THE GROWTH OF SEGREGATION IN AMERICAN SCHOOLS: CHANGING PATTERNS OF SEPARATION AND POVERTY SINCE 1968

Gary Orfield

with the assistance of
Sara Schley
Diane Glass
Sean Reardon

A Report of the Harvard Project on School Desegregation
to the
National School Boards Association

The Harvard Project on School Desegregation is a student-faculty research project directed by Gary Orfield involving students from the Harvard Graduate School of Education, Harvard Law School and Harvard College. This Project, which will issue a series of studies, has been supported by the Spencer Foundation.

December 1993
ISBN 0-88364-179-8

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

School Integration in the 1990s

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

For the first time since the Supreme Court declared school segregation in the South unconstitutional in 1954, the public schools in that region have turned back toward greater segregation. Southern segregation grew significantly from 1988 to 1991 and segregation of African-American students across the U.S. also increased. Segregation of African-American students in the South declined dramatically from the mid-1960s through the early 1970s, was stable until 1988, but then began to rise. This is particularly striking because the South has been the nation's most integrated region since 1970 and actually became slightly more integrated in the 1980-88 period.

Segregation of Latino students, who will soon be the largest minority group in U.S. public schools, continued to increase as it has consistently since data was first collected in the 1960s. The increase of Latino segregation was most rapid in the West. There are already more Latinos than African-Americans in the Pacific Coast region, the Mountain states, the Southwest, Texas, and three New England states.

This study provides national data moving beyond previous reports by showing the relationship of segregation to poverty. It shows that both African-American and Latino students are much more likely than white students to find themselves in schools of concentrated poverty. Segregation by race is strongly related to segregation by poverty.

Much of the educational damage of racial segregation probably grows out of this relationship. The first major longitudinal study of the federal government's largest compensatory education program, Chapter 1, found that the program was not producing gains in achievement test scores. It found that Chapter 1 students in high poverty schools were performing much worse than their counterparts in low poverty schools. The children in the high poverty schools read less, got lower grades and had lower attendance rates. (*Education Week*, Nov. 24, 1993: 15).

Minority students are much more likely to be in high poverty schools. They face not only discrimination and stereotypes about minority schools but schools struggling with the much greater concentration of health, social, and neighborhood problems that are found in high poverty schools.

This study shows where segregation is concentrated and where schools remain highly integrated. It offers the first national comparison of segregation by community size. It shows that segregation remains high in big cities and serious in mid-sized central cities. Many African-American and Latino students also attend segregated schools in the suburbs of the largest metropolitan areas. On the other hand, rural areas and small towns, small metropolitan areas, and the suburbs of the mid-size metro areas are far more integrated.

When the civil rights movement began, intense rural segregation and racial domination in the South seemed to be one of the most immoveable racial problems in the nation. Now rural schools provide an example to the rest of the country.

This report was also able to explore the way in which a state's pattern of school district organization relates to the segregation of its students. Except where there were sweeping desegregation plans crossing district lines, states with more fragmented district structures tended to have higher levels of segregation. This was particularly true in states that had relatively small proportions of minority students who were concentrated in few districts.

The Supreme Court's 1974 decision in the Detroit case, *Milliken v. Bradley*, 418 U.S. 717 (1974) limited desegregation to a single district unless the court found that suburban or state action had caused segregation in the city. Since the vast majority of large central city systems have a shrinking minority of white students (Orfield and Monfort, 1988), this greatly limited the possibility of desegregating those cities. Since the Court had earlier required rapid and complete desegregation within districts in *Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Bd. of Ed.*, 402 U.S. 1 (1971), these decisions meant that states that happened to have a history of small districts would be allowed a much higher level of segregation than those with a history of county-wide systems. The decisions also meant that as segregation spread to include larger sections of central cities and new white suburbs spread into separate districts, segregation would increase. The fact that the school district serving Charlotte, N.C. happened to cover a county of 528 square miles while the Boston school district was only one twelfth as large in a much bigger metropolitan area explains a great deal about the kind of desegregation the two cities experienced. The Charlotte plan included the great majority of white middle class students in the metropolitan area and many of its centers of new growth; the Boston plan excluded both. Charlotte had extensive desegregation two decades later; Boston led the country in disruption and white enrollment decline. The *Milliken* decision is surely the basic reason why Illinois, New York, Boston, Michigan, and New Jersey, each of which has a much lower share of African-American students than many Southern states, have been the most segregated states for black students for more than a decade.

This report concludes that the country and its schools are going though vast changes without any strategy. The civil rights impulse from the 1960s is dead in the water and the ship is floating backward toward the shoals of racial segregation.

Since 1980, the debate over school reform has had virtually nothing to say about problems of racial and economic isolation. American schools need a new set of goals for successful multi-racial education reflecting the vast changes in American society and they need help in identifying and implementing the most effective ways to reach those goals. This report recommends policies to school districts, state governments, and federal civil rights and education officials to foster integrated education and to make interracial schools function more effectively. It calls for a resumption of civil rights enforcement by the Education Department's Office for Civil Rights and the Civil Rights Division of the Justice Department, restoration of federal aid for successful integration strategies, basic research on the

consequences of segregation by race, ethnicity and poverty, and an examination of the ways in which multi-racial education functions most effectively. It calls for rewarding, rather than punishing, successfully integrated school systems in the revision of Chapter 1--the largest federal compensatory education program. Recognizing that many of the problems of race and poverty segregation are the results of housing policies and housing discrimination, it recommends that housing officials end policies and practices that foster segregation and take steps to support integrated communities. It calls for focusing attention on the very rapidly growing suburban minority communities to prevent the development of severe segregation in parts of suburbia.

THE DATA

Analysis of trends in school desegregation has been carried out on several occasions. The principal author of this report previously directed studies on six occasions beginning in 1976 for Congressional committees, the Joint Center for Political Studies, and the National School Boards Association. Since the early 1970s, only the Carter Administration has published federal desegregation statistics. The most recent analyses, in January 1992, reported on trends in the 1988-89 school year. This report carries the research into the 1991-92 school year using the most recent federal data now available.

Until this year, all of the segregation reports were based on statistics collected by the Education Department's Office for Civil Rights (OCR). Until the OCR required school districts to report data by race and ethnicity, many school districts refused to collect or to report such information. Before the mid-1960s the only racial data collected and published in much of the country was assembled by journalists in a private organization, the Race Relations Reporting Service in the South. Most northern school districts refused to regularly report any racial statistics, claiming that they treated everyone the same and that such data was unnecessary. Many claimed that counting students by race was itself a civil rights violation. Few kept track of Latino and other minority students; in fact, it wasn't until 1980 that even the U.S. Census made a concerted effort to count the Latino population.

Until the 1990s the racial data was always that collected by the Education Department for civil rights enforcement purposes. This data was collected separately from other school data and was not part of the basic federal database on schools in the U.S. The government has traditionally published few educational statistics by race and the National Center for Education Statistics did not have racial identifiers on much of its basic information about elementary and secondary education.

Since the information was not considered part of the core of national data, it was not collected systematically from all school districts and the districts reporting changed from time to time as the priorities of the civil rights office changed and the priority of civil rights within the executive branch waxed and waned. The data was initially collected every year but then was reduced to every two years.

Data was required from most Southern districts, since many were operating desegregation plans negotiated with the OCR, and from most other big districts with substantial minority enrollment. However, little data was collected from the largely white districts in the north and the sample of districts varied from year to year. The only "universal sample" of all school districts in the U.S. was taken in 1976.

