiency: Your school has told you and/or your parents that you qualify for additional help learning English.



Table A.1: Mean school characteristics, 2014-15

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	All schools	Baseline sampling frame	High-pov. recruit. pool	Mid-pov. recruit. pool	Study schools
N	592	438	217	108	165
Charter school	0.147	0.105	0.124	0.093	0.079
Brooklyn	0.331	0.340	0.341	0.481	0.358
Manhattan	0.215	0.199	0.258	0.157	0.176
Queens	0.184	0.199	0.028	0.204	0.097
Bronx	0.243	0.263	0.373	0.157	0.370
Staten Island	0.027	–	–	–	–
High-poverty recruitment pool	0.341	0.461	0.931	–	0.630
Mid-poverty recruitment pool	0.182	0.247	–	1.000	0.327
Pilot study participant	0.039	0.052	0.101	0.000	0.139
% Female	49.5	49.2	49.1	48.6	48.7
% Male	50.5	50.8	50.9	51.4	51.3
% Asian	9.4	10.2	4.3	13.1	5.0
% Black	37.2	35.9	36.8	40.5	37.4
% Hispanic	41.1	42.4	55.3	34.5	51.6
% Other race	1.5	1.4	0.9	1.5	1.1
% White	10.8	10.1	2.6	10.3	4.8
% SWD	20.2	20.5	23.1	19.7	22.9
% EL	11.0	12.3	16.2	11.2	14.8
% FRPL	80.3	82.1	89.7	84.3	88.9
Census tract residential poverty	38.2	38.3	49.1	34.6	45.0
Mean 8th grade math scale score	291.7	291.6	284.1	293.8	284.7
Mean 8th grade ELA scale score	294.4	293.5	284.6	295.5	286.8
Enrollment	591.2	576.7	426.6	647.0	473.2
Grade 8 enrollment	123.5	134.6	98.8	153.0	116.0
Grade 9 enrollment	19.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Notes: authors' calculations using data from the NYCDOE and American Community Survey (for Census tract poverty rates). School enrollment and demographic data come from the 2014-15 NYCDOE Demographic Snapshot.

Table A.2: Mean high school admissions process outcomes, 2013-14

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
	All schools	Baseline sampling frame	High-pov. recruit. pool	Mid-pov. recruit. pool	Study schools
N	530	382	189	98	147
Graduation rates:					
1st choice	83.3	82.8	80.0	83.5	80.7
1st-3rd choices	82.2	81.6	79.1	82.2	79.7
All choices	81.0	80.4	78.0	80.8	78.5
Final matched school	76.5	75.5	72.2	76.2	72.9
9th grade enrolled school	76.9	75.7	72.3	76.4	73.0
Variability in gradrate (range)	22.4	24.3	27.5	23.3	26.5
Graduation rates <70%:					
1st choice	14.1	15.5	20.1	13.9	19.5
1st-3rd choices	16.3	17.7	22.5	16.2	21.7
All choices	18.9	20.6	25.7	18.9	24.8
Final matched school	30.6	34.0	41.3	31.3	39.7
9th grade enrolled school	30.2	33.8	41.3	31.0	39.9
Number of main round choices	7.0	7.7	8.4	7.3	8.1
Matched to 1st choice	48.3	44.6	46.2	43.6	45.6
Matched to 1st-3rd choice	75.1	73.6	75.6	72.4	75.3
Participation in R2 after main round match	9.7	10.3	10.7	11.3	10.9
9th grade enrollment in matched school	88.2	89.9	88.9	91.5	89.4
Enrolled in a charter high school	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.1
Percent in same boro, choices 1-3	79.1	79.3	75.0	81.2	76.3
Limited unscreened, choices 1-3	34.8	35.8	45.6	31.3	44.1
Screened, choices 1-3	38.4	35.8	29.2	38.2	30.4

Notes: authors' calculations using 2013-14 high school admissions data from the NYCDOE (the most recent available at the time of randomization to treatment assignment).

Table A.3: Counts of schools by treatment group, borough, and blocking group

	Treatment groups:			Control	Total
	FF1	FF2	FF3		
Borough totals:					
Bronx	14	14	14	19	61
Brooklyn	14	14	14	16	58
Manhattan	7	7	7	8	29
Queens	4	4	4	4	16
Total	39	39	39	47	164
Blocking group totals:					
Bronx	10	10	10	15	45
Brooklyn	11	11	11	13	46
Manhattan	6	6	6	7	25
Queens	2	2	2	2	8
Queens (Rockaways)	2	2	2	2	8
Bronx (pilot)	4	4	4	4	16
Brooklyn (pilot)	3	3	3	3	12
Manhattan (pilot)	1	1	1	1	4
Total	39	39	39	47	164

Notes: This table shows our planned assignment of 164 recruited schools to treatment and control groups. Schools were randomly assigned to treatments within matched blocks of similar schools. Blocks were formed within the eight strata of schools listed in the bottom panel. 23 pilot study schools were blocked separately within borough, and all pilot schools were assigned to one of three treatments (none to control). Nearest neighbor (non-pilot) matches from the same borough were selected as controls for the pilot study blocks. One additional non-pilot school in Brooklyn was added to the Brooklyn (pilot) group to balance one of the blocks. After treatment groups were assigned, the 165th school (which shared a guidance counselor with another participating school) was forced into the same treatment group.

