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On the 66th anniversary of Brown v. Board of Education, the Government Accountability Office (GAO), at the request of Congressman Bobby Scott and former Congressman John Conyers, released a detailed national analysis of contemporary school segregation and its consequences. The findings were stark and damning. Between 2000 and 2013, the number of students attending schools in which more than 75% of students were low income and black or Hispanic more than doubled, to 8.4 million. Racial and economic polarization also was evident: 16 percent of all public schools in the U.S. served high shares of racial minorities and students in poverty, while another 16 percent served low shares.1 Similar trends hold true for Virginia; the state has experienced a 60% increase in racially and economically isolated schools in little more than a decade.2 These schools are heavily concentrated in Virginia’s metropolitan communities.

Decades of research from multiple disciplines, including education policy, economics, social psychology, sociology, higher education and history, indicate that racially segregated schools of concentrated poverty harm academic achievement and educational and life outcomes.3 A similar array of research indicates that students of all backgrounds benefit from well-designed diverse schools that guard against second-generation segregation within the building. These benefits accrue along academic, social and civic lines, occur in both the short- and long-term and matter for individuals and for society.4 Evidence shows that low income and black students in diverse schools experience positive outcomes above and beyond these dimensions, to include: higher academic achievement, increased educational and occupational attainment, attendance at high quality college, higher earnings, reduced likelihood of incarceration and better health in adulthood.5

Distinguished from numerical diversity in schools—though that’s a precondition—integration requires intentional commitment to continually bringing students and families together on a level playing field, working toward shared goals, guided by supportive authorities like teachers, leaders and caregivers. Whether or not a child’s school is integrated matters for several critical, interrelated reasons, all of which align with the Virginia Board of Education’s comprehensive plan. First, school integration promotes stronger learning and fosters skills needed for a thriving workforce. Second, it reduces prejudice and opens up access to the multifaceted information and opportunities that flow through social worlds. These two outcomes relate to a third: school integration strengthens citizenship for our multiracial democracy. Finally, integration creates more equitable access to key educational resources like high quality, engaging curricula, strong, diverse teachers and funding. When it comes to the material and human resources that matter most for schools, diverse schools fare better than racially segregated, high poverty ones.

1. Integrating schools promotes stronger learning and fosters skills needed for a thriving workforce

Diverse schools and classrooms set the stage for stronger learning outcomes across all student groups. Students with different ways of seeing and thinking about the world, based on differing experiences moving through it, add depth, creativity and nuance to schoolwork that homogeneous settings simply can’t produce. Diverse schools and classrooms nurture critical and creative thinking, collaboration and communication. In short, the attributes linked to interacting with a diverse group embody what Virginia’s General Assembly requested when it instructed the Board to create the Profile of a Virginia Graduate.

Yet recent polling data suggests that while all families overwhelmingly value racially diverse learning environments, they may not be fully aware of their many positive academic attributes. Seventy percent would prefer their child went to a racially diverse school, but only about fifty percent think that diversity is important for learning.

Katherine Phillips, a social psychology professor in the business school at Columbia, begs to differ. She compares participation in diverse groups to “going to the gym for your mind,”
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finding that participants prepare more intensively for work in a diverse group, partly in anticipation that consensus might be more difficult to reach. During group work sessions, members consider multiple points of view on an issue, often simultaneously. Positions are explicated more carefully and conflicts force participants to grapple with new ideas.

Similarly, Scott Page, a researcher at the University of Michigan, has been examining and trumpeting the value of diverse teams for more than a decade. His careful mathematical models applied to higher education and industry reveal a “diversity bonus” for diverse teams working together on difficult problems. Creative solutions are readier when team members bring heterogeneous perspectives and expertise to an issue. Confirming evidence flows from different sectors and multiple disciplines, including sociology, psychology, economics and demography.