All data on national, regional, and state trends was based on statistical projections of the data from the districts which had actually submitted data to estimate state, regional, and national totals. During the 1980s, when school desegregation was an extremely low priority in the executive branch, the data became weaker and was processed much more slowly. The 1982 data had so many problems that it was virtually impossible to analyze trends. The 1988 data, the most recent examined, lacked adequate samples to reliably project state trends for a number of states.

Metropolitan data was always weak, except in the South. While 75% of Americans live in metropolitan areas, and even higher proportions of African-American and Latino students, even the basic information to understand metropolitan trends was not collected by the federal government for most of the U.S. Although we have become a suburban society to a considerable extent--there are more suburbanites than either big city, small city, or rural residents--the suburbs were often ignored in the data collection process. Since data was not collected from many suburbs in the Northeast, the Midwest, and the West, the samples were not adequate to describe suburban and metropolitan level segregation patterns in much of the country. This report is the first to present a national analysis of segregation patterns by size of community and to describe the levels of segregation in suburbia.

There has been no ongoing analysis of racial change or segregation in the schools of many U.S. metropolitan areas. The limitations of the data permitted use of only one measure of segregation where any could be used. No analysis could be done of the dramatic increases in minority enrollment taking place in certain sectors of many suburban rings in recent years.

This report draws on a much richer body of data, vastly superior to any that has been available for a generation. The basic source is the U.S. Department of Education's Common Core of Data Public School Universe, 1991-92. This data comes from every public school in every state which has submitted its records. The great majority of the states with significant minority population submitted complete records. Only Virginia and Georgia, of the states with large minority enrollments, did not submit. This means that this report uses actual, not projected data (except for the 1988-89 projected data for missing states), and that it is possible to look at the state and metropolitan totals across the nation.

As the country considers possible major changes in desegregation policies in the wake of recent Supreme Court decisions on Oklahoma City, Kansas City, and DeKalb County, Georgia (one of the nation's largest suburban system), it is very important to have information of this quality. I hope that the Department of Education will soon be receiving such data from all states. In a country which is only about thirty years from having a

majority of "minority" students in U.S. public schools, if present trends continue, this information is needed to understand how communities are changing, to guide civil rights policies, and to plan educational programs.

This paper reports a number of rates of change over time for states and regions. Whenever the process of measuring segregation changes, of course, there is a question about the comparability of the data. It is true that at least some small part of the changes reported here may reflect problems with the earlier data projections, particularly at the state level. In spite of the earlier sampling problems, however, the previous data usually showed continuous patterns of gradual change over time, except where major policy changes were instituted, and there is also a great deal of continuity between previous data and this data, although it is computed from a different source. The basic trends are clear at the national and regional levels. The information on single districts has no sampling problems since it was based each year on data collected on all students in a district (with extremely few exceptions) rather than from a sample.

One of the greatest advantages of using the Common Core data for this study is that we were able to carry out an analysis not possible in the earlier reports. Because the school level database includes the poverty level (percent on free lunch) of the school as well as the racial and ethnic statistics, we could examine the relationship between segregation by race and segregation by poverty. A recent federal report reached similar conclusions, showing that minority group students were 77% of the students in high poverty schools but only 19% in low poverty schools. Forty-five percent of high poverty schools but only 4% of low poverty schools had intensely segregated enrollments of 90-100% minority students. (U.S. Dept. of Education, *Reinventing Chapter* 1: 17) Since there is a vast body of research showing powerful impacts of school poverty on educational outcomes, this is an extremely important issue.

MEASURES OF DESEGREGATION

This study defines desegregation as the extent to which African-American and Latino students attend school with white students. Desegregation can be measured in many ways. The methods employed here were chosen because they are readily understandable, provide information on the kinds of schools students actually attend, have been used in previous reports, and can be compared across the U.S., regions, states, and cities. Segregation is measured by calculating the proportion of African-American and Latino students in schools with more than half whites and the proportion in schools that are intensely segregated, with 90-100% minority students. The other measure used here, the exposure index, shows the typical proportion of, for example, white students in schools attended by African-American students. This report examines the degree of exposure of African-American and Latino students to whites. In the tables and analyses, "predominantly minority" means more than half of the enrollment of the school is African-American, Latino, Native American or Asian and "intensely segregated" means 90-100% combined minority enrollment. Other measures will be explored in a forthcoming report on cities and metro areas.

NATIONAL AND REGIONAL SEGREGATION PATTERNS
INCREASED SEGREGATION FOR BLACK AND LATINO STUDENTS

The huge changes in the racial composition of American public schools and the segregation of African-American and Latino students over the past half century have often been misunderstood. The great increase in the proportion of non-white students has not been a consequence of "white flight" from public to private schools, it has been the product of huge changes in birth rates and immigration patterns. In fact there has been no significant redistribution between the sectors of American education. During the 1970-84 period, there was a small increase in the share of students in private schools, but between 1984 and 1991 public enrollment grew 7% while private enrollment dropped 9%. (*The Condition of Education 1993:* 100).

According to the Census Bureau's most recent estimates, the number of black students enrolled in public schools in the U.S. increased 3% from 1972 to 1992, the first two decades of widespread busing plans. In contrast, Latino enrollment soared 89% and white enrollment dropped by 14%, a trend which led to many claims that whites were abandoning public education because of resistance to integration. The decline was not, however, the result of whites leaving public schools. The drop was not balanced for by growth in white private school enrollment. The Census Bureau reports that there were 18% fewer white students in private elementary schools and 23% fewer than had been in private high schools two decades ago. (U.S. Census Bureau, *School Enrollment*, 1993 table A1, pp. A2-A5). The proportion of whites in public schools was actually increasing. The underlying reality, of course, was a dramatic drop in the number of school age white children in the U.S., as the white birth rate fell and the white population aged.

In 1992, 89% of whites, 95% of blacks, and 92% of Latinos attended public schools at the elementary level. Even among upper income whites, only one-sixth of the children were in private education. At the high school level, 92% of U.S. children were in public schools, including 92% of whites, 95% of Latinos, and 97% of blacks. Private high school was most common among higher income whites, but served only one-eighth of their children. (Ibid.: x). Desegregation has certainly not produced white abandonment of the public schools, though it has doubtless had impacts on enrollment trends in some districts.

Just as many Americans believe there is flight from public schools, many believe that desegregation is something that was tried a generation ago but did not last. In fact, the major changes in desegregation occurred for black students in the 1966 to 1972 period. The changes were very large and lasted with little overall erosion for about two decades. They were concentrated in the South and the Border states, the only regions to face a serious federal enforcement effort. Segregation is greatest in the large northern cities where desegregation was never accomplished.

This report reflects what may be the beginning of a historic reversal. The 1980s saw concerted effort by the Department of Justice, particularly during the Reagan Administration,

to terminate desegregation orders. Previous reports have shown that the effort had no net impact during the Reagan years. In fact, by some measures, black students became more integrated from 1980 to 1988.

There is, of course, a long delay in policy development and implementation in the federal courts. This report shows that, for the first time since the *Brown* decision, resegregation of African-American students occurred during the Bush Administration. Part of this may reflect the development of case law permitting both the abandonment of desegregation plans and return to segregated neighborhood schools under some circumstances. (*Board of Education v. Dowell*, 498 U.S. 237 (1991). The 1991 Oklahoma City decision gave Supreme Court approval to a process of ending desegregation plans that began earlier.

The proportion of black students in schools with more than half minority students rose from 1986 to 1991, reaching the level that had existed before the Supreme Court's first busing decision in 1971 (Table 1). The share of black students in intensely segregated (90-100% minority) schools -- which had actually declined during the 1980s -- also rose. Table 1 also shows that the consistent trend toward greater segregation of Latino students continued unabated on both measures. During the 1991 school year, Latino students were far more likely than African-Americans to be in predominantly minority schools and slightly more likely to be in intensely segregated schools.