Table A.4: Balance test: predicting treatment assignment using school characteristics

	(1) FF1 vs C	(2) FF2 vs C	(3) FF3 vs C
Percent with no R1 match	-1.602 (-0.482)	1.958 (0.624)	1.644 (0.574)
Graduation rate of top 3 choices	0.068 (1.186)	-0.012 (-0.225)	-0.074 (-1.459)
Percent of top 3 choices limited unscreened	0.018 (1.054)	0.016 (1.058)	-0.012 (-0.780)
Mean 8th grade math score	0.053 (1.362)	-0.015 (-0.420)	0.019 (0.516)
Mean 8th grade ELA score	-0.015 (-0.355)	0.019 (0.390)	0.039 (1.005)
Grade 8 enrollment	0.003 (1.783)	-0.002 (-1.077)	-0.001 (-0.741)
% Free or reduced price lunch	0.008 (0.487)	-0.006 (-0.473)	0.003 (0.238)
% EL	-0.015 (-0.540)	-0.002 (-0.068)	0.014 (0.675)
% SWD	0.006 (0.235)	-0.003 (-0.105)	0.034 (1.527)
% Female	0.003 (0.111)	-0.022 (-0.611)	0.022 (1.029)
% Black	0.024 (1.198)	-0.017 (-0.866)	-0.015 (-0.634)
% White	0.045 (1.358)	-0.014 (-0.493)	-0.044 (-1.287)
% Hispanic	0.021 (1.162)	-0.021 (-1.163)	-0.020 (-0.874)
Charter school	0.360 (0.604)	0.225 (0.508)	0.402 (0.709)
Percent ELA level 1	0.010 (0.355)	0.015 (0.420)	0.007 (0.263)
Percent Math level 1	0.032 (1.122)	-0.011 (-0.402)	0.015 (0.495)
Pilot study	0.962* (2.496)	1.046** (2.940)	0.910* (2.378)
Constant	-21.997 (-1.500)	3.008 (0.148)	-11.469 (-0.660)
N	86	86	87
Joint p-value	0.780	0.964	0.863

Notes: t -statistics in parentheses. * = $p < 0.05$ ** = $p < 0.01$. All regressions include randomization block fixed effects.

Table A.5: Mean school characteristics by treatment group, 2014-15

	Treatment groups:			Control
	FF1	FF2	FF3	
N	39	39	40	47
Charter school	0.077	0.103	0.075	0.064
Brooklyn	0.359	0.359	0.375	0.340
Manhattan	0.179	0.179	0.175	0.170
Queens	0.103	0.103	0.100	0.085
Bronx	0.359	0.359	0.350	0.404
In high poverty sampling frame	0.667	0.513	0.700	0.638
In mid poverty sampling frame	0.308	0.410	0.275	0.319
Pilot study participant	0.205	0.205	0.175	0.000
% Female	48.7	48.6	48.6	48.7
% Male	51.3	51.4	51.4	51.3
% Asian	4.3	4.9	5.8	5.0
% Black	37.1	40.1	38.3	34.7
% Hispanic	52.0	49.1	50.8	54.1
% Other race	1.2	0.9	1.1	1.2
% White	5.4	4.9	3.9	4.9
% SWD	23.5	22.3	23.6	22.2
% EL	13.9	13.7	15.6	15.7
% FRPL	89.7	87.1	90.3	88.7
Census residential poverty	45.0	42.8	46.3	45.6
Mean 8th grade math scale score	283.7	284.1	285.3	285.4
% Level 1 math	51.9	50.2	48.6	48.3
% Level 4 math	2.2	2.8	3.4	2.9
Mean 8th grade ELA scale score	285.6	287.0	287.4	287.1
% Level 1 ELA	42.5	39.5	39.1	39.1
% Level 4 ELA	2.7	2.7	3.2	3.5
Enrollment	498.0	462.5	414.9	511.1
Grade 8 enrollment	132.4	99.6	112.8	118.6
Grade 9 enrollment	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Mean graduation rate - all choices	79.4	79.5	79.0	79.7
Mean graduation rate - top 3 choices	80.6	80.5	80.2	80.7
Mean graduation rate - 1st choice	81.3	81.1	81.1	81.7
Percent of all choices limited unscreened	46.0	45.2	41.6	42.5
Percent of top 3 choices limited unscreened	45.5	44.4	39.5	42.0
Percent of 1st choices limited unscreened	45.3	43.6	38.4	41.7
Percent with SPHS offer	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Percent with LGA offer	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Percent with no R1 match	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1

Notes: One recruited school that shared a guidance counselor with a second recruited school was omitted from the original block randomization and later added back to FF3 (the group to which its companion school was randomly assigned). This explains why FF3 includes 40 schools instead of the original 39 from Table A.3. High school choice outcomes in the bottom section of the table are from 2013-14.