Higher education has grasped the learning potential embedded in diverse classes for over a century. Its early emphasis on educational diversity came with approach of the Civil War. The Harvard president at the time urged universities to consider enrolling students from different regions of the country “to remove prejudice by bringing them into friendly relations.”

Following the war, a subsequent Harvard president sought diversity in admissions to foster “the wholesome influence that comes from observation of and contact with people different than ourselves.”

Studies from higher education shows that exposure to diverse classmates tends to trigger something called “cognitive disequilibrium,” or the disconnect between prior beliefs and new information. Higher-order thinking and stronger integrative complexity are the result.

Higher education law and literature also point to the link between student body diversity and the legitimacy of our institutions. In *Sweatt v. Painter*, one of the lawsuits preceding *Brown*, the court ruled against segregated law schools, saying a law school “cannot be effective in
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isolation from the individuals and institutions with which the law interacts.” This extends across many other sectors, including government, education and business. In our diversifying society, if universities do not admit and graduate more students of color, linked in turn to equitable preparation in K-12, institutions that require postsecondary education for employment increasingly will be out of step with the populations they serve.

While elementary and secondary schools often have been slower to understand diversity’s fundamental importance to learning, many of the same tenets hold true. As the conduit to the worlds of higher learning and work, any critical-thinking, cross-cultural or problem-solving skills that haven’t been developed during earlier education must be remediated later. This is already the case. In universities, students of color suffer “racial battle fatigue” around the repeated need to educate white peers who are meaningfully interacting across racial lines for the first time. In the workforce, in one year alone, Google spent $150 million on diversity and bias training initiatives. Intel estimates spending $60 million a year for its five-year diversity plan.

In addition to better preparing students for learning, living and working in a multiracial society, diverse schools hold the advantage of positive peer effects. These are the varying outcomes linked to students’ friendships and social relationships within their cohorts. Peers matter because they can positively influence views on going to school and class, completion of assignments and college enrollment. Peers can also have a negative impact; one study showed that knowing a close friend or acquaintance who drops out increases the chances of someone else in their peer group doing the same. Peer makeup further influences how adults interact with students, including teacher expectations, instructional level and family involvement.
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studies indicate peer composition is more important than even a child’s own socioeconomic standing entering school.\textsuperscript{24}

All students receive academic benefits in racially and economically diverse schools\textsuperscript{25} though the benefits accumulate more sharply to historically disadvantaged groups.\textsuperscript{26} In diverse schools, low income black or Hispanic students experience higher academic achievement across multiple academic subjects, including math, science language and reading.\textsuperscript{27} Historically advantaged students who are both white and higher income tend to score well on tests regardless of peer composition. This may relate in part to the numerous resources—strong parental education, tutoring, after school and summer extracurricular activities—surrounding them outside of school.\textsuperscript{28}

A recent federal analysis on the racial achievement gap found that achievement—measured by test performance on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), otherwise known as the Nation’s Report Card—was lowest for black and white students in schools with the highest concentrations of black students. However, after controlling for socioeconomic status, achievement differences between settings with high and low concentrations of black students disappeared for white students. These recent findings specifically applied to white students attending racially isolated black schools, though multiple past studies of white student outcomes in desegregated schools indicate no declines and some gains in achievement.\textsuperscript{29}

More broadly, the racial achievement gap closed most rapidly and significantly during desegregation era, according to NAEP data.\textsuperscript{30} A state-level analysis of NAEP test scores from the
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similarly found that states with the lowest segregation also report the narrowest achievement gap.\textsuperscript{31} Potential causal factors here, explored further below, include a more evenly distributed flow of consequential resources to desegregated schools.