Table 1

Percent of U.S. Black and Latino Students in Predominantly Minority and 90-100 Percent Minority Schools, 1968-1991

	Predominantly Minority		90-100% Minority	
	Blacks	Latinos	Blacks	Latinos
1968-69	76.6	54.8	64.3	23.1
1972-73	63.6	56.6	38.7	23.3
1980-81	62.9	68.1	33.2	28.8
1986-87	63.3	71.5	32.5	32.2
1991-92	66.0	73.4	33.9	34.0

Source: U.S. Department of Education Office for Civil Rights Data in Orfield, *Public School Desegregation in the United States, 1968-1980*, tables 1 and 10, 1991 Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data Public Education Agency Universe and OCR data tapes.

The third measure of segregation used in this report reveals the same pattern. Table 2 shows that the proportion of whites in the school of the typical black student dropped from 36% to 34% during this period. For Latinos, the decline was from 33% to 31%. Once again we see a reversal of a trend toward greater integration for African-Americans and a continuation of a trend toward greater segregation for Latinos. Latinos are also more segregated than blacks on this measure.

Table 2

Percent of White Students in School Attended by Typical Black or Latino Student, 1970-1991

	Black Students	Latino Students
1970	32.0	43.8
1980	36.2	35.5
1986	36.0	32.9
1991	34.4	31.2

Regional Differences

Ever since the civil rights revolution, school segregation has varied greatly from region to region. The fact that enforcement concentrated on the South and desegregation was never achieved in some of our largest and most influential cities may help explain the belief that desegregation cannot work. Leaders in intensely segregated and visible cities like New York, Washington, and Los Angeles often assume that things are worse in the South and that desegregation was an unfortunate failure. Both African-American and Latino students, however, continue to face the most intense segregation in the Northeast. Millions of African-Americans in the southern and border states attend schools that are still well-integrated decades after the first court orders. Understanding regional differences is essential when examining desegregation policy.

In the Northeast, about half of Latino and African-American students attend intensely segregated schools with 90-100% minority students. The 17 southern and border states that had state-mandated segregation until 1954 continue to be the most integrated region for blacks. Southern black students are only half as likely to be in intensely segregated schools as those in the Northeast. Blacks are most integrated in the area in which the majority of the black population is located. Latinos are least segregated in the Midwest, among the regions with a significant Latino population. Latinos in the West, their most important region, however, are significantly more segregated than southern blacks (Table 3).

Table 3

Segregation by Region*, 1991-92 School Year

Latino Segregation by Region, 1991-92
% of Latino Students in Region in Schools

Region	0-50% Minority	50-100% Minority	90-100% Minority
South	23.2	76.8	38.6
Border**	65.6	37.4	10.8
Northeast	21.9	78.1	46.2
Midwest	46.5	53.5	21.1
West	26.5	73.5	29.7
U.S. Total	26.6	73.4	34.0

Black Segregation by Region, 1991-92
% of Black Students in Region in Schools

Region	0-50% Minority	50-100% Minority	90-100% Minority
South	39.2	60.8	26.6
Border**	40.7	59.3	33.2
Northeast	23.8	76.2	50.1
Midwest	30.1	69.9	39.4
West	30.3	69.7	26.4
U.S. Total	34.0	66.0	33.9

* list of states within each region is in Appendix A
** very small % of Latino students in this region

Blacks have more contact with whites in school in the South than in any other region even though the South has by far the largest proportion of blacks in its schools. More than half of all blacks in the U.S. live in the South. The exposure index shows that blacks in the southern and border states are in schools, on average, where almost two-fifths of the students are white. The Northeast and Midwest states, which have much larger white majorities, provide much less integration for blacks (Table 4).

Latinos experience least contact with whites in the Northeast, the South (which includes Texas) and the West. (The list of states within each region can be found in Appendix A.)

Table 4

Exposure of Black and Latino Students to White Students, 1991-92

Percent of White Students in the School of the Typical Minority Student

Region	Blacks	Latinos
South	38.3	28.0
Border	37.3	55.6*
Northeast	26.1	26.4
Midwest	31.7	47.2
West	34.5	31.9
U.S. Total	34.4	31.2

The huge changes in school segregation in the South in the four decades since the *Brown* decision deserve the closest attention. In 1954, there was legally required apartheid in the region's schools with virtually no students crossing the state-mandated racial lines. That system was 98% intact a decade later when Congress enacted the 1964 Civil Rights Act. That act, its enforcement by the Johnson Administration, and a series of sweeping Supreme Court decisions produced a decisive and lasting transformation in the next six years. Table 5 shows that the South went from one-tenth of one percent of its black students in majority white schools in 1960 to 33% a decade later. There was an even larger change in the proportion of students in virtually all-black schools; only 34% percent of southern blacks were in these intensely segregated schools by 1970. The story of a persistent and stable reform and increasing integration in the South continued until 1988, in spite of the Reagan administration's opposition and the virtual ending of federal enforcement activity.

The South is nowhere near returning to its pattern before the civil rights revolution, but the direction of change has reversed. Given recent changes in the law and a widespread debate among southern school boards about ending desegregation plans, the increase in segregation shown here could foreshadow much larger moves toward racial isolation in the future.

Table 5

Change in Black Segregation in the South, 1967-1991
Percent of Students in Majority White Schools

1954	.001
1960	.1
1964	2.3
1967	13.9
1968	23.4
1970	33.1
1972	36.4
1976	37.6
1980	37.1
1986	42.0
1988	43.5
1991	39.2

Source: Southern Education Reporting Service in Reed Sarratt, *The Ordeal of Desegregation* Harper & Row, 1966: 362; HEW Press Release, May 27, 1968; OCR data tapes; NCES Common Core of Data statistics, 1991-92.

SEGREGATION AND DESEGREGATION AMONG THE STATES

Although regional variations in segregation are large, those at the state level are even greater. While the regional variations reflect, particularly in the case of African-Americans, the effects of differences in law and enforcement activity at the national level, variations among the states relate more closely to the impact of particular decisions, institutional structures, and patterns of demographic change and immigration.

For more than a decade, the same four states, Illinois, Michigan, New York and New Jersey, have been at the top of the list of intensely segregated states for African-Americans. Segregation is most intense in the largest older industrial metropolises where the central city and its school district were hemmed in by independent suburbs a century or more ago. Table 6 shows that segregation for black students continues to grow from very high levels in New York and that intense segregation was growing throughout the greater New York area, reflected in the statistics for Connecticut and New Jersey. There were large increases in intense segregation in Michigan, New Jersey, Tennessee, Alabama, Maryland, and Connecticut. The resegregation in the South is beginning to challenge the high segregation

levels of parts of the urban North. California moved into the list of the top four states for the percentage of black students in predominantly minority schools even through it has less than one tenth black students.

Table 6

Most Segregated States for Black Students By Two Measures, 1991-92

	% in 90-100% Minority Schools	Change from '80		50-100% Minority Schools	Change from '80
Illinois	(59.3)	-8.4	New York	(84.6)	+7.9
Michigan	(58.5)	+7.5	Illinois	(80.2)	+ .8
New York	(57.5)	+1.3	California	(80.0)	+4.7
New Jersey	(54.6)	+4.3	Michigan	(79.9)	-2.0
Pennsylvania	(45.7)	-3.3	Mississippi	(74.4)	-2.0
Tennessee	(37.3)	+7.5	New Jersey	(73.5)	-3.2
Alabama	(36.8)	+4.9	Maryland	(72.2)	+5.0
Maryland	(36.7)	+6.4	Wisconsin	(70.1)	+16.6
Mississippi	(36.6)	- .1	Pennsylvania	(69.0)	-1.7
Connecticut	(36.2)	+4.2	Louisiana	(68.4)	-2.6

A third measure, the exposure index (Table 7) shows that New York has the lowest proportion of whites in schools attended by blacks, followed by Illinois, Michigan and New Jersey. It also shows that white students in those highly segregated northern states are in school with less than half the proportion of blacks than are in the school of a typical white student in Arkansas, Mississippi, Alabama, or a number of other southern and border states.