Table B.1: Mean characteristics of schools on Fast Facts

	All study schools	Treatment groups:			Control	<i>p</i> -value
		FF1	FF2	FF3		
N	165	39	39	40	47	
Number of schools on FF1	30	30	30	30	30	
Total # of seats	4036.3	4146.8	4002.1	4066.0	3947.9	0.639
Graduation rate	81.5	81.6	81.4	81.4	81.7	0.423
Imputed gradrate	0.176	0.185	0.180	0.163	0.176	0.244
Graduation rate $\geq 70\%$	0.985	0.979	0.977	0.989	0.994	0.322
Apps per seat	9.4	9.6	9.4	9.1	9.4	0.529
Same borough	0.789	0.812	0.789	0.805	0.757	0.124
Travel time (mins.)	25.3	24.7	26.7	25.7	24.2	0.077
Audition	0.077	0.083	0.068	0.078	0.077	0.519
Ed Option	0.152	0.148	0.148	0.163	0.151	0.499
Limited Unscreened	0.574	0.573	0.599	0.572	0.557	0.162
Screened	0.251	0.248	0.246	0.254	0.255	0.738
Screened: Language	0.096	0.093	0.088	0.091	0.108	0.170
Zoned	0.014	0.016	0.018	0.015	0.009	0.465
Screened pgms only	0.233	0.237	0.216	0.234	0.243	0.192
Bronx	0.355	0.352	0.376	0.336	0.357	0.063
Brooklyn	0.330	0.332	0.323	0.353	0.313	0.910
Manhattan	0.254	0.259	0.233	0.242	0.279	0.248
Queens	0.061	0.056	0.068	0.069	0.052	0.380
New school	0.263	0.256	0.265	0.257	0.272	0.589
SD gradrate (with imp)	9.0	9.0	9.0	9.0	8.9	0.996

Notes: for this table we first calculated a mean for each middle school characterizing the 30 high schools on its Fast Facts list. This table reports the means of those quantities, over all study schools (N=165) and separately by treatment group. Recall that Fast Facts lists were generated for all schools in the study, regardless of treatment group. The *p*-value reported in the rightmost column is from a regression of the listed high school characteristic on a set of treatment group indicators and randomization block fixed effects. The null hypothesis tested is that the coefficients on the three treatment indicators are jointly zero. The graduation rate and graduation rate $\geq 70\%$ outcomes are conditional on being non-missing. Total seat counts do not include zoned guarantee programs, which do not have a maximum seat count.

Table B.2: Mean characteristics of high schools listed on combined Fast Facts and academically non-selective school supplement

	All study schools	Treatment groups:			Control	<i>p</i> -value
		FF1	FF2	FF3		
N	165	39	39	40	47	
Number of schools on FF2	32.4	32.5	32.1	32.3	32.8	0.347
Total # of seats	4310.9	4441.3	4237.2	4325.9	4251.1	0.607
Graduation rate	81.2	81.3	81.1	81.1	81.4	0.418
Imputed gradrate	0.190	0.200	0.196	0.172	0.191	0.093
Graduation rate $\geq 70\%$	0.981	0.975	0.971	0.987	0.989	0.299
Apps per seat	9.3	9.5	9.3	9.1	9.3	0.675
Same borough	0.767	0.781	0.765	0.789	0.737	0.158
Travel time (mins.)	26.1	25.6	27.2	26.5	25.3	0.242
Audition	0.069	0.073	0.062	0.070	0.069	0.623
Ed Option	0.140	0.135	0.136	0.151	0.137	0.409
Limited Unscreened	0.612	0.612	0.631	0.607	0.601	0.232
Screened	0.230	0.227	0.228	0.235	0.231	0.866
Screened: Language	0.089	0.086	0.082	0.085	0.099	0.270
Zoned	0.013	0.015	0.017	0.015	0.008	0.459
Screened pgms only	0.212	0.214	0.199	0.213	0.220	0.335
Bronx	0.363	0.360	0.388	0.344	0.360	0.026*
Brooklyn	0.325	0.332	0.315	0.349	0.308	0.813
Manhattan	0.251	0.255	0.228	0.238	0.279	0.183
Queens	0.061	0.053	0.069	0.069	0.053	0.279
New school	0.271	0.267	0.275	0.261	0.281	0.487
SD gradrate (with imp)	8.9	9.0	9.0	8.9	8.9	0.922

Notes: for this table, we first calculated a mean for each middle school characterizing the 30+ high schools on its combined Fast Facts and non-selective school supplement. This table reports the means of those quantities, over all study schools (N=165) and separately by treatment group. Recall that these lists were generated for all schools in the study, regardless of treatment group. The *p*-value reported in the rightmost column is from a regression of the reported school characteristics on a set of treatment group indicators and randomization block fixed effects. The null hypothesis tested is that the coefficients on the three treatment indicators are jointly zero. The graduation rate and graduation rate $\geq 70\%$ outcomes are conditional on being non-missing. Total seat counts do not include zoned guarantee programs, which do not have a maximum seat count.

