THE CENTURY FOUNDATION

Remedying School Segregation

Appendix A: Voluntary Inter-district School Choice Programs

AUGUST 23, 2016 — PAUL TRACTENBERG, ALLISON RODA AND RYAN COUGHLAN

The following inter-district programs are well-established and longstanding efforts, many of which have grown out of desegregation litigation. See Table 8 for a comparison.

1. On the west coast, the Palo Alto, California school district has a voluntary transfer program, known as the "Tinsley Program."[1] The program resulted from a 1985 lawsuit, in which plaintiff parents claimed that students in the majority-minority Ravenswood City School District were receiving an unequal education compared to students in neighboring school districts with low percentages of minorities. Under a 1986 settlement, neighboring districts agreed to receive a specified number of Ravenswood students. The program had multiple goals: to reduce racial isolation of students of color in Palo Alto, Ravenswood, and other San Mateo County school districts; to improve educational achievement of Ravenswood students; and to enhance inter-district cooperation.

2. The Omaha, Nebraska program, Learning Communities, was created in 2007 by the state legislature as a regional education model. It had multiple goals: to reduce funding disparities between Omaha and its suburbs; to create more socioeconomic diversity in schools; and to challenge the achievement gap in the Omaha metro area.[2] Under the program, students from neighboring suburban districts attend schools in Omaha.

3. The Minneapolis, Minnesota inter-district program is called "The Choice is Yours." It is an open enrollment program that gives low-income Minneapolis families more options to attend suburban schools.[3] The program was created as a result of a lawsuit filed by the Minneapolis branch of the NAACP complaining about educational inadequacies in Minneapolis.

4. Milwaukee, Wisconsin has a voluntary transfer program called Chapter 220, which resulted from a 1976 desegregation case. This program is designed to racially integrate schools by giving minority students the opportunity to attend schools in suburban areas that are predominantly white and by giving white students from the suburbs the opportunity to attend racially diverse schools in Milwaukee.[4]

5. St. Louis, Missouri has a program called Voluntary Integration Choice Corp. Like most of the programs listed here, the St. Louis program grew out of a lawsuit, a 1983 desegregation ruling in *Craton Liddell , vs. Board of Education of the City of St. Louis, Missouri*.[5] The

This report can be found online at: https://tcf.org/content/report/remedying-school-segregation/.

Table 8. Characteristics of the full participant sample

Voluntary Interdistrict Desegregation Programs	Date/Action	Number of Participating Students	Goals of Program
Urban-Suburban Transfer			
Rochester, New York "Urban-Suburban Transfer Program"	1965 Legislation	450 students (2009)	"[t]o voluntarily decrease racial isolation, deconcentrate poverty and enhance opportunities for students in the Rochester City School District and in the suburban districts of the Greater Rochester Area"[13]
Boston and Springfield, Massachusetts "METCO Program"	1966 Legislation	3300 students (2010)	"expand educational opportunities, increase diversity, and reduce racial isolation, by permitting students in certain cities to attend public schools in other communities that have agreed to participate"[14]
Indianapolis, Indiana "Suburban Township Desegregation Plan	1981 federal desegregation case	No longer accepting students	Phase out between 1998-2017 In 2011, 4 receiving suburban districts participated
St. Louis, Missouri "Voluntary Integration Choice Corp" or VICC	1983 federal desegregation case	5882 students (2010)	suburban schools increase their population of black students by 15% or to reach a maximum population of 25% black students Since the St. Louis school district achieved unitary status in 2008, schools were able to opt out of program.
Palo Alto, California	1986 State Court Order	893 students (2009)	to reduce racial isolation of students of color in Palo Alto, Ravenswood, and other San Mateo County school districts; to improve educational achievement of Ravenswood students; and to enhance inter-district cooperation.
Minneapolis, Minnesota "The Choice is Yours"	2001 State Court Order	2100 students (2010)	open enrollment program that gives low-income Minneapolis families more options to attend suburban schools
Two-way transfer			
Hartford, Connecticut "Open Choice" (formerly Project Concern and Project Choice)	1966 Sheff state court order	19,000 in city magnets/ 2,300 transfer to suburban districts	Hartford students can attend schools in participating suburban districts, and White students in suburban communities can attend magnet schools in Hartford
Milwaukee, Wisconsin "Chapter 220"	1979 federal desegregation case	375 in city magnets/ 2,261 transfer to suburban districts (2010)	acially integrate schools by giving minority students the opportunity to attend schools in suburban areas that are predominantly white, and white students from the suburbs the opportunity to attend racially diverse schools in Milwaukee
Omaha, Nebraska "Learning Community"	2007 state legislature as a regional education model	6,007 students transfer across district lines (2010[15])	to reduce funding disparities between Omaha and its 11 participating suburban districts; to create more socioeconomic diversity in schools; and to challenge the achievement gap in the Omaha metro area

program's goal was to have suburban schools increase their population of Black students by 15% or to reach a maximum population of 25% Black students.[6] Since the St. Louis school district achieved unitary status in 2008, schools were able to opt out of the program.