Peer effects research has often relied on narrowly defined outcomes for students, typically achievement on standardized tests. Though accountability policies continue to ensure that test scores remain the currency of the day, the discussion of educational benefits as they relate to peer groups must be extended. Most standardized tests simply aren’t designed to measure significant learning outcomes linked to diversity—things like heightened creativity, the ability to see and relate to multiple points of view and comfort working across lines of difference to solve complex problems. Increasingly, though, these are qualities valued by colleges and employers.\textsuperscript{32}

In addition to being overly focused on test results, peer effects research tends to overlook the many assets students of color carry into educational settings. In 2005, a researcher exploring how Hispanic students experienced higher education synthesized these assets into various forms of cultural wealth. Valuable assets linked to historically marginalized students included high and hopeful future aspirations, perseverance, grit, resistance to social inequality, adept linguistic communication and storytelling, strong familial and communal ties and the ability to comfortably traverse different social contexts.\textsuperscript{33} At the same time, the cultural wealth that non-marginalized students bring to diverse settings remains important. Sonia Nieto, an education researcher at UMass-Amherst writes,

The weight of cultural capital can’t be ignored. To do so would be both naïve and romantic because it would deny the reality that power, knowledge and resources are located in the norms of dominant cultures and languages. To imply that working class students and students from dominated groups need not learn the cultural norms of the dominant group is effectively to disempower the students who are most academically vulnerable.”\textsuperscript{34}

Fundamentally, exposure to and exchange of these different assets is valuable for all students.

Diverse schools and classrooms lend themselves to contact with peers of differing racial and economic backgrounds. From that contact flows another realm of advantages linked to school diversity. These social advantages, which include reductions in prejudice and
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stereotyping, are more critical than ever in a rapidly diversifying society still Balkanized along racial and ethnic lines.

2. Integrating schools reduces prejudice and integrates social worlds

The social-psychological damages of racial separation formed a central rationale for the 1954 Brown decision. Citing studies from the field of psychology, the justices declared, “To separate them [black students] from others of similar age and qualifications solely because of their race generates a feeling of inferiority as to their status in the community that may affect their hearts and minds in a way unlikely ever to be undone.”

Kenneth and Mamie Clark, a pair of young, married African American social psychologists known for their cutting edge research on the relationship between segregation and self-esteem in young black children, produced much of the social science evidence informing the justices’ decision in Brown. One set of experiments involved child preferences for baby dolls identical except for their skin color. Gathering groups of black children aged 3 to 7, the Clarks would ask questions about the racial identity of the dolls, the ones they liked most, and which ones “looked bad” or were a “nice color.” Most of the black children—even the youngest—preferred the white dolls. A related Clark study drew connections between school segregation and color consciousness, finding that black children in racially isolated schools were more aware of their race than black children in more diverse schools.

Experiments conducted by different researchers during the same time period confirmed and extended these results for both black and white children. One showed that an overwhelming majority of white children (89%) preferred white dolls, along with a significant majority (57%) of black children. This particular study also tested racial associations with housing and poverty; majorities of both races were more likely to provide the brown dolls with worn clothing and housing in an apartment unit instead of a brick single family home. Racial separation and the unequal footing it created, in other words, insidiously shaped children’s perceptions of themselves and others at a very early age. Though research on segregation’s psychological costs for white children also was submitted to the Court as part of the social science statement in Brown, the justices chose to focus solely on its damages for black children. Seven years after the Court’s ruling in Brown, Dr. Martin Luther King perhaps put it best, “segregation distorts the

soul and damages the personality. It gives the segregator a false sense of superiority and the segregated a false sense of inferiority.”

In the 50s and 60s, both Dr. King and the Supreme Court recognized that systems of segregation operate through stigma and status inequality. Segregation marked African Americans as inferior and thus not worthy of equal access to an array of educational, social, economic or political benefits. Physical separation fosters social separation—and this is where prejudice finds fertile soil.

Prejudice arises out of the human desire to understand ourselves as part of a group. It revolves around questions like “who am I?” and “where do I belong?” People are wired to define themselves as part of an in-group or an out-group (or an “us” versus a “them”). Under damaging conditions like segregation, individuals in power are easily convinced of their own group’s superiority and work to exclude others from key resources and opportunities.

