

Ogden-Jenner School Merger: Review of Related Literature

Prepared by Sarah Cashdollar

June 18, 2016

Nationwide, as the proportion of nonwhite students has risen dramatically, so too has racial and socioeconomic school segregation. Chicago leads the nation in extreme racial segregation; only 9% of Chicago Public Schools students are white, yet most of the city's white students attend schools that hold a plurality of other white students. At the same time, Chicago has the nation's highest percentage of black students attending what a 2012 report by The Civil Rights project has called "apartheid schools" – schools that are between 0 and 1% white.¹ The city's racial segregation is accompanied by socioeconomic segregation, with most black students attending schools that have disproportionately high concentrations of poverty. Within CPS, Ogden International and Jenner Academy for the Arts are two schools that typify Chicago's school segregation pattern. Ogden, located in the Gold Coast neighborhood, is one of the city's whitest, wealthiest, and highest-achieving schools, while Jenner, just a mile west, is one of its near-apartheid schools – 98% black, 99% low-income, and with test scores that consistently fall well below district and state averages. Yet a plan proposed by parents, principals, and community members for the future of these schools is not so typical. Since the fall of 2015, in the face of increasing overcrowding at Ogden and severe under-enrollment at Jenner, this coalition of advocates from both Ogden and Jenner have striven to merge the two schools into one. In the midst of these efforts, this report seeks to inform the potential merger by exploring the effects of racial and socioeconomic segregation on student outcomes, the role of integration in closing achievement gaps, and the impact of racial and socioeconomic diversity on learning,

¹ Orfield, G., Kucsera, J., & Siegel-Hawley, G. (2012). E pluribus... Separation: Deepening double segregation for more students. *The Civil Rights Project/Proyecto Derechos Civiles*. <http://tinyurl.com/zxdfgt8>

career readiness, political engagement, and other student outcomes. It will also caution about the potential negative effects of school integration projects, including re-segregation in the form of racialized tracking and negative peer effects, and will explore ways schools can prevent these adverse outcomes. With thoughtful implementation guided by effective precedents in other school districts, school mergers such as that proposed by Ogden and Jenner community members will be able to capitalize on the many benefits of integration for students of all racial and socioeconomic backgrounds.

Segregated Schools and Student Outcomes: Past and Current State of Affairs

Commissioned by Lyndon B. Johnson as part of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, the 1966 Coleman report² was the first to comprehensively investigate the effects of racial and socioeconomic school segregation on student achievement in the United States. The report found that minority students not only attended lower-quality schools, but that they were more affected by school quality than were majority students:

The conclusion can be drawn that improving the school of a minority pupil will increase his achievement more than will improving the school of a white child increase his. Similarly, the average minority pupil's achievement will suffer more in a school of low quality than will the average white pupil's. (p. 129)

It went on to state that the socioeconomic composition of the student body was the strongest in-school factor predicting minority student achievement. In other words, a minority student attending a school with a mostly low-income student body was highly likely to experience low achievement:

² Coleman, J.S., Campbell, E.Q., Hobson, C.F., McPartland, J.M., Mood, et al. (1966). Equality of educational opportunity. Office of Education, *U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, National Center for Education Statistics*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

...the principal way in which the school environment of Negroes and whites differ is in the composition of their student bodies, and it turns out that the composition of their student bodies has a strong relationship to the achievement of Negro and other minority pupils. (p. 130)

Thus, the report suggested that school segregation had a twice-negative impact on minority student achievement by both 1) sequestering minority students in lower-quality schools and 2) creating student bodies composed of mostly low-income students.

Today, the picture is just as bleak. Despite decades of attempts at school integration following *Brown v. Board of Education* and the 1964 Civil Rights Act, many of these attempts were thwarted by white hostility and poor, top-down implementation that left little room for community input.³ Meanwhile, white suburbanization and discriminatory housing policy increasingly promoted residential segregation, making diverse student bodies even more rare,⁴ while a 1991 Supreme Court decision paved the way for schools to dismantle some of their desegregation plans.⁵ As a final nail in the coffin, a 2007 Supreme Court decision in *Parents Involved in Community Schools vs. Seattle School District No. 1* made attempts to integrate in the midst of “de facto” school segregation (i.e. segregation caused by housing patterns) by assigning students to schools based on race extremely difficult, forcing some districts to end their desegregation programs.⁶ As a result, despite some recent patterns of residential desegregation, schools today remain severely segregated, with many urban school students attending schools

³ Wells, A.S., Fox, L., Cordova-Cobo, D. (2016). How racially diverse schools and classrooms can benefit all students. *The Century Foundation. Report K-12*. <https://tcf.org/content/report/how-racially-diverse-schools-and-classrooms-can-benefit-all-students/>

⁴ Rothstein, R. (2016). Segregating housing, segregated schools. *Education Week*, 33(26):35-40 http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2014/03/26/26rothstein_ep.h33.html

⁵ Board of Ed. of Oklahoma City Public Schools v. Robert L. Dowell, 498 U.S. 237 (1991)

⁶ *Parents Involved in Cmty. Sch. v. Seattle Sch. Dist. No. 1*, 551 U.S. 701 (U.S. 2007)

that are virtually 100% minority and low-income.⁷ And the impacts of segregation on minority student achievement are just as negative as they were found to be at the time of the Coleman report.