6. The final Midwestern inter-district program is in Indianapolis, Indiana. It is called the Suburban Township Desegregation Plan and involves city students being assigned to suburban schools. The program resulted from a 1981 federal desegregation case.

7. The Urban-Suburban Transfer Program in Rochester, New York was a result of racial disturbances in New York State.[7] In responding to a survey from the New York State Commissioner, the Rochester suburb of West Irondequoit acknowledged that "their students were being deprived of meaningful opportunities to interact with children of other cultures."[8] The resulting inter-district program was developed in 1964. Its mission was "[t]o voluntarily decrease racial isolation, deconcentrate poverty and enhance opportunities for students in the Rochester City School District and in the suburban districts of the Greater Rochester Area."[9] In 2015, the program celebrated 50 years.

8. The Metco Program, established in 1966, is another voluntary inter-district program in Boston and Springfield Massachusetts. The programs' intent is to "expand educational opportunities, increase diversity, and reduce racial isolation, by permitting students in certain cities to attend public schools in other communities that have agreed to participate."[10] There are currently about 3,300 students participating in thirty-three school districts in metropolitan Boston and in four school districts outside Springfield.[11]

9. Open Choice in Hartford Connecticut offers students in Hartford the opportunity to attend [non-magnet?] schools in suburban districts, and students in suburban communities the opportunity to attend [non-magnet district?] schools in Hartford.[12]

Notes

1 "Tinsley Voluntary Transfer Program," San Mateo County Office of Education, http://www.smcoe.org/parents-and-students/tinsley-voluntary-transfer-program.html.
2 "Learning Community Timeline of Douglas and Sarpy Counties," Learning Community of Douglas and Sarpy Counties, http://www.learningcommunityds.org/about/history/.
3 "The Choice Is Yours Minnesota Program," Minneapolis Public Schools, https://schoolrequest.mpls.k12.mn.us/the_choice_is_yours_minnesota_program
4 "Suburban School Opportunities," Milwaukee Public Schools, 2015, http://mps.milwaukee.k12.wi.us/MPS-Shared/Documents/Suburban_school_opportunities.pdf.
5 469 F. Supp. 1304, 1979.
6 "Voluntary Interdistrict Choice Corporation," Choice Corp, www.choicecorp.org.
7 "Urban-Suburban Interdistrict Transfer Program: The History of Project U–S," Monroe #1 Board of Cooperative Educational Services, September 2015, http://www.monroe.edu/files/1161/us_history_50thannivedition_rev4_21_16.pdf.
8 *Ibid.*
9 "History and Mission, Urban Suburbam Interdistrict Transfer Program, http://www.monroe.edu/UrbanSuburban.cfm?subpage=1161.
10 "Metco Program," Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, May 25, 2016, http://www.doe.mass.edu/metco/.
11 Ibid.
12 "Hartford Regional Open Choice Program," Greater Hartford Regional School Choice Office, 2016, http://www.choiceeducation.org/hartford-region-open-choice-program.
13 "History and Mission, Urban Suburbam Interdistrict Transfer Program, http://www.monroe.edu/UrbanSuburban.cfm?subpage=1161.
14 "Metco Program," Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, May 25, 2016, http://www.doe.mass.edu/metco/.
15 "Metco Program," Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, May 25, 2016, http://www.doe.mass.edu/metco/.

THE CENTURY FOUNDATION

Remedying School Segregation

Appendix B: Quantitative Methods

AUGUST 23, 2016 — PAUL TRACTENBERG, ALLISON RODA AND RYAN COUGHLAN

Basic Demographic Data

A majority of the quantitative data presented in this report is descriptive in nature and required little statistical manipulation. Basic demographic data was drawn almost exclusively from the American Community Survey 2010-2014 Five-Year Estimates. Data on race/ethnicity are from an analysis of the "Hispanic or Latino Origin by Race" variable. The "Latino" population consists of all people who identify as Hispanic or Latino. The "White," "Black," and "Asian," populations consist of all people who identify as these subgroups and as "Not Hispanic or Latino." Data included in the analysis of population change between 1970 and 2010 are from the U.S. Decennial Census. While the variables for race and ethnicity have shifted during this time period, efforts were made to ensure as much consistency in subgroup definition over time as possible. These efforts involved using the term "Latino" to encompass populations previously labeled "Spanish," "of Spanish origin," and "Hispanic."