Table 7

Exposure of Blacks, Latinos, and Whites to Students of Each Group, by State, 1991-92*

	% Whites in School of Typical Student		% Minorities in School of Typical White	
	Blacks	Latinos	Blacks	Latinos
Alabama	34.6	72.0	19.6	.3
Arizona	49.7	41.4	3.3	16.6
Kansas	44.4	77.3	14.3	.6
California	27.3	27.0	5.3	21.5
Colorado	52.6	55.4	3.7	12.2
Connecticut	35.3	34.3	6.1	4.8
Delaware	64.5	62.4	26.6	2.8
Dist. of Columbia	1.7	8.1	37.9	10.7
Florida	42.0	34.7	16.6	7.3
Illinois	20.2	31.5	6.6	4.9
Indiana	47.2	61.1	6.0	1.3
Iowa	76.6	84.9	2.4	1.2
Kansas	58.1	67.8	5.6	3.8
Kentucky	72.1	82.3	7.6	.2
Louisiana	32.4	49.4	27.4	1.0
Maryland	29.1	47.8	16.0	2.0
Massachusetts	45.0	45.4	4.4	4.6
Michigan	21.7	69.0	4.8	2.1
Minnesota	59.1	80.5	2.4	1.3
Mississippi	30.0	58.9	31.5	.2
Missouri	40.4	71.6	7.7	.7
Montana	86.0	85.9	.4	1.2
Nebraska	62.4	78.4	3.8	2.5
Nevada	61.8	62.7	7.6	10.4
New Hampshire	93.4	91.8	.8	.9
New Jersey	25.7	29.1	7.4	5.5
New Mexico	45.3	32.4	2.5	35.6
New York	19.9	18.8	6.7	5.0
North Carolina	50.8	63.5	23.1	.9
North Dakota	87.4	91.9	.7	.7
Ohio	41.2	65.0	7.0	1.0
Oklahoma	50.5	65.4	6.8	2.6
Oregon	60.8	79.2	1.7	4.4
Pennsylvania	31.1	41.8	5.0	1.5
Rhode Island	50.9	44.1	4.0	3.8
South Carolina	41.8	58.4	29.8	.5
Tennessee	36.3	78.0	10.5	.3
Texas	34.7	25.8	10.1	18.1
Utah	72.6	82.8	.5	3.6
Vermont	96.3	96.9	.6	.3
Washington	63.5	61.1	3.3	4.6
West Virginia	78.9	91.4	3.2	.2
Wisconsin	39.1	58.0	4.1	1.8
Wyoming	80.6	82.9	.8	5.5

*states not reporting data omitted

The level of segregation for Latino students is high across the country but is most severe in the Northeast, in the Chicago area, and in the two states in which a substantial majority of all Latinos go to school--California and Texas. New York State has had the highest segregation for Latino students for a generation. It led the nation in 1980 as it does today. New York is a clear leader on all three methods of measuring segregation. Rounding out the list of the five most segregated states for Latinos are Texas (number 2 on two out of three measures), California, New Jersey, and Illinois. The most important centers of settlement for both Mexican Americans and Puerto Ricans have become severely segregated.

Compared to earlier rankings from 1970, almost all states with significant Latino enrollment have become more segregated. Four states have moved up on the list of the most segregated states since 1980--California, Illinois, Connecticut, and Rhode Island. The changes in California have been dramatic. In 1970, the typical California Latino student was in a school with 54.4% white students; a decade later it was down to 35.9%, and by 1991 it was 27.0%. Blacks in Alabama and Mississippi are significantly less segregated, according to this measure, than Latinos in California.

Table 8

Most Segregated States for Latino Students, 1991-92 by Three Measures, 1970-1991

% in Majority White Schools		% in 90-100% Minority Schools		% White in School of Typical Latino	
New York	(13.2)	New York	(58.1)	New York	(18.8)
Texas	(20.1)	New Jersey	(44.4)	Texas	(25.8)
California	(20.2)	Texas	(41.7)	California	(27.0)
New Mexico	(21.6)	California	(35.4)	New Jersey	(29.1)
Illinois	(25.2)	Illinois	(33.7)	Illinois	(31.5)
New Jersey	(26.4)	Connecticut	(33.7)	New Mexico	(32.4)
Connecticut	(32.6)	Florida	(28.0)	Conn.	(34.3)
Florida	(32.6)	Penn.	(27.4)	Florida	(34.7)
Rhode Island	(37.7)	Indiana	(19.6)	Arizona	(41.4)
Pennsylvania	(38.6)	New Mexico	(18.3)	Pennsylvania	(41.8)
Arizona	(40.6)	Arizona	(16.2)	Rhode Island	(44.1)

One reason for the increase in segregation of Latino students is the tremendous increase in the number and proportion of Latino students in most of the areas in which they were concentrated in the past two decades. Table 9 shows this growth. In all of the states with high Latino enrollments except New York and New Mexico, increases have been explosive, greatly outpacing overall enrollment gains. During this twenty-one year period, 1.7 million

more Latino students were enrolled in the schools of California, Texas and Florida, and Illinois also experienced very rapid growth in their Latino communities.

The huge increases in California and Texas, are extremely important because these states shape the educational opportunities of almost three-fifths of Latino children, Latinos will have more students than either whites or blacks in both states in the not too distant future if present trends continue.

Table 9

Growth of Latino Enrollments, 1970-1991
All States with more than 100,000 Latino Students

	1991 Enrollment	1970 Enrollment	Change #	Change %
California	1,804,500	706,900	1,097,600	155
Texas	1,190,800	565,900	625,100	111
New York	413,900	316,600	97,300	31
Florida	248,400	65,700	182,700	278
Illinois	191,500	78,100	113,400	145
Arizona	160,400	85,500	74,900	88
New Mexico	139,700	109,300	30,400	28
New Jersey	134,900	59,100	75,800	128

Source: DBS Corp.,1982; 1987; 1991-92 NCES Common Core of Data, Public Education Agency University.

The most segregated states tend to be states with a large (but not necessarily the largest) percentage fractions of minority students. Although there is considerable overlap, the most integrated states with significant proportions of minority students tend to be states with smaller fractions, particularly for African-American students. Those which have substantial fractions of minority students and maintain high levels of integration tend to have large (often county-wide) school districts or inter-district desegregation plans in their largest metropolitan areas. There are three states where the student population is more than one-fourth African-American with high levels of integration--North Carolina, Delaware, and Virginia. North Carolina and Delaware have large city-suburban desegregation plans. North Carolina and Virginia are organized to a considerable degree (although there are important exceptions) in large county school districts. Among the other states on the list, Kentucky has a large city-suburban plan in Louisville, Nevada has a county-wide desegregation plan in Las Vegas; and Indiana has a city-suburban plan in Indianapolis, its largest urban community. Colorado, which appears on both lists, has a major desegregation order in Denver.