A wide range of studies shows that a school's concentration of poverty continues to predict an individual student's achievement more strongly than that student's specific socioeconomic background. A recent analysis of thousands of school districts across the United States, for example, has found that children at schools with the highest concentrations of poverty typically score four grade levels lower on assessments of math and reading than children at schools serving no students who live in poverty.⁸ In addition to the direct peer effects of attending school with mostly low-income students and the often subpar educational materials offered by high-poverty schools, segregation perpetuates academic disparity by segregating the teaching force. High-poverty schools attract less qualified teachers than low-poverty schools, and the teachers they do bring in have higher rates of turnover.⁹ Segregation also frequently results in higher rates of harsh, exclusionary discipline for low-income students. In Chicago, for example, schools with the highest concentrations of poverty also report the highest suspension rates.¹⁰ Exposure to such harsh discipline measures increases a child's chances of dropping out of

⁷ Orfield, G., Kucsera, J., & Siegel-Hawley, G. (2012). E pluribus... Separation: Deepening double segregation for more students. (see footnote 1)

⁸ Reardon, S.F., Kalogrides, D., & Shores, K. (2016). The geography of racial/ethnic test score gaps (CEPA Working Paper No.16-10). *Stanford Center for Education Policy Analysis*: <http://cepa.stanford.edu/wp16-10>

⁹ Clotfelter, C., Ladd, H., & Vigdor, J. (2010). Teacher mobility, school segregation, and pay based policies to level the playing field. *Education, Finance, and Policy*, 6(3), 399-438.

¹⁰ Sartain, L., Allensworth, E.M., Porter, S. (2015). Suspending Chicago's students: Differences in discipline practices across schools (Research Report, September 2015). *University of Chicago Consortium on Chicago School Research*. <https://consortium.uchicago.edu/sites/default/files/publications/Suspending%20Chicagos%20Students.pdf>

school,¹¹ such that, as we would expect given the relationships between segregation and discipline practices, segregated and high-poverty schools have higher dropout rates than wealthier schools.¹² The risks correlated with attending a segregated, low-income school last well into adulthood, with continued segregation in employment¹³ and increased likelihood of incarceration.¹⁴ Thus, the negative correlates of school segregation extend far beyond depressed test scores, shaping outcomes for pupils' entire lifespans.

Desegregation: Closing the Achievement Gap and Other Benefits for Minority Students

Given the effects of school segregation on student achievement, it is unsurprising that racial desegregation (along with the socioeconomic desegregation it entails) is considered a promising way to close the academic achievement gap. In fact, recent analyses of racial desegregation efforts in the past point to desegregation's potential for dramatic improvement in minority student outcomes. As pointed out by Gary Orfield, cofounder of the Civil Rights Project/Proyecto Derechos Civiles, the test score gap between black and white students reached its narrowest point during the 1980s apex of the mandated desegregation movement. These gaps again widened as schools subsequently became resegregated and the national education agenda

¹¹ Advancement Project & The Civil Rights Project (2000). Opportunities suspended: The devastating consequences of zero tolerance and school discipline policies. Cambridge: The Civil Rights Project. <http://civilrightsproject.ucla.edu/research/k-12-education/school-discipline/opportunities-suspended-the-devastating-consequences-of-zero-tolerance-and-school-discipline-policies/>

¹² Balfanz, R., & N. Legters, N. (2004). Locating the dropout crisis: Which high schools produce the nation's dropouts? Where are they located? Who attends them? *Center for Research on The Education of Students Placed at Risk*, Johns Hopkins University. <http://www.csos.jhu.edu/crespar/techreports/report70.pdf>.

¹³ Wells, A. S., & Crain, R. L. (1994). Perpetuation theory and the long-term effects of school desegregation. *Review of Educational Research*, 64, 531-555; Braddock, J. H., & McPartland, J. (1989). Social-psychological processes that perpetuate racial segregation: The relationship between school and employment segregation. *Journal of Black Studies*, 19(3), 267-289.

¹⁴ Losen, D.J., Gillespie, J. (2012). Opportunities suspended: The disparate impact of disciplinary exclusion from school. *The Civil Rights Project/Proyecto Derechos Civiles*. <https://civilrightsproject.ucla.edu/resources/projects/center-for-civil-rights-remedies/school-to-prison-folder/federal-reports/upcoming-crr-research>

turned toward accountability reforms rather than integration.¹⁵ However, large-scale quantitative analyses continue to bolster our understanding of the relationship between desegregation and higher achievement for minority students. One such analysis found racial diversity to predict higher academic achievement for students of all racial and ethnic backgrounds,¹⁶ while another found that, if a completely racially segregated city were to become completely racially integrated, the black-white SAT score gap would close by one-quarter.¹⁷

In addition to improved academic achievement, evidence suggests that desegregation has other important impacts for minority students. As expected given the established relationship between segregation and harsh discipline practices, racial integration has been hypothesized to result in improved school climates and reduced rates of suspension for minority students.¹⁸ Integration has been found to enhance minority students' self-concept of ability¹⁹ and improve expectations for minority students' own educational aspirations.²⁰ Indeed, minority students who attend integrated schools are better prepared academically and socially for higher education.²¹ A robust literature has also found that black students who attend desegregated schools are more

¹⁵ Orfield, G. (2001) Schools more separate: Consequences of a decade of resegregation. Harvard: *The Civil Rights Project*, <https://civilrightsproject.ucla.edu/research/k-12-education/integration-and-diversity/schools-more-separate-consequences-of-a-decade-of-resegregation/orfield-schools-more-separate-2001.pdf>

¹⁶ Brenner, A.D., & Crosnoe, R. (2011). The racial/ethnic composition of elementary schools and young children's academic and socioemotional functioning. *American Education Research Journal*, 48(3): 621-646, <http://aer.sagepub.com/content/48/3/621.abstract>

¹⁷ Card, D., & Rothstein, J. (2006). Racial segregation and the black-white test score gap. *Journal of Public Economics*, 91(11-12): 2158-2184. <http://www.nber.org/papers/w12078>

¹⁸ Eitle, T.M. & Eitle, D.J. (2004). Inequality, Segregation, and the Overrepresentation of African Americans in School Suspensions. *Sociological Perspectives*, 47(3): 269-87, <http://spx.sagepub.com/content/47/3/269.short>.