Table B.3: Mean characteristics of high schools listed on combined Fast Facts and academic interest area supplement

	All study schools	Treatment groups:			Control	<i>p</i> -value
		FF1	FF2	FF3		
N	165	39	39	40	47	
Number of schools on FF3	42.9	43.0	43.2	42.3	43.0	0.512
Total # of seats	6278.3	6473.2	6230.4	6208.1	6216.0	0.206
Graduation rate	82.6	82.7	82.6	82.3	82.7	0.448
Imputed gradrate	0.162	0.168	0.161	0.153	0.163	0.472
Graduation rate $\geq 70\%$	0.989	0.987	0.984	0.988	0.997	0.318
Apps per seat	9.4	9.6	9.5	9.2	9.4	0.438
Same borough	0.653	0.669	0.648	0.674	0.625	0.113
Travel time (mins.)	31.6	31.4	33.1	31.7	30.5	0.096
Audition	0.069	0.077	0.065	0.070	0.067	0.161
Ed Option	0.223	0.215	0.221	0.231	0.225	0.191
Limited Unscreened	0.570	0.572	0.586	0.567	0.560	0.211
Screened	0.252	0.250	0.250	0.251	0.254	0.883
Screened: Language	0.092	0.093	0.086	0.091	0.099	0.161
Zoned	0.019	0.021	0.021	0.020	0.014	0.510
Screened pgms only	0.177	0.181	0.168	0.177	0.180	0.335
Bronx	0.280	0.274	0.287	0.271	0.286	0.366
Brooklyn	0.310	0.314	0.304	0.332	0.294	0.877
Manhattan	0.316	0.322	0.303	0.307	0.331	0.485
Queens	0.093	0.090	0.106	0.090	0.088	0.330
New school	0.224	0.219	0.222	0.221	0.231	0.696
SD gradrate (with imp)	8.804	8.846	8.859	8.792	8.733	0.782

Notes: for this table, we first calculated a mean for each middle school characterizing the 30+ high schools on its combined Fast Facts and academic interest area supplement. This table reports the means of those quantities, over all study schools (N=165) and separately by treatment group. Recall that these lists were generated for all schools in the study, regardless of treatment group. The *p*-value reported in the rightmost column is from a regression of the reported school characteristics on a set of treatment group indicators and randomization block fixed effects. The null hypothesis tested is that the coefficients on the three treatment indicators are jointly zero. The graduation rate and graduation rate $\geq 70\%$ outcomes are conditional on being non-missing. Total seat counts do not include zoned guarantee programs, which do not have a maximum seat count.

Table B.4: Text message reminders and participants by week

Week number	Date of message (Sunday)	Text message 1:		Text message 2:		Cumulative Treatment 2 School visits	Number of unique text participants	Number of unique text schools
		General	Openhse	General	Openhse			
1	20-Sep-15	9	30	39	0	12	93	19
2	27-Sep-15	3	36	22	17	17	339	27
3	4-Oct-15	2	37	10	29	24	591	32
4	11-Oct-15	0	39	1	38	33	868	38
5	18-Oct-15	0	39	0	39	34	1194	38
6	25-Oct-15	0	39	1	38	36	1585	38
7	1-Nov-15	0	39	0	39	37	1665	38
8	8-Nov-15	1	38	10	29	38	1729	39
9	15-Nov-15	0	39	2	37	39	1787	39
10	22-Nov-15	0	39	14	25	39	1881	39
11	29-Nov-15	1	38	22	17	39	1881	39
Total		16	413	121	308			

Notes: authors' calculations.

Table C.1: Percent of students with information session priority, 2014-15

	1st choice	1st-5th choices	All LUS choices
All students	40.8	36	34.8
Free lunch	37.9	34.3	33.4
Reduced price lunch	49.3	41.5	39
Not free or reduced	53.7	45.4	43
EL	33.3	30.4	29.7
Not EL	41.9	36.9	35.6
Special education	35.6	31.7	30.2
Not special education	42.4	37.4	36.1
Black	40.3	37	36
Hispanic	37.1	32.4	31.2
Not black or Hispanic	54.1	46.4	44.5
Female	42.3	37.1	36
Male	39.5	35.1	33.7
Bottom two ELA quartiles	36.2	32.5	31.5
Top two ELA quartiles	50.3	43.3	41.4
N	18,379	87,446	149,038

Notes: authors' analysis using data from the 2014-15 high school admissions process. Only public school applicants to limited unscreened (LUS) programs that gave open house or information session priority are included. Students given priority for other reasons—such as returning 8th graders—are excluded from these calculations. Column (1) includes the 18,379 students who ranked a LUS program as their 1st choice. In columns (2) and (3), the unit of observation is a student-choice. For example, if a student ranked three LUS programs and received information session priority for two, they would be counted twice among those with priority and once among those without priority. These columns can be interpreted as the probability a student with a given characteristic—having ranked a LUS school—received information session priority for that school. “Not free or reduced” also excludes students enrolled in a universal free meals school.