Table 10

Most Integrated States for Black and Latino Students
More than Half of Students in Majority White Schools
(States with at Least 5% Students of Group)

	BLACKS	
	%	% in Majority White Schools
Kentucky	14	95.5
Delaware	28	91.5
Nevada	7	77.0
Nebraska	6	69.4
Kansas	11	64.3
Oklahoma	10	57.6
North Carolina	25	56.3
Virginia	33	53.8
Indiana	11	52.8
Colorado	6	52.3
	LATINOS	
Wyoming	6	93.4
Nevada	12	73.2
Washington	6	63.6
Colorado	17	60.2

When examining the most integrated states for African-American students, it is obvious that there have been long-term impacts of court orders, particularly those that provide for city-suburban desegregation. The two leading states, Kentucky and Delaware, have large black populations concentrated in their largest central cities, Louisville and Wilmington, where school districts became about three-fourths black in the 1970s. However, both were transformed by massive consolidation and desegregation in their largest metropolitan areas. Nevada also has one large metropolitan area and has county-wide districts serving entire metropolitan areas which have been extensively desegregated. North Carolina and Indiana also have been deeply affected by city-suburban desegregation in their largest urban communities.

The states with the most integration for African-American students have a very low percentage of African-Americans in their schools. The only states with more than the national average share of black students, where most of the black students were in majority white schools, were Delaware, North Carolina and Virginia. Kentucky was close to the national share of black minority segregated schools in states with few minority students and had a very high level of integration.

There were sixteen states with less than five percent black students in 1991-92 (Table 11). Among them are two with large enrollments of Latino students, Arizona (24%) and New Mexico (47%). African-American students in those two states were often in predominantly minority schools but relatively few were in intensely segregated schools. Among the others, Washington has 6% Latino students. Among the states with small African-American and small Latino enrollments, only Utah has a significant proportion of its black students in highly segregated minority schools (12%). Minnesota and Oregon have the highest fraction of their small African-American enrollments in predominantly minority schools--Minnesota has 46% and Oregon, 35%.

Table 11

Most Segregated States with Blacks Under 5% of State Enrollment, 1991-92

State	Percent Black	% in 50-100% Minority Schools	% in 90-100% Minority Schools
Arizona	4.0	44.8	13.5
Minnesota	3.2	45.6	.0
New Mexico	2.3	52.8	6.5
Oregon	2.4	34.8	.0
Utah	.7	15.4	11.7
Washington	4.3	30.0	.4
West Virginia	3.9	11.5	.0

Colorado was the only state with more than the national average share of Latino students where most were enrolled in majority white schools. There were many states with small proportions of Latino students--more than two-thirds of the states had less than 5%--but some of these states still showed high segregation for Latino students. The most segregated state with a small Latino enrollment was Pennsylvania where three-fifths of Latinos attended predominantly minority schools even though the state was only 3% Latino. The next highest were Maryland, Louisiana, Ohio, and Indiana, each of which managed to segregate many Latino students though they had a small percentage in their schools.

In some cases, the segregation of Latinos in minority schools was partially a by-product of a very large African-American enrollment, as in Louisiana, Maryland, and South Carolina. Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Indiana, however, produced a good deal of segregation in states with very large white majorities in their public schools. In these cases, the basic problem was a concentration of Latinos in the largest heavily minority districts. In Indiana, for example, the Latino students were strongly concentrated in the Gary-Hammond-East Chicago area.

SCHOOL DISTRICT FRAGMENTATION AND SEGREGATION

There is a relationship between the fragmentation of districts and higher segregation, but it is an irregular relationship for blacks because of the offsetting power of desegregation plans that change the outcome in a number of areas. For Latinos, on the other hand, there are few plans and the relationship between district structure and level of segregation is more clear. Six of the states with fragmented districts had levels of intense segregation higher than those for any of the states with the larger districts (Table 12).

The effects of small districts are partially offset by a large mandatory inter-district desegregation order in Indiana (for Indianapolis) and substantial voluntary interdistrict plans in Massachusetts, Missouri and Wisconsin (Boston, Milwaukee, and St. Louis).

The four states that have the most extreme segregation for African-Americans -- New York, Illinois, Michigan, and New Jersey -- are all large states with fragmented school districts breaking metropolitan housing markets into many school districts. Although there are twelve states that have a larger proportion of black students than any of them, their district fragmentation and the absence of significant cross-district desegregation plans produces extreme segregation, even though Detroit had a major order within the central city and New Jersey has made a significant effort to accomplish the desegregation that can be accomplished within district lines.

Table 12

Average Size of School Districts and Level of Segregation, Selected States, 1991-92

	Enrollment Median	Percentage of Students in Intensely Segregated Schools	
		Blacks	Latinos
Large Districts			
Alabama	3,095	36.8	1.4*
Delaware	3,479	.0	.0*
Florida	12,028	24.9	28.0
Louisiana	6,526	34.4	12.3*
Maryland	13,165	36.7	9.1*
Nevada	3,184	.0	.5
North Carolina	4,838	6.2	.9*
South Carolina	3,592	17.7	7.4*
Tennessee	3,235	37.3	1.1*
Utah	4,048	11.7	.4*
Virginia	3,571	6.4	.2*
West Virginia	4,771	.0*	.0*
Small Districts**			
Arizona	850	13.5*	16.2
Arkansas	687	8.2	.8*
California	1,396	33.7	35.4
Colorado	521	.1	2.2
Connecticut	1,827	36.2	33.7
Illinois	795	59.3	33.7
Indiana	1,906	25.9	19.6*
Massachusetts	1,821	12.5	7.5
Michigan	1,674	58.5	3.1*
Missouri	556	26.2	3.9*
Nebraska	37	.0	.0*
New Jersey	971	54.6	44.4
New Mexico	805	6.5*	18.3
New York	1,431	57.5	58.1
Ohio	1,768	12.9	1.5*
Oklahoma	355	14.4	2.0*
Texas	801	30.2	41.7
Washington	925	.4	.1*

* Indicates states with less than 5% African-American or Latino students.

** States with largest districts have 3000 or more students in median district. Small district states have median of 2000 or less.

Source of NCES, Directory of Public Elementary and Secondary Education Agencies, 1991-District Data: 92, Table 6.

SEGREGATED COMMUNITIES AND INTEGRATED COMMUNITIES

The enrollment statistics for American communities of different sizes and locations shows that both African-American and Latino students who live in towns, rural areas and the suburbs of small metropolitan areas are the most likely to be experiencing integrated education. By far, the most serious segregation is in the large central cities, followed by the smaller central city communities. In the large central cities, 15 of every 16 African-American and Latino students are in schools where most of the students are non-white. In the smaller central cities, 63% of African-American and 70% of Latinos attend such schools. Both groups are, however, almost five times more likely to be in majority white schools in those cities than in the largest cities.

The suburbs are much less segregated than the central cities for black students, although they are far from full integration. Two out of five suburban blacks in the large metropolitan areas and three-fifths of those in suburbs of smaller metros are in majority white schools. Latino students are significantly more segregated than blacks in the suburbs, in spite of studies that suggest that they are more able to cross the lines of residential separation. A very large increase in minority enrollment in suburban schools is now underway in a number of metropolitan areas. These statistics suggest that these changes will produce a good deal of suburban segregation unless offsetting plans are put in motion. Three-fifths of black students in the suburbs of big cities already attend majority non-white schools.

Table 13

Segregation Patterns by Type of Community
School Segregation of Blacks and Latinos, 1991-92

School Race %	Large Metros		Small Metros		Towns		Rural
	City	Suburbs	City	Suburbs	25,000+	Small	Areas
90-100% Minority							
Blacks	63.9	21.5	27.4	14.6	12.2	9.3	173
Latinos	56.2	22.4	32.8	13.7	4.2	20.0	193
50-100% Minority							
Blacks	92.4	57.9	62.9	43.0	45.5	44.9	458
Latinos	93.8	63.9	70.4	51.4	44.0	60.5	465
Majority White							
Blacks	7.6	42.1	37.1	57.0	54.5	55.1	542
Latinos	6.2	31.1	29.6	48.6	56.0	39.5	535

Large metros are defined in Table 13 as urban communities in which the central city has a population over 400,000. There were 33 cities of this size in the 1990 Census. In 1986, the 25 largest central city systems contained 30% of U.S. Latino students, 27% of blacks, and 3% of whites, and this unequal distribution of students was a fundamental cause of the nation's most severe segregation.