¹⁹ Wilson, K. L. (1979). The effects of integration and class on black educational attainment. *Sociology of Education*, 53, 84-98.

²⁰ Frost, M.B. (2007). Texas students' college expectations: Does high school racial composition matter? *Sociology of Education*, 80: 43-66, <http://soe.sagepub.com/content/80/1/43.abstract>.

²¹ Massey, D.S. & Fisher, M.J. (2006). The effect of childhood segregation on minority academic performance at selective colleges. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 29(1): 1-26, <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/01419870500351159>

likely to also attend desegregated colleges, which in turn leads to desegregated employment, increased employment in white collar and professional jobs than blue collar jobs, and desegregated professional networks.²² Additional long-term effects of desegregation include increased occupational attainment and adult earnings, increased health status, and decreased chance of incarceration for minorities who attend desegregated schools. Further, the benefits of desegregation extend to subsequent generations. Black children whose parents attended desegregated schools, regardless of whether or not they attend desegregated schools themselves, have been found to achieve higher academically, repeat fewer grades, graduate high school and attend college at a higher rate, and attend higher quality colleges than their peers whose parents attended segregated schools.²³ At the same time, no negative effects for white students are found on academic or any other outcomes. As pointed out by Erica Frankenberg,²⁴ this finding that white students experience no harm from desegregation has been found time and time again, by desegregation supporters and detractors alike. Indeed, despite the persistent fear that integration will harm white student achievement, all evidence suggests that racial desegregation narrows the achievement gap between blacks and whites by improving the black student experience without diminishing that of whites.²⁵

As a case study of how local efforts at school racial integration can close achievement gaps, consider an example set forth in Hartford, Connecticut. After a 1996 Connecticut State

²² Wells, A.S. & Crain, R.L. (1994). Perpetuation theory and the long-term effects of school desegregation. *Review of Educational Research*, 64(4): 531-555, <http://rer.sagepub.com/content/64/4/531.full.pdf+html>

²³ Johnson, R.C. The grandchildren of Brown: The long legacy of school desegregation. Working paper, http://socrates.berkeley.edu/~ruckerj/RJabstract_BrownDeseg_Grandkids.pdf

²⁴ Frankenberg, E. (2007). Introduction: School integration – The time is now. In E. Frankenberg & G. Orfield (Eds.), *Lessons in integration, realizing the promise of racial diversity in American schools*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press.

²⁵ Johnson, R.C. (2011). Long-run impacts of school desegregation & school quality on adult attainments. *NBER Working Paper No. 16664*, <http://www.nber.org/papers/w16664>

Supreme Court ruling found that segregation throughout the state was undermining students' access to equal educational opportunity, the Capital Region Education Council (CREC) led an effort to create over forty magnet schools across districts in the Hartford area. These interdistrict magnet schools were required to meet specific integration requirements, with families applying voluntarily and students admitted by lottery. Despite having no academic admissions standards for applicants, studies comparing admitted students to those who were not selected by the lottery system have found the integrated schools to be hugely academically successful. In 2009, for example, black and Latino students from urban areas achieved significantly higher in math and reading at the magnet schools than did their peers who were not selected for the magnets, narrowing the statewide achievement gap between minority and white students.²⁶ In 2011 and 2013 this trend continued, with black, Hispanic, and low-income students at the magnet schools all scoring significantly higher than the state averages for their respective subgroups. The gap between minority students and white students in reading was completely eliminated in the third grade, and the gap between low-income and other students was almost completely eliminated in the tenth grade. White students attending the magnet schools also scored higher than white student state averages, suggesting that the magnet schools helped close achievement gaps by improving the educational experience for all students, with exceptional improvements for low-income and minority students.²⁷ Although self-selection may be responsible for some of the

²⁶ Cobb, C.D., Bifulco, R. & Bell, C. (2009). Evaluation of Connecticut's Interdistrict Magnet Schools. *The Center for Educational Policy Analysis, University of Connecticut*, <http://achievehartford.org/upload/files/CEPA%20Evaluation%20of%20Connecticut's%20Inter-district%20Magnet%20Schools.pdf>

²⁷ Ellsworth, S.S., Galluci, D.M., Douglas, B.E. & Walsh, D.P. (2012). Capital Region Education Council (CREC) Student achievement overview. *Office of Data, Research, & Evaluation*, Hartford, CT. http://sheffmovement.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/04/2012_CRECE_Research-Brief.pdf; Ellsworth, S.S., Galluci, D.M., Crowl, D., & Richards, D. (2013) CREC student achievement overview 2013, *Office of Data Analysis, Research and Technology*, Hartford, CT, <http://sheffmovement.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/CREC-Student-Achievement-Overview-2013.pdf>

magnet schools' success, the Hartford example suggests that racially integrated schools have the potential to provide benefits for all students, not only those most at risk.

As noted earlier, these vast benefits of racial desegregation are largely tied to the way race often operates as a proxy for socioeconomic class, such that racial desegregation almost always involves class desegregation as well. According to Orfield, “educational research suggests that the basic damage inflicted by segregated education comes not from racial concentration but from the concentration of children from poor families.”²⁸ Indeed, in 2013 the achievement gap between rich and poor students was almost twice as wide as that between white and black students overall.²⁹ Thus, desegregation based on the socioeconomic status of students directly rather than on student race is increasingly being proposed as a way to address the root cause of the achievement gap between middle class (mostly white) and poor (mostly minority) schools.³⁰ Aside from targeting one source of the achievement gap directly, socioeconomic integration plans conveniently sidestep the difficulties of implementing race-based desegregation plans following the 2007 *Parents Involved in Community Schools* case, allowing public districts to instead assign students to schools based on socioeconomic status. And the outcomes of districts that have adopted socioeconomic integration plans look very promising.