Integration, on the other hand, creates conditions that can redefine group contours. As Elizabeth Anderson, professor of philosophy at the University of Michigan, puts it in her book The Imperative of Integration, “By expanding the boundaries of “us” to include members of different social groups, integration turns in-group favoritism from an obstacle to a tool of interracial concord.” So if anxiety and fear fester with separation, empathy, care and trust grow with contact.

Multiple studies confirm that school desegregation reduces prejudice and cultivates better relationships between groups. It is even more effective than living in a diverse neighborhood for developing positive attitudes toward out-groups. This is partly because, unlike more happenstance encounters in neighborhoods, school desegregation creates structured opportunities for cross-racial interactions and true interracial friendships. Friendship is the most meaningful arena when it comes to attitudinal change; deeply knowing someone from a different group makes you more likely to extend that group the “us” treatment.
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When students experience school desegregation early in life, it also increases the likelihood they will seek out desegregated spaces—in the form of postsecondary options, workplaces and neighborhoods—over the life course. This creates opportunities for perpetuation across generations. Choosing a diverse neighborhood because of your own exposure to diversity increases the chances that your child will enroll in diverse schools linked to that neighborhood.

The stakes surrounding greater social integration couldn’t be higher. The lack thereof represents a fundamental explanation for our growing inequality. This is because social networks, understood as our webs of family, friends and acquaintances, shape access to opportunity across many related dimensions. Said differently, there’s truth to the old adage, “It’s not what you know, it’s who you know.” In the swiftly diversifying U.S., social circles remain extremely separate. Whites report the most segregated networks: a 2016 survey found that the average white American’s social circle was 91% white and just 1% black. Fully three out of four whites report no people of color in their social networks. When our social circles are segregated, so too is the valuable information about schooling, neighborhoods and employment contained within them.

Unequal rationing of opportunity is nurtured by the myopia formed in separate social worlds. If we surround ourselves only with people of similar backgrounds and perspectives, how can we embrace different lived experiences? And if we can’t understand our increasingly divergent realities, how will we muster the political will to tackle the democratic costs of inequality?

3. Integrating schools strengthens citizenship for our multiracial democracy


Public schools serve many purposes. Among the most central is preparation for life as a citizen in a democratic society. Schools teach students the history of our participatory democracy. They illuminate the gap between how democracies function in reality and how they function in the ideal. From there, students learn how to make informed decisions in service of democracy’s continuation.

This assumes, of course, that civics education remains an educational priority. School integration matters here. Students in diverse, multiracial schools (serving 3-4 racial/ethnic groups) are more likely than students in segregated, high poverty schools to report opportunities to learn civil and political knowledge and skills, according to a Chicago survey of nearly 50,000 students. Similarly, surveys of diverse schools in a number of districts around the country show that students of all backgrounds feel positively toward civic engagement. Civic learning opportunities in schools can offset lower civic participation in families and neighborhoods. But schools have to directly focus on citizenship outcomes, not just assume they will occur as a byproduct of being in a classroom community. And teaching method matters too—instruction that includes opportunities for service learning, discussion of current events and regular discussion of controversial topics like race prompts the best outcomes.

As our democratic society becomes more multiracial and more unequal, school integration represents a key antidote to tribalism in our politics. School integration can lead to greater social cohesion. A socially cohesive society is one that embraces the needs and views of all groups within it; one that helps its citizens see that their individual prosperity is dependent upon cooperation with a larger community.

How does school integration foster cohesion in a diverse democracy? As Roz Mickelson and Mokubung Nkomo point out in a highly detailed review of research, the answer to that question brings together many of the academic and social outcomes flowing from school integration. Diverse schools and classrooms give students practice navigating across lines of


difference. They build perspective-taking and problem-solving skills in all groups. Discussions about democracy and its shortcomings tend to be richer, more complex and more empathic among diverse peers. Diverse schools lead to higher educational and occupational attainment for historically marginalized students, which reduces inequality and allows for more even participation in the political process. They establish an early basis for citizens to interact on equal terms, helping students understand the crucial difference between generosity towards those in need and giving everyone what they need to succeed. Without equal status contact among different groups, it’s possible to do the former, much harder to do the latter.