Table C.2: Impact of informational interventions on graduation rate of choices and matches, with missings imputed

	Treatment groups				Control group	
	FF1	FF2	FF3	Pooled	Mean	SD
Graduation rate:						
1st-3rd choices (mean) (with imputed)	0.219 (0.451)	-0.376 (0.606)	-1.026+ (0.534)	-0.384 (0.424)	80.9	10.6
Final matched school (with imputed)	1.633** (0.537)	0.565 (0.618)	-0.0775 (0.567)	0.743 (0.455)	73.6	13.2
9th grade enrolled school (with imputed)	1.056+ (0.538)	0.396 (0.615)	-0.156 (0.585)	0.450 (0.459)	74.4	13.7
Graduation rate below 70%:						
1st-3rd choices (mean) (with imputed)	-3.186* (1.592)	-1.116 (2.004)	0.474 (1.977)	-1.330 (1.576)	21.9	29.5
Final matched school (with imputed)	-7.235** (2.284)	-5.522* (2.781)	-3.113 (2.771)	-5.311* (2.185)	40.3	49.0
9th grade enrolled school (with imputed)	-5.869** (2.238)	-4.319 (2.677)	-2.827 (2.735)	-4.376* (2.143)	38.4	48.6

Notes: each *row* reports estimates from two regressions. The first includes indicator variables for the separate treatment groups (FF1-FF3). The second pools the three treatment groups into one indicator variable. Graduation rates were imputed for high schools that had not yet had a graduating cohort (see Appendix B for details). Sample sizes vary from 18,058 (9th grade enrolled school) to 19,107 (1st-3rd choices). All models include the following controls: school randomization block, student race/ethnicity, female, free lunch eligible, reduced-price lunch eligible, special education, EL, foreign born, quadratic in 7th grade ELA and mathematics z -scores, missing indicators for z -scores and other covariates, and indicator for students in schools that received a treatment in our 2014-15 pilot study. School-level controls include a charter indicator, 8th grade enrollment, percent female, percent by race/ethnicity, percent with disabilities, percent EL, and mean 8th grade math and ELA scores. All school controls are measured in the year prior to treatment. Standard errors in parentheses, adjusted for clustering at the school level. + $p < 0.10$ * $p < 0.05$ ** $p < 0.01$ *** $p < 0.001$.

Table C.3: Impact of informational interventions: excluding pilot study schools

	Treatment groups			Control group	
	FF1	FF2	FF3	Mean	SD
% of 1st-3rd choices from intervention-specific list	9.619*** (2.239)	5.479* (2.254)	6.714** (2.005)	37.2	32.6
Matched to 1st choice	2.378 (1.615)	2.572 (1.844)	2.625 (1.603)	44.6	49.7
Graduation rate:					
1st-3rd choices (mean)	0.444 (0.487)	-0.149 (0.702)	-0.578 (0.552)	80.9	11.2
Final matched school	1.633** (0.590)	0.342 (0.718)	0.366 (0.616)	73.4	13.7
Graduation rate <70%:					
1st-3rd choices (mean)	-3.140+ (1.828)	-2.032 (2.310)	-0.631 (2.116)	23.1	31.6
Final matched school	-6.702** (2.474)	-5.261+ (3.093)	-4.806 (2.940)	42.9	49.5

Notes: each *row* reports estimates from two regressions. The first includes indicator variables for the separate treatment groups (FF1-FF3). The second pools the three treatment groups into one indicator variable. Sample sizes vary from 14,705 (graduation rate at final matched school) to 17,083 (matched to 1st choices). All models include the following controls: school randomization block, student race/ethnicity, female, free lunch eligible, reduced-price lunch eligible, special education, EL, foreign born, quadratic in 7th grade ELA and mathematics z -scores, missing indicators for z -scores and other covariates. School-level controls include a charter indicator, 8th grade enrollment, percent female, percent by race/ethnicity, percent with disabilities, percent EL, and mean 8th grade math and ELA scores. All school controls are measured in the year prior to treatment. Standard errors in parentheses, adjusted for clustering at the school level. + $p < 0.10$ * $p < 0.05$ ** $p < 0.01$ *** $p < 0.001$.

Table C.4: Impact of informational interventions: excluding charter schools

	Treatment groups			Control group	
	FF1	FF2	FF3	Mean	SD
% of 1st-3rd choices from intervention-specific list	10.66*** (2.163)	5.130* (2.148)	5.630** (2.047)	37.5	32.6
Matched to 1st choice	3.090+ (1.785)	3.037 (1.922)	3.248+ (1.720)	44.9	49.7
Graduation rate:					
1st-3rd choices (mean)	0.397 (0.509)	-0.237 (0.711)	-1.054+ (0.562)	80.8	11.2
Final matched school	1.545** (0.583)	0.204 (0.708)	-0.147 (0.627)	73.4	13.7
Graduation rate <70%:					
1st-3rd choices (mean)	-3.112+ (1.845)	-0.957 (2.404)	0.560 (2.169)	23.3	31.7
Final matched school	-6.387* (2.554)	-4.578 (3.204)	-2.963 (3.020)	42.8	49.5

Notes: each *row* reports estimates from two regressions. The first includes indicator variables for the separate treatment groups (FF1-FF3). The second pools the three treatment groups into one indicator variable. Sample sizes vary from 15,766 (graduation rate at final matched school) to 18,301 (matched to 1st choices). All models include the following controls: school randomization block, student race/ethnicity, female, free lunch eligible, reduced-price lunch eligible, special education, EL, foreign born, quadratic in 7th grade ELA and mathematics *z*-scores, missing indicators for *z*-scores and other covariates, and indicator for students in schools that received a treatment in our 2014-15 pilot study. School-level controls include 8th grade enrollment, percent female, percent by race/ethnicity, percent with disabilities, percent EL, and mean 8th grade math and ELA scores. All school controls are measured in the year prior to treatment. Standard errors in parentheses, adjusted for clustering at the school level. + $p < 0.10$ * $p < 0.05$ ** $p < 0.01$ *** $p < 0.001$.