One of the most well known examples of socioeconomic desegregation is that of the Wake County district in Raleigh, North Carolina. A district that historically had used student race in order to integrate schools, Wake County switched over to integration based on student

²⁸ Orfield, G. (1978). Must we bus? Segregated schools and national policy. *The Brookings Institution*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press, p. 69.

²⁹ Reardon, S.F. (2013). The widening income achievement gap. *Educational Leadership*, 70, (8): 10–16, <http://www.ascd.org/publications/educational-leadership/may13/vol70/num08/The-Widening-Income-Achievement-Gap.aspx>

³⁰ Potter, H., Quick, K. & Davies, E. (2016). A new wave of school integration: Districts and charters pursuing socioeconomic diversity. *The Century Foundation. Report K-12*. <https://tcf.org/content/report/a-new-wave-of-school-integration/>

socioeconomic status in 2000, requiring that none of its schools had more than a 40% low-income student body. To achieve these school student populations, the district used mandatory busing, often sending students from the suburbs to the city and vice versa. The results of this plan earned the district national acclaim. Academic achievement gaps narrowed significantly as student achievement soared. The number of black third through eighth graders passing their state exams, for example, doubled within just a few years of implementation. White students in the district also benefited, outperforming their peers in other large districts throughout the state.³¹ According to Gerard Grant, professor emeritus at Syracuse University, Wake County “reduced the gap between rich and poor, black and white, more than any other large urban educational system in America.”³² Despite the district’s overwhelming success, the integration plan had strong conservative critics, some of whom suggested that the district could better serve the neediest students by concentrating them together in schools and providing those schools with additional resources.

To assess this question of whether socioeconomic integration or extra resources directed toward low-income schools would be more effective, researchers³³ conducted a study in Montgomery County, Maryland. There, low-income families were assigned to public housing randomly in either low-income neighborhoods where they would attend high-poverty neighborhood schools, or in middle- and high-income neighborhoods where they would attend

³¹ Finder, A. (2005). As test scores jump, Raleigh credits integration by income. *The New York Times*, http://www.nytimes.com/2005/09/25/education/as-test-scores-jump-raleigh-credits-integration-by-income.html?_r=0

³² Grant, G. (2009). *Hope and despair in the American city: Why there are no bad schools in Raleigh*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. As cited by Kahlenberg, R.D. (2012-2013). From all walks of life: New hope for school integration. *American Educator*, 36(4): 2-7, 10-14, 40, <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ995900.pdf>

³³ Mantil, A., Perkins, A.G., & Aberger, A. (2012). The challenge of high-poverty schools: How feasible is socioeconomic school integration? In R.D. Kahlenberg (Ed.) *The future of xchool integration*, 155–222.

low-poverty schools. At the same time, the Montgomery County school district provided the high-poverty schools with significant extra funding (approximately an additional \$2,000 per student), which translated into an extended learning day, small class sizes, and other reforms. This situation, as described by Richard Kahlenberg,³⁴ provided the opportunity to assess whether low income students attending the socioeconomically integrated, low-poverty schools would perform better than those attending the segregated, high-poverty schools with concentrated district resources. Despite the gains expected for students attending the schools with all the extra district funding, the low-income students at the low-poverty schools performed much better, closing the math achievement gap with middle- and upper-income student by fifty percent. Although these results are unsurprising given Coleman's 1966 findings on the importance of the socioeconomic makeup of a student's peers in determining his or her own achievement, they provide modern-day evidence for the large positive potential impact of socioeconomic diversity on student outcomes. Indeed, for educators and parents concerned with raising minority student achievement and the achievement of low-income students in general, socioeconomic integration appears to be one of the most promising reforms.³⁵

Desegregation: Benefits for All Students

School racial and socioeconomic integration efforts are beneficial not only for minority and low-income students, however. A vast body of research has found that exposure to demographic diversity has immensely wide-ranging effects, from enhanced financial performance in the workplace³⁶ to increased information sharing among jurors³⁷ to better

³⁴ Kahlenberg, R.D. (2012-2013). From all walks of life: New hope for school integration. *American Educator*, 36(4): 2-7, 10-14, 40, <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ995900.pdf>

³⁵ Mantil, A., Perkins, A.G., & Aberger, A. (2012). The challenge of high-poverty schools: How feasible is socioeconomic school integration? (see footnote 34)

³⁶ Richard, O.C., Kirby, S.L., & Chadwick, K. (2013). The impact of racial and gender diversity in management on financial performance: How participative strategy making features can unleash

preparation for debate among partisans.³⁸ In short, “simply being exposed to diversity can change the way you think,” in the words of Columbia Business School professor Katharine W. Phillips,³⁹ And the impact of racial and socioeconomic diversity is perhaps greatest on youth, enhancing their cognition, intercultural understanding, and preparation for employment in a globalized world, as this section, inspired by The Century Foundation’s report, “How Racially Diverse Schools and Classrooms Can Benefit All Students,”⁴⁰ will show. Thus, by promoting racial and socioeconomic diversity, desegregation can improve the educational experiences for students of all backgrounds.

Elite colleges have long recognized the importance of diversity on their campuses and have fought in court to defend their means of achieving diverse student populations, most recently in *the Fisher v. University of Texas* (known as *Fisher II*) case. As such, parties interested in the impact of desegregation on educational outcomes can turn to the higher education literature for a large swath of research on the relationship between racial/socioeconomic diversity and learning. As summarized by the American Psychological Association⁴¹ and the American Educational Research Association,⁴² this higher education

diversity advantage. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 24(13): 2571-2582. [https://utdallas.influent.utsystem.edu/en/publications/the-impact-of-racial-and-gender-diversity-in-management-on-financial-performance\(eeff9d22-b986-4149-9410-7239f429fdd4\).html](https://utdallas.influent.utsystem.edu/en/publications/the-impact-of-racial-and-gender-diversity-in-management-on-financial-performance(eeff9d22-b986-4149-9410-7239f429fdd4).html)

³⁷ Sommers, S.R. (2007). Race and the decision making of juries. *The British Psychological Society*, 12: 171-187.