Ultimately, diverse schools can produce citizens and leaders who viscerally understand the struggles of groups beyond their own. Graduates have learned to see, understand and respond to the needs of others. They have practice constructing shared points of view. They feel more accountable to and connected with a broad, rather than narrow, community of us. As two stakeholders wrote in their push for more equitable access to Montgomery County, Maryland’s competitive magnets, “We know that a more diverse student body would be indispensable to fostering a generation of compassionate, socially responsible learners and thinkers.”

4. Integrating schools encourages equitable access to high quality, engaging curricula

School integration is related to the presence of more challenging curricula. In 2016, the federal report from the Government Accountability Office (GAO) found that, compared to more diverse settings, schools serving high shares (75% or more) of black, Hispanic and low income students offered far fewer advanced math and science courses at the middle and high school level. For instance, just under 50% of high poverty black and Hispanic schools offered 7th grade Algebra I, compared to 79% of low poverty black and Hispanic schools and 65% of diverse schools. Though the discrepancies narrowed somewhat when it came to 8th grade Algebra, they persisted—denying many middle school students in segregated high poverty black and Hispanic schools the opportunity to gain a foothold in challenging math classes. High poverty black and Hispanic schools were also much less likely to offer high school Advanced
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Placement classes (which garner students college credit if they perform well on the assessment) or calculus and physics than other types of school settings.69

The only exception to pervasive curriculum disparities was in the realm of gifted and talented classes. A slightly higher percentage of high poverty black and Hispanic schools (59%) offered gifted and talented coursework than low poverty black and Hispanic schools (55%). This may reflect a drift toward segregation within high poverty black and Hispanic schools as families vie for access to limited resources like gifted and talented programs.

Indeed, segregation within schools has consistently undermined—but not erased—the benefits of desegregation.70 Sometimes referred to as second generation segregation, or tracking, the racially identifiable sorting of students into separate classrooms cords off access to more complex curricula. Lowest track classes suffer the most;71 in some diverse schools these learning spaces look much like instruction in segregated, high poverty settings. School integration efforts thus involve tackling both external and internal educational inequalities.

The stakes attached to unequal access to challenging curriculum are high. These courses can better prepare students for participation in civic society, postsecondary pursuits, boost chances of college admission by padding Grade Point Averages (GPAs) and, in the case of successful Advanced Placement (AP) test performance, shave off the cost of higher education. Perhaps more fundamentally, high level courses lend themselves to more rigorous instruction and deep student engagement.

A dramatic narrowing of the curriculum in schools and classrooms serving historically marginalized students is a significant byproduct of the standards and accountability movement. Teaching carefully tailored to content assessed by annual testing permeates high poverty schools and classrooms. Some argue that this is appropriate; students must start with the basic skills before progressing to more complex and challenging material.72 Others worry, though, that steady doses of “drill and kill” instruction geared toward rote memorization foster stress and detachment from school.

Take an example from a widely recognized teacher working under No Child Left Behind mandates in a racially segregated, high poverty Hartford city school. As reported in Susan Eaton’s book about school desegregation efforts in Connecticut, the Hartford teacher had designed a captivating unit on monarch butterflies. It involved an intensive search and retrieval
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mission, aided by magnifying glasses, for eggs scattered on neighborhood milkweed plants. Students watched as the eggs hatched and carefully tended caterpillar jars over the summer, sending their teacher postcards about metamorphosis. In the fall, they set the butterflies free. Eaton wrote, “Even the few [third grade] students whose anti-school defenses were already erected lowered their drawbridges for this lesson.” Yet as district pressure to perform well on the Connecticut Mastery Tests ratcheted up, lessons once animated by children’s budding interests and rich with expeditionary learning were squeezed out by formulaic writing drills and intensive test preparation.