Table 14

Exposure of Blacks, Latinos and Whites to Students of Other Groups, by Size of Community

Community Type	% White in School of Typical Black or Latino		% Minority in School of Typical White	
	Blacks	Latino	Blacks	Latino
Large Metro				
City	13.7	15.0	18.9	16.5
Suburbs	40.8	36.2	13.2	8.5
Small Metro				
City	37.5	33.0	7.0	6.7
Suburbs	50.6	47.5	8.2	5.1
Towns				
25,000+	50.4	53.0	8.1	5.4
Small	25.6	40.3	6.0	4.3
Rural	48.7	48.6	4.7	2.0

RELATIONSHIP OF RACE AND POVERTY

This report examined the relationship between race and poverty for the 83,845 schools from across the U.S. in the Education Department's Common Core dataset. In 1991, 13% of these schools were "high poverty" schools with more than 50% poor students (receiving free lunch). Another 18% had between 25% and 50% students in poverty. Half of American schools, on the other hand, had less than 10% poor students. Two-thirds (69%) of the schools with less than one-tenth students in poverty had 10% or fewer African-American and Latino students. Among the high poverty schools, in contrast, only one-seventh had less than a tenth African-

American and Latino students. At the other extreme, among the 5,047 schools with 90-100% African-American and Latino students, 57% were high poverty schools. A student in an intensely segregated African-American and Latino school was 14 times as likely to be in a high poverty school as a student in a school with less than a tenth black and Latino students. There was a very strong correlation, .66, between a school's percent of black and Latino students and its poverty level (Table 15).

Segregation by race was very likely to mean segregation by poverty. Three-fifths of all high poverty schools in the U.S. have majorities of black and Latino students. A child in a school that is in an intensely segregated school has seven times more likelihood of being in a high poverty school than a child in an integrated school with 20-30% African-American and Latino students. Very few of the many millions of children in the more than 47,000 overwhelmingly white schools experience concentrated poverty. If poverty is systematically linked to educational inequality, as it consistently is in educational research, the very powerful link between racial and poverty segregation is a central element in perpetuating the educational inequality of minority students.

Table 15
Relationship Between School Poverty Level and
% Black and Latino Enrollment

% Poor in Schools	Percent Black and Latino Students									
	0-10	10-20	20-30	30-40	40-50	50-60	60-70	70-80	80-90	90-100
0 - 10	60.2	46.0	35.8	30.2	28.2	27.9	28.1	30.2	29.8	36.2
10 - 25	22.2	28.4	26.8	18.8	12.4	7.5	5.5	3.7	3.7	1.7
25 - 30	13.6	21.1	29.8	36.7	37.5	31.6	20.4	11.5	11.3	5.6
50 - 100	4.0	4.4	7.6	14.2	22.0	33.0	46.1	51.2	55.1	56.5
% of U.S. Schools	56.5	9.2	7.0	5.6	4.4	3.6	2.8	2.4	2.2	6.0

POLICY TRENDS

Four of the six Administrations since 1968 have opposed urban desegregation orders. During the 1980s the Justice Department frequently advocated terminating plans. No new major school desegregation cases have been filed by the Department of Justice since 1980 and the Education Department's Office for Civil Rights became inactive during the 1980's. The Carter Administration improved the federal desegregation aid program and filed some important cases but Congress removed much of the Education Department's authority to require desegregation during the Carter period. The Clinton Administration had not filled its key civil rights policy position, Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights, a year after the election and has taken no major school desegregation initiatives. There have been no important positive policy proposals supporting desegregation from any branch of government since bipartisan passage of the Emergency School Aid Act desegregation assistance program in 1972. That program was eliminated in 1981.

There have, however, been a number of very different experiments in ways to accomplish desegregation in courts and communities across the country. Virtually all of the new desegregation plans of the past 15 years include major education reform components and many incorporate forms of choice. There is much that could be learned from a systematic comparison of the outcomes.

Desegregation advocates have long discussed the difficult process of moving schools from "desegregation" -- the physical presence of students from different racial groups in the same school -- to "integration" -- in which there are inter-racial classes taught by integrated faculties with curriculum, policies, and school processes that respect and treat fairly students from each racial group. In its decisions in the 1960s, the Supreme Court had defined a number of requirements for desegregation that went beyond student reassignment. The Supreme Court recognized in its second Detroit decision, *Milliken v. Bradley*, 433 U.S. 282 (1977), that "pupil assignment alone does not automatically remedy the impact of previous, unlawful racial isolation." These decisions led to desegregation plans which include many elements of educational reform intended to remedy the inferior education that had been provided for minority students.

The 1972 Emergency School Aid Act recognized these needs and provided billions of dollars for retraining teachers, supported early experiments in magnet schools, helped schools develop instructional materials reflecting the contributions of all parts of society, provided funds for human relations training, and funded many educational experiments. The evaluations of the program were extensive and positive, both in terms of better human relations and in terms of improved academic achievement. (MacQueen and Coulson, 1978; Coulson and associates, 1977; National Opinion Research Corporation, 1973; Slavin and Madden 1979). The program was widely popular and it concentrated funds very strongly in communities with difficult desegregation challenges, particularly the large cities under desegregation orders. It was separated from the busing controversies by a policy that excluded any payments for pupil transportation. It was not a program that required desegregation; it was a program to make it

possible that desegregation that was taking place and was being done as well as possible. It was supported by many critics of busing. This program was terminated in 1981, without any vote on its merits, as one of the hundreds of policy and program changes across the government incorporated in the massive Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act and approved in a single vote.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Successfully integrated schools will not happen by accident. Leadership, skill, and resources are essential elements in the difficult process of building equitable schools in a society with very severe separation and inequality in other aspects of life. Equal educational opportunity is the fundamental American answer to inequality but segregated schools concentrate poverty and low achievement in schools that are not equal. Children in such schools are literally cut off from avenues to opportunity commonly available in middle class schools. The segregated schools have, on average, much lower achievement and are often so overwhelmed with problems of poor families isolated in neighborhoods without connections to opportunity, that the task of providing access for minority students to stronger schools deserves high priority. In a world with a number of other nations tearing apart along ethnic lines, the traditional American idea of the common school bringing together people from many backgrounds and preparing them to live as effective citizens in a democracy that guarantees rights for all deserves reaffirmation.

Resumption of Civil Rights Enforcement

Throughout the 1980s, the federal government portrayed school desegregation as a temporary punishment rather than a long-term national goal. Education policy discussions were carried on as if segregation was irrelevant and as if equal education could be achieved in segregated schools, even though those schools had always had unequal results. Although federal projections suggested that American schools would become about half "minority" within three decades, national educational goals said nothing about issues of racial separation, inequality, and equal opportunity for non-whites. The issues have been ignored, although segregated schools are visibly unequal and a large majority of Americans favor integrated schools, though they are divided on the means to obtain them.

The most basic need is for a strong affirmation of the goal to successfully integrate schools, accompanied by a renewed commitment to enforcing civil rights law. Also needed is official support rather than attacks on communities that are working to achieve successfully functioning interracial schools. This should be part of a broader vision for the future of American communities and supported by agencies dealing with housing and urban development and economic opportunity. HUD Secretary Henry Cisneros has outlined such a vision, pledging much stronger support for fair housing. A similar commitment is needed for school integration.