³⁸ Loyd, D.L., Wang, C.S., Phillips, K.W., & Lount, Jr., R.B. (2013). Social category diversity promotes pre-meeting elaboration: The role of relationship focus. *Organization Science*, 24(3): 757-772.

³⁹ Phillips, K.W. (2014). How diversity makes us smarter. *Scientific American*, <http://www.scientificamerican.com/article/how-diversity-makes-us-smarter/>

⁴⁰ This section’s themes and organizational structure were inspired by Wells, A.S., Fox, L., Cordova-Cobo, D. (2016). How racially diverse schools and classrooms can benefit all students. (see footnote 3)

⁴¹ Brief of *Amicus Curiae*: The American Psychological Association in Support of Respondents in *Fisher v. University of Texas at Austin*. <http://www.scotusblog.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/14-981bsacAmericanPsychologicalAssociation.pdf>

⁴² Brief of *Amicus Curiae*: The American Educational Research Association et.al. in Support of Respondents in *Fisher v. University of Texas at Austin*,

literature has found striking cognitive benefits when students are exposed to social groups that have perspectives different from their own. Exposure to diversity is associated with improved cognitive development,⁴³ including improved ability to think critically and solve problems,⁴⁴ especially for students who belong to the majority group. White students, for example, have been shown to experience more cognitive stimulation and enhanced comprehension of material through discussion or anticipation of discussion with students of color.⁴⁵ This improved learning occurs due to the cognitive disequilibrium elicited through interaction with surprising or new thoughts and ideas shared by students from other backgrounds.⁴⁶ Students must then reset equilibrium by accumulating more information and thinking through its meaning with these new viewpoints in mind.⁴⁷ In short, students' opportunities to interact with groups of people who have different perspectives from their own – whether through racial, ethnic, gender, or socioeconomic group membership – appears to enhance the very thought processes (critical thinking, taking alternative views, and problem-solving) that happen to be integral to academic success.⁴⁸ Further, these interactions with diverse groups help all students grow confidence in their own

<http://www.utexas.edu/vp/irla/Documents/ACR%20American%20Educational%20Research%20Association%20et%20al.pdf>

⁴³ Bowman, N.A. (2010). College diversity experiences and cognitive development: A meta-analysis, *Review of Educational Research* 80(1): 4-33.

⁴⁴ Denson, N. & Zhang, S. (2010). The impact of student experiences with diversity on developing graduate attributes. *Studies Higher Education*, 35(5): 529-543, <http://tinyurl.com/zek5owz>

⁴⁵ Sommers, S.R., Warp, L.S., & Mahoney, C.C. (2008). Cognitive effects of racial diversity: White individuals' information processing in heterogeneous groups. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 44(4): 1129-1136, <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0022103108000036>

⁴⁶ Crisp, R.J., & Turner, R.N. (2011). Cognitive adaptation to the experience of social and cultural diversity, *Psychological Bulletin*, 137(2): 242-266. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21142349>

Bowman, N.A. (2010). College diversity experiences and cognitive development: A meta-analysis. (see footnote 44)

⁴⁷ Chang, M.J., Astin, A.W., & Dongbin, K. (2004) Cross-racial interaction among undergraduates: Some consequences, causes, and patterns. *Research in Higher Education*, 45(5): 529-553.

⁴⁸ Hurtado, S. (2005). The next generation of diversity and intergroup relations research. *Journal of Social Issues*, 61(3): 595-610. <http://tinyurl.com/jplygrm>

Pitt, R.N. & Packard, J. (2012). Activating diversity: The impact of student race on contributions to course discussions, *Sociological Quarterly*, 53(2): 295-320.

intellectual abilities.⁴⁹ Because these studies were mainly conducted with college-aged students, practitioners should exercise caution when considering whether diverse conditions would affect K-12 students in the same way. However, combined, this body of work suggests that exposure to diversity has promising effects on cognition in general.

Exposure to other racial and socioeconomic groups is not only important for enhancing cognitive development; it is also important for maintaining one's ability to think critically in the context of people different from oneself. Lacking experience with diversity, students are prone to the impairments to cognitive functioning caused by implicit bias. Implicit biases are subconscious attitudes towards others based on stereotypes about racial, ethnic, gender, class and other groups. Stemming from natural cognitive processing that uses heuristics to make judgments in the most efficient way possible, implicit biases are thought to result from cultural learning through exposure to media, social institutions, and other avenues that communicate stereotypical messages about groups of people. Although these biases are present in majority and minority group members alike, people are generally unaware of their own implicit biases, which are measured by psychologists through implicit association tests.⁵⁰ Despite their unconscious nature, implicit biases can have serious impacts on an individual's ability to interact successfully with others. Several studies, for example, have found that doctors with higher implicit racial biases perform worse when treating nonwhite children.⁵¹ Further, these biases can affect the

⁴⁹ Nelson Laird, T.F. (2005). College students' experiences with diversity and their effects on academic self-confidence, social agency, and disposition toward critical thinking. *Research in Higher Education*, 46(4): 365-387.

Antonio, A.L. (2004). The influence of friendship groups on intellectual self-confidence and educational aspirations in college, *The Journal of Higher Education*, 75(4): 446-471.