Intensive test preparation in racially segregated high poverty schools can be fueled by a desire to show that the racial or economic makeup of students doesn’t have to determine performance. Romanticized by iconic movies like Stand and Deliver or Lean on Me, turning in strong, school-wide scores on testing become a rallying cry for students and staff alike. In a policy environment that so heavily sanctions—and pillories—underperforming schools, those attitudes reflect some measure of self-preservation. But all of it rests on the assumption that tests accurately and solely reflect school-related inputs like strong teaching. So many interrelated non-school factors—family socioeconomic status, neighborhood context, early years care and instruction, to name a few—also influence those scores. Perversely, schools serving high shares of students from historically marginalized communities have the most to overcome and often the fewest resources with which to do so.

On the other side of the coin, schools and classrooms serving white and/or affluent students have viewed state-issued standardized tests as a floor, not a ceiling, for performance. This offers more freedom for creative exploration in classrooms and more time to bring material to life. A survey of school leaders in the aftermath of No Child Left Behind found that just one in five principals in low minority schools reported reduced time for the arts, compared to one in three principals in high minority schools. Suburban districts were also less likely than urban ones to decrease instructional time for subjects other than math or language arts.

With the advent of the more rigorous Common Core standards, however, even the most privileged schools began to zero in on content and test preparation. Massachusetts was the only state where about half of tested students previously had reached proficiency under the higher Common Core bar; in almost every other the vast majority were set up to fail. In New York, after about 70 percent of students flunked the new Common Core aligned tests, a wave of protests took the form of the “opt out” movement. Roughly one in five New York students did
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not take a required standardized test by 2015. And more affluent districts reported higher percentages of students opting out.77

This aspect of the backlash against the Common Core raises an interesting question: If our nation’s most advantaged families do not think heavy emphasis on test preparation is in the best interests of their kids and schools, why should it be considered good policy for anyone else?

5. Integrating schools improves equitable access to strong, diverse teachers

Strong teachers, as the Virginia Board of Education has recognized, are among the most influential in-school factors when it comes to student performance.78 The ingredients that go into strong teaching include some combination of experience, subject matter expertise, rigor and quality of training, adept verbal communication and warmth.79

We know that good teachers are crucial to student success and what characteristics define them. We also know that, despite their fundamental importance to student opportunity, quality teachers are perhaps the most unevenly distributed resource in the educational landscape.

Within schools, experienced, high quality teachers are differentially sorted across classrooms, with the strongest instructors often serving the least challenging classrooms.80 These same patterns emerge on a much broader scale within school systems.81 Teachers in struggling, segregated schools get paid the least, miss the most days of work and turn over frequently.82

Punitive accountability and assessment systems, already indicted for stifling creative and challenging curricula, additionally harm teacher hiring and retention efforts in schools serving high concentrations of students in poverty. Once these schools are branded an accountability failure, it’s much more difficult for them to attract and hold strong teachers with plentiful options for employment in less stressful environments.83

More racially and economically diverse schools, on the other hand, tend to attract stronger teachers.84 During a time of growing racial mismatch between faculties and students, diverse schools are more likely to report diverse faculties. A survey of more than 1,000 U.S. teachers found that schools in which African American or Hispanic students made up between 40 and 90 percent of the enrollment reported lower shares of white teachers relative to the national average.85 In 2005, at the time of the study, white teachers accounted for more than 85 percent of the national teaching force but between 62 and 82 percent of teachers in racially diverse schools. Teachers in stably diverse schools also reported more positive student interactions and school-community relationships.86

Racially diverse faculties are essential for a number of reasons. They can help model effective cross-racial teamwork and interactions.87 They create stronger teams in general, because diversity brings new perspectives and insight to complex challenges.88 They send the message that teachers and leaders can and should come from any racial background. They reach students with a diverse array of perspectives, needs and learning styles because they themselves are diverse.89 Teachers of color on diverse faculties additionally offer support systems for
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families and students of color in the school, have higher expectations of students of color, produce higher achievement and are more likely to recommend students of color for gifted and talented courses than white teachers.