Maps

All of the maps were constructed using ArcGIS. The demographic data displayed in the maps are from the 2010 U.S. Decennial Census. These maps present data for the census block level. For ease of viewing individual maps, data are displayed for seven classes using Jenks' Natural Breaks algorithm. This algorithm organizes data in a way that maximizes differences between classes.

Segregation Analysis

The segregation analysis for the Morris School District was conducted using Reardon's SEG module in Stata 14.0. Dissimilarity Indices, Exposure Indices, and Isolation Indices were calculated for all variables. The dissimilarity index is the proportion of either of two groups that would need to move to a new location in order to ensure a proportional representation of both groups in all related geographies. The dissimilarity index (D) equals

$$\frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\left|\frac{a_i}{A}-\frac{b_i}{B}\right|$$

where:

a_i = the population of group *a* in the i^{th} area (e.g. school, census tract, or towns)

A = the total population of group *a* in the full study area (e.g. all schools, all census tracts, or all towns)

b_i = the population of group *b* in the i^{th} area (e.g. school,

This report can be found online at: https://tcf.org/content/report/remedying-school-segregation/.

census tract, or town)
B = the total population of group *b* in the full study area (e.g. all schools, all census tracts, or all towns).

The Exposure Index is the probability of a person from group a interacting with a person from group *b* in area *i*. It equals

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N}[(\frac{a_i}{A})(\frac{b_i}{T_i})]$$

where:
a_i = the population of group *a* in the i^{th} area (e.g. school, census tract, or municipality)
A = the total population of group a in the full study area (e.g. all schools, all census tracts, or all municipalities)
b_i= the population of group b in the ith area (e.g. school, census tract, or municipality)
T_i = the total population in the i^{th} area (e.g. all schools, all census tracts, or all municipalities).

The Isolation Index is the probability of a person from group *a* interacting with another person from group *a* in area *i*. It equals

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N}[(\frac{a_i}{A})(\frac{b_i}{T_i})]$$

where:
a_i = the population of group a in the ith area (e.g. school, census tract, or municipality)
A = the total population of group a in the full study area (e.g. all schools, all census tracts, or all municipalities)
T_i = the total population in the ith area (e.g. all schools, all census tracts, or all municipalities).

Each measure of segregation was calculated across five geographies: K-5 schools in the Morris School District, census tracts serving students in the K-5 schools in the Morris School District, towns serving students in the K-5 schools in the Morris School District, census tracts serving students in Morristown High School, and towns serving students in Morristown High School. The school-level analysis used data from the New Jersey Department of Education's enrollment files. Data from each pair of sister schools was combined for analysis, leaving four geographic areas: Normandy Park (magnet school), Hillcrest/Alexander Hamilton, Woodland/Thomas Jefferson, and Alfred Vale/Sussex. The neighborhood-level analysis used census tract data from the American Community Survey 2010-2014 Five-Year Estimates. Data from the five census tracts in Morris Township and the four census tracts in Morristown were used in the analysis for K-5 tracts. Data from the five census tracts in Morris Township were combined and data from the four census tracts in Morristown were combined to conduct the analysis of segregation between K-5 towns. Data from the five census tracts in Morris Township, the four census tracts in Morristown, and the two census tracts in Morris Plains were used in the analysis for 9-12 tracts. Data from the five census tracts in Morris Township were combined, data from the four census tracts in Morristown were combined, and data from the two census tracts in Morris Plains were combined to conduct the analysis of segregation between 9-12 towns.

School Outcomes Analysis

School outcomes data are derived from the New Jersey Department of Education's Assessment Report State Summary files. The percent proficient variable was calculated by adding the reported values of "Proficient" and "Advanced Proficient."