⁵⁰ Brownstein, M. (2016). Implicit bias. Zalta, E.N. (Ed.) *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/implicit-bias/#FutRes>

⁵¹ Green, A.R., Carney, D.R., Pallin, D.J., Ngo, L.H., Raymond, K.L., Iezzoni, L.I., & Banaji, M.R. (2007). Implicit bias among physicians and its prediction of thrombolysis decisions for black and white patients. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*, 22(9): 1231-1238; Goyal, M.K., Kupperman,

behaviors and performance of individuals regardless of their intentions or their conscious attitudes. In fact, the more deliberately an individual tries to avoid allowing her implicit biases to guide her behavior, the more likely she will behave in prejudiced ways.⁵² This occurs because attempting to suppress one's own biases expends a great deal of mental energy, leaving fewer cognitive resources to attend to non-stereotypical information.⁵³ In short, for any student planning for a career that involves working with diverse groups of people, and especially for a career that requires high cognitive load, holding implicit biases may be a significant detriment to optimal performance.

An effective way to avoid the discriminatory effects of implicit biases is to reduce the biases themselves through exposure to members of other groups, especially minority groups.⁵⁴ Schools that intentionally promote inclusion by inviting racially and socioeconomically diverse students to hold shared membership in the school community can diminish students' negative subconscious attitudes, especially if students take part in this membership for prolonged periods.⁵⁵ Crucially, however, gaining the full advantages of school diversity requires that a "critical mass" of students from any single minority group – for example, low-income students – are represented. The size of this critical mass varies, but there must exist a sufficient number of

N., Cleary, S.D., Teach, S.J., & Chamberlain, J.M. (2015). Racial disparities in pain management of children with appendicitis in emergency departments. *JAMA Pediatr.*, 169(11): 996-1002.

⁵² Monteith, M. J., Sherman, J. W., & Devine, P. G. (1998). Suppression as a stereotype control strategy. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 2: 63–82; Wegner, D. M. (1994). Ironic processes of mental control. *Psychological Review*, 101: 34–52.

⁵³ Feldon, D.F. (2007) Cognitive load and classroom teaching: The double-edged sword of automaticity. *Educational Psychologist*, 42(3), 123-137.

⁵⁴ Van Bavel, J.J., & Cunningham, W.A. (2008). Self-categorization with a novel mixed-race group moderates automatic social and racial biases. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 35(3): 321-335.

⁵⁵ Brief of *Amicus Curiae*: The American Psychological Association in Support of Respondents in *Fisher v. University of Texas at Austin*. (see footnote 42)

students to avoid any individuals serving as “token” students,⁵⁶ which can increase stereotype threat among minority students and reinforce stereotypes among majority students. Instead, schools aiming to help all of their students benefit from diversity are in the best position to do so when they have substantial representations of minority student groups.

In addition to improving cognition, exposure to diversity has been shown to reduce explicit prejudices and promote positive relations among various demographic groups within school communities.⁵⁷ In the case of the racially and socioeconomically integrated Hartford Interdistrict Magnet Schools described earlier, white students and students of color at the magnets were more likely than students at the regular public schools to express closeness towards and friendship with other-race students, report stronger intergroup relationships, perceive less racial tension, and show greater multicultural interests.⁵⁸ Outcomes like these benefit students in a number of ways, not least of which is preparation for twenty-first century employment. About half of Fortune 100 companies, for example, joined together in order to file a brief⁵⁹ in the *Fisher II* case stating that hiring people who have been educated in diverse school environments is in the companies’ best interests. The National Research Council Committee on Defining Deeper Learning and 21st Century Skills defines “appreciation for diversity” as a key marker of intellectual openness in the workplace.⁶⁰ Along with enhanced creativity, critical

⁵⁶ Brief of *Amicus Curiae*: The American Educational Research Association et.al. in Support of Respondents in *Fisher v. University of Texas at Austin*. (see footnote 43)

⁵⁷ Antonio, A.L. (2001). Diversity and the influence of friendship groups in college. *The Review of Higher Education*, 25(1): 63-89.

⁵⁸ Cobb, C.D., Bifulco, R. & Bell, C. (2009). Evaluation of Connecticut’s Interdistrict Magnet Schools. (see footnote 27)

⁵⁹ Brief of *Amicus Curiae*: Fortune-11 and Other Leading American Businesses in Support of Respondents in *Fisher v. University of Texas at Austin*.
<https://www.utexas.edu/vp/irla/Documents/ACR%20Fortune%20100%20and%20Other%20Leading%20American%20Businesses.pdf>

⁶⁰ Pellegrino, J.W., & Hilton, M.L. (2001). Education for life and work: Developing transferable knowledge and skills in the 21st century. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.

thinking, leadership skills, conflict negotiation, intercultural effectiveness,⁶¹ and capacity to increase profits, employees who have experience and comfort working with various cultural groups are better equipped to work with diverse colleagues and costumers. In fact, in one survey,⁶² 96% of employers rated employee comfort with diverse cultural groups as an important consideration. Youth tend to agree; in a survey of students across the country, one study found that white students view preparation to work in a diverse society as important to their futures.⁶³ Indeed, exposure to diversity early in life, which increases intercultural comfort and reduces implicit bias, lays the groundwork for skills that are crucial in the twenty-first century economy.

According to the vast body of literature on the benefits of diversity, school integration efforts have the potential to raise academic achievement, improve cognitive functioning, and enhance long-term life outcomes by a number of different measures. Vital to obtaining these positive outcomes, we have shown, is a critical mass of students who identify with any one minority group. In addition to these efforts to reduce tokenism, schools must take several additional measures to ensure students are receiving the full benefits of racial and socioeconomic diversity.