Despite their myriad benefits, racially diverse faculties are all too rare. Many black teachers in the South lost their jobs during the early days of court-ordered desegregation. Teacher credentials became more salient during this era, a discrimination tactic that effectively thinned the ranks of African American faculty. Past discrimination maps onto contemporary struggles to recruit and retain teachers of color. College enrollment rates and certification and credentialing requirements remain a barrier, as does the diminished status of the teaching profession, the low pay and the funneling of teachers of color into segregated schools struggling with accountability sanctions.

A central takeaway is that teacher demographics strongly relate to student demographics. Just as schools with diverse student bodies are linked to diverse faculties, schools with homogeneous student bodies are linked to homogeneous faculties. Intensely segregated white schools (where black and Hispanic students made up less than 10 percent of the enrollment) reported in 2006 that 96% of the teachers were white, on average. In intensely segregated nonwhite schools (where white students made up less than 10% of the enrollment), white teachers accounted for just 38% of the faculty. Early on, courts recognized the mutually reinforcing impact of student and teacher segregation.

An example from Charlotte-Mecklenburg brings these teacher-student dynamics to life. In 2001, a federal district judge declared Charlotte Mecklenburg Schools free from court
oversight of desegregation despite broad public opposition. A policy that prioritized choice and neighborhood-based student assignment swiftly resegregated students. Economist Kirabo Jackson at Northwestern University used the student assignment policy shift to assess whether or not teachers also resegregated. He found that schools enrolling higher shares of black students after desegregated ended saw a decline in high quality teachers (defined by years of experience and performance on certification tests). High quality white and black teachers were more likely to leave schools with significant proportions of black students, though the teachers that remained were disproportionately black.

6. Integrating schools improves educational outcomes by equalizing funding

Three decades before the resegregation that made Kirabo Jackson’s research on student-teacher dynamics possible, Charlotte stood poised to implement one of the nation’s farthest reaching city-suburban school desegregation plans. Within the city, West Charlotte High, a segregated black school, prepared for the first time to open its doors to both white and black students. When they opened, the school boasted new paved parking lots, two tennis courts, and a completely overhauled interior. A West Charlotte student who graduated one year prior to the desegregation-related upgrades said,

It took integration to get the parking lots paved. Those gravel parking lots had been out there for years, and we had asked and asked for paved parking lots…and then I come back when I’m in college, we’re one of the model schools and everything’s paved, the office is immaculate. And I’m like, what a difference a day makes.

With desegregation, then, came a swift effort to equalize grossly disparate material resources in Charlotte. Those disparities rigidly and intentionally defined segregated education despite the Supreme Court’s 1896 “separate but equal” doctrine. Fully funding a dual system of public schools for children living in the same geographic area was expensive, even if white political will had existed to do so. The result: when public schools for black children were provided at all, they were characterized by highly disparate funding. In the deep South, states typically spent five to six times as much on white students, ranging from $31 to $37 per white student compared to $5 to $7 per black student.
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Even when northern philanthropic associations stepped into fill the void in public financing for black education in the South, black communities had to provide matching dollars. They did, often at great expense. In Alabama, the Rosenwald Fund helped pay for the construction of nearly 350 schools during the early 1900s. Of the total $905,545 spent building the schools, rural black communities, comprised largely of tenant farmers, raised nearly $350,000. The Rosenwald Fund contributed nearly $200,000. White taxpayers offered about $68,000; black taxpayers roughly $292,000. Black citizens thus bore the financial brunt of a system of public school segregation designed to blunt access to the same opportunities afforded white citizens.