Civil rights enforcement responsibilities of the Education Department's Office for Civil Rights and the Justice Department's Civil Rights Division should include enforcement of the requirements for desegregation in *Green, Swann, Milliken II*, and *Freeman v. Pitts*. These standards require: 1) full desegregation within a district, including faculty and staff desegregation; 2) equity in transportation, facilities, and activities; 3) ending the racial identifiability of schools; 4) remedying (with state assistance) the educational and human relations damage from a history of segregation; 5) good faith implementation by local officials; and 6) equalizing educational quality. The Office for Civil Rights has authority to translate these goals into specific regulations under the 1964 Civil Rights Act and the Civil Rights Restoration Act. The Justice Department represents the U.S. in hundreds of on-going desegregation cases and the Education Department has enforcement responsibility over many of these issues under Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act. Collection and analysis of appropriate data, effective handling of complaints, support for serious monitoring of outstanding court orders, and enforcement actions where needed are essential elements of such an approach. Enforcement and litigation priorities should include obtaining inter-district desegregation, at least on a voluntary level, wherever the legal requirements can be met.

Help in Updating Old Plans

Many school systems are operating under unrevised desegregation plans adopted two decades or more ago. Although public opinion surveys show that opposition to busing is declining and that only 4% see school segregation as one of the biggest problems with local schools (Gallup Poll, *Phi Delta Kappan*, October 1993), there is a great deal of criticism of plans that no longer fit local conditions. No community is the same as it was a generation ago and plans not adjusted as population changes are often ineffective. Although courts may not require readjustments, there should be assistance available to help school districts devise plans that reflect current conditions. Civil rights officials should help local districts obtain court approval for new plans that better realize desegregation goals. The goals should be developing and implementing plans that work to produce lasting integration and increased educational equity for minority students, not either formalistically continuing a plan whose utility has eroded or returning to segregated schools.

Segregation and Federal Compensatory Education Policy

This report shows a very high level of segregation for minority students and shows that segregation by race is very likely to also be segregation by poverty. Congress is now in the process of rewriting Chapter 1, the basic law for compensatory education. By directing money to schools with concentrated poverty, this program reflects the belief that added resources can help bridge the big educational gaps between high-poverty schools and more affluent schools. The research conducted in preparation for the revisions shows that Chapter 1 eligible low-income students in schools with less intense concentrations of poverty do better than those in the poorest and most isolated schools. Low-income students in the schools with a lower concentration of poverty do as well as the average student in the high-poverty schools. The study demonstrates that the high-poverty schools had less adequate curriculum

and instruction, lower attendance and "often lack the physical security, nurturing supervision and enriching experiences that promote and reward learning in more advantaged communities" (*Reinventing Chapter 1*, U.S. Dept. of Education, 1993: 154). The Clinton Administration has responded to this data by calling for concentrating Chapter 1 funds even more intensely in the poorest schools.

The idea of a concentrated effort to make schools that are separate by race and poverty more equal is a reasonable response to the evidence of devastating educational problems; it has been the basic federal response since the 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act made this the largest federal education program. It is good to help these over-burdened schools, but it would be counter-productive to adopt a policy that had the unintended consequence of punishing schools that have managed to get poor students out of high-poverty schools and into schools with stronger educational programs, as a result of their effort to comply with the desegregation requirements of the U.S. Constitution. Such a policy would reward many schools in the most segregated areas--the Northeast and the Midwest -- and punish integrated schools in the southern and border states as well as the nation's smaller communities, all of which have done much more to break up segregation.

The analysis underlying the revisions of Chapter 1 accepts the isolation of poor and heavily minority communities as a given and attempts to find ways to compensate, even though the report concludes that Chapter 1 "has not appreciably improved the average performance of high poverty schools"(Ibid.: 78). The policy proposals say nothing about the possibility of breaking up these destructive concentrations of children from families suffering from an array of educational, health, economic and social crises.

If funding is to be targeted by extreme poverty, a school district that dismantled its desegregation plan and sent minority children back to segregated neighborhood schools where everyone was poor, would reward resegregated schools with more money. Meanwhile, a system sending poor children to a school with richer opportunities in a high school where nearly everyone goes to college, could not fund those children in their desegregated schools because the poverty concentration would be too low. Although it is vital to aid poverty schools and to insist on more effective use of the federal funds, policy makers should keep in mind the fact that contact with better prepared students and teachers in a more effective school elsewhere also may have powerful educational advantages for low income minority children. Our basic education law should not undermine compliance with desegregation requirements; it should create an incentive for such accomplishments and encourage techniques that make desegregation more educationally effective by helping students catch up and obtain full access to opportunities within their new school.

Where a school district can demonstrate that it has successfully implemented a desegregation plan that reduced racial and economic isolation, its schools should be funded on the basis of how concentrated their poverty would have been if neighborhood schools were in effect. Such school systems should be permitted considerable flexibility in designing ways to help its low-income students obtain and take advantage of the better opportunities in their

desegregated school. They should not be required to concentrate its Chapter 1 dollars on the poorest schools but should be able to use them to prepare the students from high poverty neighborhoods for their more challenging academic settings. Schools successfully complying with constitutional requirements should be funded and given increased discretion in using the funds under a plan for realizing the potentials of integrated education so long as they can demonstrate progress toward those goals for low-income minority young people.

Desegregation Assistance Program

During the administration of President Nixon, the White House and Congress worked to create a bipartisan program to aid successful desegregation. The program, called the Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA), was enacted in 1972 and was greatly strengthened and improved by Congress in 1978. It helped hundreds of districts in teacher training, human relations, and curriculum development to make the transition from segregated to desegregated schools more effective. It avoided the busing controversy by specifying that none of the federal money could be used for local transportation costs, but only for the educational and human relations efforts.

ESAA, the largest federal education program eliminated in the last generation, and a number of much smaller programs were combined into a block grant to the states called Chapter 2. But there was no requirement that any of the money be spent for desegregation or that it go to the heavily minority districts that had been receiving funds. States generally distribute the money on a per capita basis to school districts. The focus on successful interracial schooling disappeared. A much smaller magnet school program was later revived as interest in choice grew. An entire generation of students has gone through the schools and a great many new teachers have begun their work since the program intended to aid successful school integration ended.

A number of states are now under court orders or consent decrees for funding desegregation costs, including some of those supported by ESAA, as well as compensatory education under *Milliken II*. Under the largest orders, Missouri has spent billions of dollars on the St. Louis and Kansas City cases. California has a state law funding 80% of the costs of desegregation orders within certain limits. None of these programs have the kind of targeting, planning, and evaluation requirements in the Emergency School Aid Act. The great majority of school districts operating desegregation plans receive neither federal nor state money to support effective integration. The state programs, consent decrees, and *Milliken II* plans tend to be poorly focused.

The reauthorization of federal education law should include desegregation assistance grants for long-term programs to improve race relations and educational equity as provided in the 1978 amendments to ESAA. Since the experience during the start-up phase of this program in the early 1970s showed that a lot of money would be wasted at the beginning unless there was reasonable preparation, Congress should authorize a small program for the first year, growing in following years.

Congress should require a federal review summarizing the effects of ESAA and other successful programs which increase the benefits of desegregated schools such as the Johns Hopkins Student Team Learning project. The Education Department should be directed to prepare a report for American educators based on that review and to provide on-going bulletins and case studies about the most effective practices for integrated schooling as research proceeds. Congress should also call for a resumption of federal research on interracial schooling, a subject that was virtually abandoned in the 1980s, and for basic research on the situation of multi-racial schools and of the needs of Latino, Asian and African-American students in interracial settings.

Desegregation should not be conceived in the research as an issue exclusively concerned with minority student gains. Research should include impact of various types of desegregation plans on the ability of white students to function effectively in interracial settings.