Desegregation: Potential Pitfalls

Negative Peer Effects

As stated earlier, scholars feel confident stating that desegregation efforts have no negative effects on the achievement of white students. Indeed, since most school integration

⁶¹ Brief of *Amicus Curiae*: The American Psychological Association in Support of Respondents in *Fisher v. University of Texas at Austin*. (see footnote 42)

⁶² Hart Research Associates. (2013). It takes more than a major: Employer priorities for college learning and student success. *Liberal Education*, 99(2). <http://www.aacu.org/publications-research/periodicals/it-takes-more-major-employer-priorities-college-learning-and>

⁶³ Yun, J.T. & Kurlaender, M. (2004). School racial composition and student educational aspirations: A question of equity in multiracial society. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk*, 9, 143-168.

efforts involve sending minority students from low-performing schools to majority-white, high-performing schools, there has been ample opportunity to confirm how desegregation affects white students at schools receiving low-performing minority students. Little work, however, has been conducted on how desegregation affects minority students who were already in the high-performing, receiving schools. Angrist and Lang's 2004 analysis of Boston's Metropolitan Council for Educational Opportunity (Metco) program, however, provides some insight into the effects of integration on minority students at receiving schools, suggesting that they may experience some short-lived negative impacts.

The Metco program, which started in 1966 and continues today, is one of the nation's oldest desegregation programs. It sends students on a voluntary, first come, first served basis from Boston Public Schools to schools in the city's surrounding suburban districts. Virtually all of the Metco students are black or Latino and low-income, and as a group they tend to score lower on achievement tests than students in the receiving suburban districts. Students in the receiving districts, on the other hand, are mostly white, wealthy, and relatively high-performing. As expected, Angrist and Lang found in 2004 that the districts receiving Metco students experienced a drop in school test score averages due to their increased proportion of low-income, lower-performing students. As a whole, however, students in the receiving districts experienced no effects on their own test scores. Yet because these suburban students were mostly white, Angrist and Lang wondered whether minority students in the receiving districts experienced the same null effects. To explore this question, they examined the case of Brookline Public schools, one of the only suburban districts with a substantial proportion of non-Metco minority students.

As expected, Angrist and Lang found different no effects of Metco participation on non-Metco white students. For some non-Metco black students, however, the addition of Metco

students did negatively influence their scores. In particular, they found modest negative effects on the reading and language scores of non-Metco black third grade girls. Since most of the incoming Metco students were black girls, Angrist and Lang hypothesize that peer effects were responsible. For example, non-Metco black girls may have replaced some of their wealthier, higher-scoring peers with Metco students, and this new composition of their peer groups may have affected their grades.

What do these findings mean for schools that already have a substantial proportion of minority students and are considering integration? According to Angrist and Lang, not much. In fact, the authors think their findings might actually be spurious, since the effects were small and affected only third graders. Angrist and Lang conclude that if the Metco students did negatively affect black girls, these effects were modest and quickly faded away. Based on this study, integrating schools may want to keep a careful eye on minority students who were already attending the higher-performing schools before integration. However, there is little reason to expect that any negative peer effects will be substantial or lasting. Instead, schools should focus most of their efforts on a potentially much more damaging pitfall of desegregation: racialized tracking.

Re-segregation Through Racialized Tracking

One of the most significant ways that efforts to increase school diversity may be undermined is through within-school tracking. Tracking, a common practice that involves grouping students by perceived ability level in rigid groups in order to adapt the rigor and type of instruction to students' abilities, is in principle an objectively meritocratic way to more efficiently and effectively engage students and meet their needs. Yet in practice, the process of assigning students to tracks is often quite subjective, depending on considerations such as

educational gatekeepers' interpretations of student ability (which may or may not take into account the quality of students' prior educational experiences), parents' level of comfort with demanding certain placements for their children, the number of seats a school offers in a given course, and a number of other non-meritocratic factors. In turn, any given track may in fact have students with widely varying ability levels. And the consequences for students assigned to low academic tracks can be dire. All students benefit from high expectations and academic rigor,⁶⁴ so when students are assigned to low academic tracks, they achieve lower than they otherwise would have in more rigorous courses.⁶⁵ Although tracks vary by ability level, one way they do tend to be homogenous is in students' socioeconomic and racial characteristics.⁶⁶ Indeed, a vast body of literature has shown that minority and low-income students are disproportionately assigned to low academic tracks and rarely assigned to honors tracks,⁶⁷ and that these assignments contribute to the racial and class achievement gaps.⁶⁸ Thus, when segregated schools become integrated, academic tracking often creates a new form of segregation: segregation within the school.

Indeed, even when school integration is carried out with the best of intentions, its major benefits on minority student achievement might be washed away if minority students don't actually attend integrated classes. Unfortunately, within-school segregation in the form of

⁶⁴ American Educational Research Association. (2004). Closing the gap: High achievement for students of color. *Research Points*, 2(3).

⁶⁵ Heubert, J.P. & Hauser, R.M. (1999). High stakes: Testing for tracking, promotion, and graduation. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

⁶⁶ Mickelson, R.A. (2001). Subverting Swann: First- and second-generation segregation in the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools. *American Educational Research Journal*, 38(2): 215-252.

⁶⁷ Heubert, J.P. & Hauser, R.M. (1999). High stakes: Testing for tracking, promotion, and graduation. (see footnote 69)

Mickelson, R.A. (2001). Subverting Swann: First- and second-generation segregation in the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools. (see footnote 70)

⁶⁸ Oakes, J. (1994). More than misapplied technology: A normative and political response to Hallinan on tracking. *Sociology of Education*, 67, 84-88.; Lucas, S.R. (1999). Tracking inequality. New York: Teachers College Press.