Table C.5: Impact of informational interventions on other measures of HS quality

	Treatment groups				Control group	
	FF1	FF2	FF3	Pooled	Mean	SD
HS 9th grade % on track:						
1st-3rd choices (mean)	-0.0840 (0.320)	-0.386 (0.414)	-1.176** (0.353)	-0.557+ (0.296)	85.6	7.4
Final matched school	0.752+ (0.382)	0.204 (0.443)	-0.738+ (0.407)	0.0750 (0.314)	81.3	10.2
College readiness %:						
1st-3rd choices (mean)	0.196 (0.607)	-0.902 (0.831)	-1.596* (0.758)	-0.734 (0.554)	63.1	14.9
Final matched school	1.649* (0.645)	-0.239 (0.803)	-1.148+ (0.655)	0.152 (0.545)	53.9	16.4
% of students who feel safe:						
1st-3rd choices (mean)	-0.504 (0.337)	-0.835* (0.396)	-0.918** (0.332)	-0.739* (0.288)	83.4	6.8
Final matched school	-0.259 (0.362)	-0.544 (0.421)	-0.737+ (0.410)	-0.505 (0.318)	80.0	9.5

Notes: each *row* reports estimates from two regressions. The first includes indicator variables for the separate treatment groups (FF1-FF3). The second pools the three treatment groups into one indicator variable. Sample sizes vary from 15,961 (college readiness at final matched school) to 19,107 (on-track percent at 1st-3rd choices). All models include the following controls: school randomization block, student race/ethnicity, female, free lunch eligible, reduced-price lunch eligible, special education, EL, foreign born, quadratic in 7th grade ELA and mathematics *z*-scores, missing indicators for *z*-scores and other covariates, and indicator for students in schools that received a treatment in our 2014-15 pilot study. School-level controls include a charter indicator, 8th grade enrollment, percent female, percent by race/ethnicity, percent with disabilities, percent EL, and mean 8th grade math and ELA scores. All school controls are measured in the year prior to treatment. Standard errors in parentheses, adjusted for clustering at the school level. + $p < 0.10$ * $p < 0.05$ ** $p < 0.01$ *** $p < 0.001$.

Table C.6: Pooled impact estimates by subgroup, part 1

	FRPL	Not FRPL	Spanish	Other lang	English	Math Q1	Math Q4	New to dist
% of 1st-3rd choices from FF1	7.314*** (1.747)	7.638*** (2.004)	9.622*** (1.601)	11.34*** (2.652)	4.211** (1.570)	6.154*** (1.727)	10.80*** (2.677)	6.256+ (3.203)
Matched to 1st choice	2.905* (1.454)	5.286** (1.770)	1.297 (1.823)	1.287 (3.355)	3.558* (1.472)	3.255+ (1.829)	5.445+ (3.161)	9.504* (4.501)
Matched to 1st-3rd choice	2.225+ (1.264)	6.124*** (1.754)	3.328* (1.571)	-2.965 (2.901)	2.888* (1.286)	4.712** (1.451)	3.692 (2.553)	6.246 (4.152)
Graduation rate: 1st-3rd choices	-0.205 (0.463)	-0.881+ (0.528)	-0.0863 (0.547)	0.387 (0.877)	-0.568 (0.490)	-0.692 (0.539)	-0.581 (0.603)	-0.774 (1.156)
Graduation rate: matched school	0.832 (0.521)	0.652 (0.562)	0.453 (0.568)	0.193 (0.934)	0.686 (0.556)	0.779 (0.593)	1.338 (1.147)	3.141+ (1.679)
% below 70% 1st-3rd choices	-1.240 (1.756)	-0.388 (1.783)	-1.839 (1.775)	-5.315+ (2.739)	0.322 (1.564)	-0.101 (1.832)	-2.852 (1.981)	-1.827 (3.439)
Graduation rate below 70% (match)	-5.040* (2.432)	-5.063+ (2.599)	-4.688* (2.226)	-7.535+ (3.924)	-3.393 (2.186)	-4.552* (2.092)	-9.962* (4.521)	-7.807 (5.791)

Notes: Student and school covariates and block effects included (as in earlier tables). Standard errors in parentheses, adjusted for clustering at the school level. + $p < 0.10$ * $p < 0.05$ ** $p < 0.01$ *** $p < 0.001$.