Research and Basic Indicators

During the 1970s there was an active program of federally sponsored research on the treatment and achievement of racial and ethnic minorities in American schools and on the effects of desegregation and various methods to aid integration within schools. That research nearly always addressed issues of black-white desegregation. Since school segregation has become primarily a problem of the largest cities and since the population of non-black minority students has exploded, there has been very little serious research on the newer issues of desegregation and racial equity. Recent research suggests that segregation has major costs for Latino students and that properly implemented desegregation could have large benefits. (Ochoa and Espinosa, 1986; Donato, Menchaca, and Valencia, 1991). It is extremely important that these issues be carefully analyzed, given the dramatic growth and deep educational problems of the Latino communities.

The Education Department should become a source of regular and reliable information on trends of enrollment, equal treatment, and achievement for each major group in the population. There should be systematic study of various approaches to desegregation and racial equity commissioned by the government. The results should be made available to educators and community leaders attempting to provide strong and successful educational experiences to a changing population.

Housing and School Desegregation

Housing discrimination and the exclusion of affordable housing from many communities with strong schools are basic reasons for the persistence of segregation by race and income in the schools. Nearly four decades after the *Brown* decision, there is still no federal policy that prohibits the use of federal housing funds in ways that will undermine school integration and that will force poor families to live for decades in communities with clearly inferior schools. There are several ways public policy could reverse the negative impacts of housing on school segregation. Better policies could lead to more neighborhood-level integrated schools and

diminish the burdens on school boards. All assisted housing plans, for example, should be reviewed by local school authorities and siting and marketing should be compatible with the district's desegregation plan. There should be, as there are in a number of court orders, provisions that reward stably integrated neighborhoods by giving them neighborhood schools.

HUD issued a regulation at the end of the Carter Administration requiring coordination of assisted housing policy with school desegregation, but it was rescinded at the beginning of the Reagan Administration. It should be reissued.

School boards should request developers, who want new schools to help the marketing of their new subdivisions, to implement a policy for marketing to minority as well as white families so that desegregated education can be built into the new communities. School boards are major employers and they should be certain that their own employees are offered a full range of housing choices and are not discriminated against by realtors, lenders, rental agents or insurance companies.

Suburban Segregation

This report shows very clearly that the old image of white suburbia no longer applies. Once it was hoped that if minority families could move to the suburbs they would find good integrated schools. Millions of minority families have now moved out, however, and segregation is all too often following close behind. The suburbs of the nation's largest metropolitan areas in the reporting states, for example, contained 1.3 million black and 947,000 Latino students in 1991, but two-thirds of the Latinos and three-fifths of the blacks were in predominantly minority schools.

The large-scale suburbanization of African-American and Latino families has occurred since the end of the civil rights era and has received very little serious policy or enforcement attention. In some respects, suburbs are even more vulnerable than cities to school segregation, since they are much smaller, have a less diverse housing market, and are deeply affected by neighborhood-level changes in the housing market.

Since many of the communities confronting these problems have many fears and no relevant experience in the area of integration, and since these challenges are likely to accelerate as the population continues to change, help is needed.

Dealing with developing suburban problems will require cooperation between housing, school officials and local governments. For example, it is very important to target and act against racial steering and panic-peddling in the real estate markets. Because the average family moves every six years, steering can resegregate a suburban community rapidly if left unattended. The suburban communities most at risk are those with small school districts. Regional approaches with cooperation among districts may be necessary and the leadership of the state departments of education and state civil rights officials in initiating planning and considering possible regional educational opportunities could be invaluable.

Major needs include data.on what is happening and information about successful models for suburban integration. The federal research agenda should include these communities, and federal and state school and housing officials should consider sponsoring conferences to exchange models of successful programs and policies. Technical assistance staffs specializing in suburban issues should be created, perhaps under Title IV of the 1964 Civil Rights Act. If individual suburban communities are left to struggle on their own, and if large-scale segregation develops in sectors of suburbia, the resulting problems will have profound and long-term effects on communities and school districts. Unless the nation wishes to recapitulate the experience of schools in city ghettos and barrios in suburban settings, there will be a need for concerted efforts to develop and maintain stable integration. These problems will not cure themselves. The risk is that they will spread and that some of the vicious cycles at work in older cities will take hold in suburbs. It is very important to devise solutions while they are still manageable.

APPENDIX A

DEFINITION OF REGIONS

South:	Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia
Border:	Delaware, Kentucky, Maryland, Missouri, Oklahoma and West Virginia
Northeast:	Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont
Midwest:	Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, Wisconsin
West:	Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Washington and Wyoming
Note:	Alaska and Hawaii are excluded from this study because of their unique ethnic compositions and isolation from the regions studied here. Analysis of these states would require close attention to Asian and Native American populations and could be carried out from the same dataset.

SOURCES

Coulson, John E., Ozenne, Dan G.; Hanes, Sally; Bradford, Clarence; Dougherty, William; Duck, Gary A.; and Hemenway, Judith, The Third Year of Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) Implementation. Santa Monica: System Development Corp. 1977.

Donato, Ruben, Martha Menchaca, and Richard Valencia, "Segregation, Desegregation, and Integration of Chicano Students," in Richard Valencia (ed.), Chicano School Failure and Success, Falmer Press, 1991: 27-63.

Espinosa, Ruben, and Alberto Ochoa, "Concentration of California Latino Students in Schools with Low Achievement: A Research Note," American Journal of Education, Nov. 1986: 77-95.

Harris Survey, "Number Opposed to Busing for Racial Purposes Drops 25 Points over a 10 Year Period," Jan. 5, 1987.

Hawley, Willis, and Associates, Strategies for Effective School Desegregation, Lexington Books, 1983.

MacQueen, Anne H., and Coulson, John E., Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) Evaluation: Overview of Findings from Supplemental Analyses. Santa Monica: System Development Corp., 1978.

National Opinion Research Corporation, Southern Schools: An Evaluation of the Emergency School Assistance Program and of Desegregation, Chicago: NORC, 1973.

Orfield, Gary, Public School Desegregation in the United States, 1968-1980, Washington: Joint Center for Political Studies, 1983.

_____, Desegregation and the Cities--The Trends and Policy Choices, Report to U.S. Senate Committee on Human Resources, 95th Congress, 1st Session, 1977.

_____, and Franklin Monfort, Racial Change and Desegregation in Large School Districts: Trends through the 1986-1987 School Year, Alexandria, Virginia, National School Boards Association, 1988.

_____, and Franklin Monfort, with Anita Stoll and Rafael Heller, Status of School Desegregation: The Next Generation, Alexandria, Virginia, National School Boards Association, 1992.

_____, and Franklin Monfort and Melissa Aaron, Status of School Desegregation, 1968-1986, Alexandria, Virginia, National School Boards Association, 1989.

_____, with Franklin Monfort and Rosemary George, "School Segregation in the 1980s: Trends in the States and Metropolitan Areas," Washington: Joint Center for Political Studies, 1987.

Slavin, Robert E. and Madden, Nancy, "School Practices that Improve Race Relations," American Educational Research Journal, Vol 16 (1979): 169-180.

U.S. Bureau of the Census, School Enrollment: Social and Economic Characteristics of Students, October 1992, October 1993.

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, New Evidence on School Desegregation, June 1987.

U.S. Department of Education, National Assessment of Chapter 1 Independent Review Panel, Reinventing Chapter 1: The Current Chapter 1 Program and New Directions, 1993.

U.S. Department of Education, Prospects: The Congressionally Mandated Study of Educational Growth and Opportunity, Interim Report, July 1993.

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, The Condition of Education, 1993.

_____, Digest of Education Statistics, 1992.

_____, Directory of Public Elementary and Secondary Education Agencies, 1991-92.