Early legal strategies to dismantle government-sponsored segregation focused on forcing states to equalize spending on white and black schools, reasoning the outlay would be prohibitively expensive. After a series of victorious lawsuits demanding truly equal facilities for black and white students in higher education, NAACP lawyers turned to the K-12 arena. Would they continue a case-by-case strategy of litigating starkly unequal facilities? Or would they strike at segregation itself? Despite serious internal misgivings, in 1950 Thurgood Marshall helped convince the NAACP’s leadership that a direct attack on segregation should guide the organization’s legal strategy for elementary and secondary public education. This battle culminated in the five cases that made up the unanimous 1954 Brown v. Board of Education decision outlawing state-sponsored segregation.

The “linked fates” theory of school desegregation held in part that equalization of educational resources would occur once the fortunes of white students were bound up with students of color. In other words, sending black and white students to the same schools would increase the likelihood of more equal educational investment (fiscal and otherwise) across all schools. So it would become harder to sustain inequitable policies or practices for some schools when children of diverse backgrounds were more evenly distributed across all of them. Desegregation was and continues to be at least partly about resource equalization.

If facility upgrades like those at West Charlotte High represented one dimension of equalization by virtue of school desegregation; reduced pupil to teacher ratios and higher per-pupil expenditures represented others. These resources mattered. One sophisticated study pointed to smaller class sizes and higher per pupil spending as potential causal mechanisms for an array of long-term benefits for black graduates of desegregated schools. Using large-scale
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datasets containing information on the life trajectories of black children born between 1945 and 1970, the researcher concluded that experiencing school desegregation meant increased educational and occupational attainment, attendance at better colleges, higher earnings and better health outcomes. It also reduced the likelihood of incarceration.\textsuperscript{110} Multiple other studies confirm these findings.\textsuperscript{111} Moreover, desegregation had an intergenerational effect. Having a black parent who attended desegregated schools was linked to higher achievement and attainment for the next generation.\textsuperscript{112} That bears repeating: higher educational attainment linked to school desegregation persisted across generations of black families, underscoring both the importance of desegregation for social mobility and the role parent education plays in reproducing outcomes for children, grandchildren and beyond.

**Conclusion**

School segregation is a root cause of educational inequality. As we’ve seen, its roots reach deep into intersecting issues of interest to the Board. These include the quality of learning outcomes and preparation for the 21\textsuperscript{st} century workforce, meaningful civic education, school accountability, teacher diversity and quality and school funding.

It matters that schools reach and shape the youngest members of society. Lessons in equality and inequality learned here, as children, reverberate for many years. To expect that schools can singlehandedly unwind the damages of segregation in other realms of life would be naïve. Still, schools can and should play a role in confronting larger societal damages.

We have numerous successful examples of policies that work to voluntarily integrate schools. Many of these contemporary strategies are rooted in equitable school choice. They involve the creation of attractive, school-wide thematic or programmatic offerings, strong outreach, the provision of free transportation, diversity goals that help ensure schools roughly reflect the communities they serve and the well-designed use of weighted lotteries to govern admission.\textsuperscript{113} Other policy avenues include implementing systems of managed choice, devising school transfer and/or turnaround strategies that promote diversity and reduce racial isolation.

\textsuperscript{110}Ibid.
redrawing attendance boundaries with an eye toward creating diverse schools and coordinating school and housing efforts to promote integration in both spheres.

State governments are meaningfully positioned to lead on school integration. Increased flexibility permitted by ESSA, a capacity to convene relevant stakeholders and incentivize integration through competitive grant priorities, regulatory processes and/or guidance and access to the bully pulpit make state governments central to future integration efforts.

The stakes continue to rise; without meaningful action we run the risk of deepening our political, economic and racial polarization.

---

114 The Century Foundation, *A New Wave of School Integration*.