Table C.7: Pooled impact estimates by subgroup, part 2

	Girls	Boys	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Immigrant	Born in US
% of 1st-3rd choices from FF1	6.835*** (1.812)	7.825*** (1.825)	15.60*** (3.018)	2.707+ (1.469)	8.581*** (1.597)	12.48*** (3.288)	10.54*** (1.943)	7.025*** (1.760)
Matched to 1st choice	5.307*** (1.532)	1.104 (1.640)	6.800+ (4.068)	4.575* (1.848)	0.895 (1.595)	7.115+ (4.070)	3.821 (2.462)	3.223* (1.354)
Matched to 1st-3rd choice	4.375** (1.497)	1.081 (1.294)	-11.22*** (3.257)	5.240** (1.602)	3.029* (1.431)	2.403 (3.101)	3.972+ (2.241)	2.476* (1.201)
Graduation rate: 1st-3rd choices	-0.420 (0.445)	-0.322 (0.511)	2.075+ (1.131)	-0.992+ (0.590)	-0.127 (0.481)	0.364 (1.273)	-0.636 (0.712)	-0.293 (0.453)
Graduation rate: matched school	0.731 (0.470)	0.610 (0.579)	0.722 (1.403)	0.414 (0.671)	0.974* (0.459)	1.795 (1.688)	-0.007 (0.769)	0.843+ (0.473)
% below 70% 1st-3rd choices	-0.621 (1.521)	-1.565 (1.969)	-14.79*** (3.531)	1.813 (1.671)	-1.354 (1.570)	-5.896+ (3.454)	-0.457 (2.408)	-1.275 (1.676)
Graduation rate below 70% (match)	-4.634+ (2.348)	-4.696+ (2.511)	-14.40* (5.608)	-2.244 (2.267)	-5.597** (2.035)	-15.10* (5.894)	-5.604+ (3.125)	-4.717* (2.284)

Notes: Student and school covariates and block effects included (as in earlier tables). Standard errors in parentheses, adjusted for clustering at the school level. + $p < 0.10$ * $p < 0.05$ ** $p < 0.01$ *** $p < 0.001$.

Table C.8: Additional subgroup estimates: usage and match rates

	Usage: % of 1st-3rd choices from intervention-specific list			Matched to 1st choice			N
	FF1	FF2	FF3	FF1	FF2	FF3	
Full study sample	10.43*** (2.112)	5.503** (2.051)	5.482** (1.957)	3.104+ (1.651)	3.530+ (1.794)	3.539* (1.655)	19109
Girls	10.07*** (2.122)	5.275* (2.192)	4.509* (2.068)	5.985** (1.864)	4.449* (2.053)	5.200** (1.939)	9371
Boys	10.71*** (2.308)	5.655** (2.135)	5.915** (2.041)	-0.0630 (1.963)	2.203 (2.223)	1.580 (1.942)	9738
Foreign born	14.30*** (2.503)	9.663*** (2.815)	7.917*** (2.198)	3.386 (3.062)	4.187 (3.379)	4.020 (3.068)	3042
Born in US	9.921*** (2.116)	5.030* (2.042)	5.173* (2.010)	3.066+ (1.627)	3.279+ (1.823)	3.353* (1.631)	16067
EL	13.11*** (2.795)	6.169* (3.041)	6.837* (2.878)	1.022 (2.277)	-0.131 (3.423)	6.241* (3.026)	3064
Not EL	9.788*** (2.166)	5.192* (2.059)	4.974* (1.962)	3.397* (1.720)	3.538* (1.755)	2.511 (1.673)	16045
Special education	8.779*** (2.498)	4.388+ (2.299)	5.744* (2.315)	0.324 (2.572)	-0.114 (2.600)	3.478 (2.446)	4141
Not special education	10.84*** (2.118)	5.888** (2.159)	5.527** (2.004)	3.706* (1.681)	4.545* (1.832)	3.289+ (1.686)	14968
Girls - Q1 math	8.491*** (2.076)	6.760** (2.020)	7.755*** (1.970)	3.949 (2.851)	0.00185 (3.214)	5.366+ (3.048)	2821
Girls - Q4 math	13.15*** (3.719)	7.616+ (4.077)	1.046 (4.657)	7.288 (4.668)	-6.345 (5.343)	10.31* (5.050)	1098
Boys - Q1 math	5.702* (2.562)	3.808 (2.655)	4.334* (2.186)	-1.310 (2.766)	3.548 (3.124)	4.554 (2.791)	3197
Boys - Q4 math	19.77*** (3.895)	7.553* (3.724)	12.86*** (3.270)	7.885 (5.703)	5.591 (5.696)	8.042 (5.225)	1030

Notes: Each row and column set (FF1-FF3) represents estimates from a separate regression for the indicated subgroup. Student and school covariates and block effects included (as in earlier tables). Standard errors in parentheses, adjusted for clustering at the school level. + $p < 0.10$ * $p < 0.05$ ** $p < 0.01$ *** $p < 0.001$.