In order to calculate the percent of Morris School District students who perform as well or better than other students across New Jersey, we created a separate table for each unique student subgroup, grade-level, and test. We then sorted each table by "Mean Scale Score," summed the number of "Valid Scale Scores" equal to or lower than the Mean Scale Score in the Morris School District for the related test/grade/subgroup, and divided this by the total number of "Valid Scale Scores" in New Jersey for the related test/grade/subgroup. It is important to note that the Department of Education does not disclose data for schools

with fewer than ten valid scale scores for a particular test/grade/subgroup. This missing data introduces a potential source of error to this particular analysis.

In order to calculate the five-year averages, we first calculated the percent of MSD students who perform as well as or better than other students across New Jersey for each demographic subgroup in each individual school year from 2010 through 2014. We then found the average value for each demographic subgroup across the five-year period.

THE CENTURY FOUNDATION

Remedying School Segregation

Appendix C: Qualitative Methods

AUGUST 23, 2016 — PAUL TRACTENBERG, ALLISON RODA AND RYAN COUGHLAN

A case study design was used to better understand the multiple ways in which community, district, and school-level respondents perceive educational quality and opportunity in a racially and socio-economically diverse district. We used several methods to answer our research questions, including two days of MHS classroom observations, sixty-four individual interviews, and eight focus groups with a diverse group of respondents from the district, school and community levels (See Table 7).

In selecting the interviewees, we employed purposive and snowball sampling in our effort to hear different voices and perspectives who were either directly involved with the regionalization efforts in Morristown (n=20), or are currently affiliated with the schools or community (n=44). In order to obtain multiple perspectives, we interviewed twenty-seven total community participants, seventeen district participants, and twenty school participants, until data saturation was reached. Focus groups with 4-8 participants each were conducted with 1) high school administrators; 2) high school teachers (2 groups); 3) homogeneous groups of Black, Latino, and White high achieving high school students chosen by the principal; 4) Spanish-speaking Latino parents at the Neighborhood House; and 5) Morris Educational Foundation parent meeting. In the future, we plan to target a more diverse set of participants to interview, including focus groups with students who have different academic profiles.

The semi-structured in- person interviews and focus groups lasted between 60-120 minutes and were conducted at the respondent's home, place of work, or restaurant. During the interviews and focus groups, we asked respondents questions about their knowledge of the school district merger, long-term effects of the merger, pros and cons of desegregated schools, and school desegregation policy. The interviews were audio taped and transcribed for research purposes.

As the interviews were transcribed, we spent time as a team combining and reorganizing categories and sub-categories from the interview data in order to create a coding outline. Next, we uploaded the transcripts into an online coding software program, Dedoose-- pulling relevant chunks of data out to support the most salient themes and findings that emerged based on our research questions. This process resulted in four "umbrella themes" and twelve more specific "dimensional codes" within the larger themes. We also consulted with colleagues about emerging themes to ensure validity and did member checks with participants.

This report can be found online at: https://tcf.org/content/report/remedying-school-segregation/.

Table 7. Characteristics of the full participant sample

Data Sources	Number
District Level	
School Board Members	5
Superintendents and Directors	8
State Education Officials and Lawyers	4
School Level	
Principals	9
Teachers	5
Guidance/Support Staff	6
Community Level	
Parents and Grandparents	15
Former Mayors	2
Realtors	2
Civic Leaders and Clergy	8
Total number of Interviewees	**64**
Focus Group	
Administrator Focus Group[1]	1
Teacher Focus Group[2]	2
Student Focus Group[3]	3
Latino Parent Focus Group[4]	1
Morris Educational Foundation FG	1
Total number of Focus Groups	**8**
School Observations	2 Days
Total number of 9-12 School Observations	**16 classrooms**

1 4 males (2 White, 1 Black, 1 Latino). 2 Two focus groups were conducted with teachers. Teacher FG 1 included 2 males and 3 females (3 White and 2 Black). Teacher FG 2 included 4 females (1 Asian American, 2 White, and 1 Latina American). 3 High school student focus groups were broken down by racial/ethnic homogeneous groups and chosen by the principal, i.e. White students, Black students, and Latino students. 4 Focus group conducted at the Neighborhood House and translated from Spanish to English (9 mothers and 1 father).

Table 7. Characteristics of the full participant sample	
Data Sources	**Number**
Race/ethnicity of district level sample (n=17)	
White	15
African American	1
Asian American	0
Hispanic/Latino	1
Race/ethnicity of teachers, staff, and administrators (n=20)	
White	10
African American	5
Asian American	0
Hispanic/Latino	5
Race/ethnicity of community sample (n=27)	
White	20
African American	6
Asian American	1
Hispanic/Latino	0