Table C.9: Additional subgroup estimates: graduation rates of choices and matches

	Graduation rate matched school			Graduation rate: below 70% matched school			N
	FF1	FF2	FF3	FF1	FF2	FF3	
Full study sample	1.664** (0.571)	0.526 (0.662)	-0.066 (0.596)	-6.274* (2.418)	-5.147+ (2.959)	-3.346 (2.865)	16657
Girls	1.439** (0.546)	0.677 (0.690)	0.0382 (0.589)	-5.795* (2.450)	-5.597+ (3.104)	-2.820 (2.945)	8272
Boys	1.754* (0.679)	0.290 (0.755)	-0.372 (0.709)	-6.280* (2.726)	-4.291 (3.216)	-3.245 (3.043)	8385
Foreign born	0.316 (0.960)	0.283 (1.007)	-0.442 (0.952)	-4.967 (3.699)	-8.233* (4.062)	-4.825 (3.833)	2651
Born in US	1.850*** (0.533)	0.579 (0.644)	-0.0417 (0.574)	-6.410** (2.310)	-4.747 (2.908)	-2.896 (2.840)	14006
EL	2.151* (1.049)	0.0174 (1.086)	-2.495* (1.137)	-12.75*** (3.435)	-5.345 (3.590)	-0.399 (3.704)	2707
Not EL	1.570** (0.569)	0.606 (0.681)	0.341 (0.591)	-4.949* (2.476)	-5.053 (3.117)	-3.558 (2.907)	13950
Special education	0.969 (0.760)	-0.420 (0.870)	-1.228+ (0.698)	-0.875 (2.943)	-1.510 (3.583)	1.913 (3.215)	3662
Not special education	1.741** (0.600)	0.631 (0.688)	0.0661 (0.637)	-7.390** (2.580)	-5.749+ (3.068)	-4.322 (3.018)	12995
Girls - Q1 math	1.636* (0.754)	1.601 (0.990)	-0.429 (0.806)	-6.346* (3.079)	-11.02** (3.903)	1.245 (3.397)	2505
Girls - Q4 math	0.418 (1.381)	-0.267 (1.500)	1.563 (1.678)	-6.815 (4.956)	-6.491 (5.213)	-11.40* (5.455)	908
Boys - Q1 math	1.633+ (0.868)	0.605 (0.838)	-0.552 (0.854)	-5.613+ (2.999)	-5.693+ (3.342)	-2.206 (3.155)	2808
Boys - Q4 math	3.822* (1.599)	0.570 (2.069)	0.275 (1.731)	-14.58* (6.220)	-2.764 (7.835)	-9.329 (6.433)	785

Each row and column set (FF1-FF3) represents estimates from a separate regression for the indicated subgroup. Student and school covariates and block effects included (as in earlier tables). Standard errors in parentheses, adjusted for clustering at the school level. + $p < 0.10$ * $p < 0.05$ ** $p < 0.01$ *** $p < 0.001$.

Table C.10: Impact of informational interventions on other choice outcomes

	Treatment groups				Control group	
	FF1	FF2	FF3	Pooled	Mean	SD
Nonselective and screened language supplement:						
Percent from nonselective supplement, 1st-3rd choices	3.263* (1.455)	6.748*** (1.588)	3.049+ (1.570)	4.077** (1.235)	14.5	23.3
On screened language supplement, % of all choices	0.485 (0.439)	-0.309 (0.386)	0.167 (0.427)	0.166 (0.359)	3.4	11.6
Any choice from screened language supplement	-0.740 (1.351)	-0.551 (1.529)	-0.957 (1.280)	-0.770 (1.119)	15.3	36.0
Characteristics of choices:						
Percent new schools, 1st-3rd choices	-0.0982 (0.735)	1.082 (0.870)	-1.056 (0.760)	-0.143 (0.628)	9.0	17.9
All choices in the same borough	9.009** (2.817)	3.551 (3.474)	3.982 (2.771)	5.792* (2.308)	51.8	–
Top 3 choices in the same borough	9.370*** (2.564)	2.346 (2.965)	3.950 (2.526)	5.609** (2.063)	64.9	–
Graduation rate of choices 1-3 in descending order	2.075* (1.010)	2.995** (0.953)	1.362 (0.997)	2.052* (0.791)	34.2	47.4
Percent of all choices within 45 minutes	-1.103 (2.254)	-3.850+ (2.132)	-3.141+ (1.836)	-2.544 (1.661)	80.0	22.6
Other outcomes:						
Took SPHS exam	0.519 (1.601)	-2.347 (1.903)	-1.109 (1.789)	-0.804 (1.498)	27.3	44.5
Offered a SPHS seat	-0.0594 (0.243)	0.157 (0.287)	-0.311 (0.236)	-0.0950 (0.212)	2.1	14.3

Notes: each *row* represents estimates from a separate regression. Sample sizes vary from 19,013 (graduation rates in descending order) to 19,109 (all others). All models include the following controls: school randomization block, student race/ethnicity, female, free lunch eligible, reduced-price lunch eligible, special education, EL, foreign born, quadratic in 7th grade ELA and mathematics *z*-scores, missing indicators for *z*-scores and other covariates, and indicator for students in schools that received a treatment in our 2014-15 pilot study. School-level controls include a charter indicator, 8th grade enrollment, percent female, percent by race/ethnicity, percent with disabilities, percent EL, and mean 8th grade math and ELA scores. All school controls are measured in the year prior to treatment. Standard errors in parentheses, adjusted for clustering at the school level. + $p < 0.10$ * $p < 0.05$ ** $p < 0.01$ *** $p < 0.001$.