tracking is an all too common response to school integration,⁶⁹ and when this occurs, it results in a perpetuation of the unequal educational outcomes that integration seeks to disrupt.⁷⁰ Even schools considered to be paragons of integration can in fact offer very unequal education opportunities based on student race. Consider the case of Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools (CMS) in Charlotte, North Carolina, a district known nationwide for its role in the 1971 *Swann vs. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools* Supreme Court case that allowed schools to use mandatory busing to desegregate. As Roslyn Mickelson⁷¹ argues, although the district was widely lauded as an integration triumph, its use of tracking and the resulting “second-generation segregation” belied its narrative of success. Tracks in the newly integrated CMS became racially segregated in a number of ways. For example, students in the district, whether black or white, who had spent more time in segregated schools before the integration efforts had lower test scores than students who had been in more integrated schools. However, black students were disproportionately more likely to have been at racially isolated schools, and as a result were more likely to have low incoming test scores. In turn, these test scores were used in part to determine track assignments. However, even black students who scored as high as their white counterparts were more likely to be placed in lower tracks. For example, Mickelson found that, of the students whose 6th grade English scores landed between the 90th and 99th percentiles, 52% of the white students but only 20% of the black students went on to take advanced English in high school. As a result, academic tracks were highly segregated by race, and as in many schools that implement tracking,

⁶⁹ Card, D., & Rothstein, J. (2006). Racial segregation and the black-white test score gap. *NBER Working Paper 12078*.; Welner, K.G., & Oakes, J. (1996). Li(Ability) grouping: The new susceptibility of school tracking systems to legal challenges. *Harvard Educational Review*, 66: 451-470.

⁷⁰ Clotfelter, C.T., Ladd, H.F., & Vigdor, J. (2003). Who teaches whom? Race and the distribution of novice teachers. Working paper. Stanford Institute of Public Policy.

Clotfelter, C.T. (2004). *After “Brown”*: The rise and retreat of school desegregation. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

⁷¹ Mickelson, R.A. (2001). *Subverting Swann: First- and second-generation segregation in the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools*. (see note 70)

the lower tracks were much less likely to have teachers who were credentialed, experienced, and teaching in their fields. Assignment to lower tracks ultimately predicted lower grades and standardized test scores, including SAT scores. Based on these findings, Mickelson argues that the district never “looked beneath the surface to truly evaluate its programs” (p. 242) and realize that tracking ultimately subverted the benefits of desegregation. She offers two potential reasons for this oversight: 1) district leadership and desegregation advocates truly thought they had achieved their equity goals, or 2) (more pessimistically) within-school segregation in the form of tracking was a means to sell school desegregation to white parents who had political influence. Mickelson concludes that few black students in this district renowned for its integration efforts ever actually experienced true desegregation, and urges integrating schools to resist the pressures toward second-generation re-segregation in the form of tracking.

But what about integrating schools that already sort students by academic achievement? Detracking, involving the elimination of the lowest academic track or the elimination of ability grouping altogether, emerges as an obvious way to prevent the perpetuation of racial and class disparities in desegregated schools. Indeed, many researchers who have studied tracking recommend its elimination. The National Research Council, for example, has found that tracking harms students placed in lower tracks rather than providing remediation,⁷² while a meta-analysis of over 300 studies on tracking found that even high-achieving students fail to benefit from tracking.⁷³ Although other studies have found mixed results on how tracking affects high

⁷² Heubert, J.P. & Hauser, R.M. (1999). High stakes: Testing for tracking, promotion, and graduation. (see footnote 69)

⁷³ Hattie, J. (2009). Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement. New York: Routledge.

achievers,⁷⁴ the National Education Policy Center, has emphasized that “research overwhelmingly counsels an end to tracking,”⁷⁵ and along with the Institute of Medicine, urges schools to use alternative strategies to provide instruction to students of varying ability levels.⁷⁶

Yet the process of detracking is anything but simple. Opposition by teachers who feel unprepared to teach heterogeneous ability groups and by parents of high-achieving students often derails attempts to detrack.⁷⁷ Despite these challenges, some schools that have been able to fully implement heterogeneous ability grouping provide optimistic perspective on the outcomes detracking could produce. In “Classroom Integration and Accelerated Learning through Detracking,”⁷⁸ Carol Burris and Kevin Welner analyze the case of South Side High School, which aimed to increase incoming minority and low-income student achievement by working with the middle school to provide more rigorous instruction to traditionally low-track students. The schools began by first eliminating just the lowest academic track, but they saw their most compelling results when they eliminated all tracks and taught students a rigorous curriculum in heterogeneously grouped classes, accompanied by small-group support classes and after-school tutoring. Between the start of the schools’ detracking process in 1995 and full implementation in 2000, South Side High African American and Latino students’ pass rate on the state exam rose from 42% to 83%, while the state average moved only from 18% to 27%. By 2009, 95% of

⁷⁴ Brewer, D.J., Rees, D.I., & Argys, L.M. (1995). Detracking America’s schools: The reform without cost? *Phi Delta Kappan*, 77: 210-212, 214-215.; Burris, C.C., Heubert, J., & Levin, H. (2004). Math acceleration for all. *Educational Leadership*, 61(5): 68-71.

⁷⁵ Mathis, W.J. (2013). Research overwhelmingly counsels an end to tracking. *National Education Policy Center*. <http://tinyurl.com/qa6cof3>

⁷⁶ National Research Council. (2004). *Engaging schools: Fostering high school students’ motivation to learn*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.

⁷⁷ Oakes, J. (2005). *Keeping track: How schools structure inequality* (2nd ed.). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.; Oakes, J. Wells, A.S., Jones M., & Datnow, S. (1997). Tracking: The social construction of ability, cultural politics and resistance to reform. *Teachers College Record*, 98, 482-510.

⁷⁸ Burris, C.C. & Welner, K.G. (2007). Classroom integration and accelerated learning through detracking. In E. Frankenberg & G. Orfield (Eds.), *Lessons in integration: Realizing the promise of racial diversity in American schools*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press.

minority students at South Side High passed the state exam.⁷⁹ White and Asian students in the detracked classes also outpaced the state growth rate, improving their pass rates from 84% to 97% between 1995 and 2000. In short, South Side High school's detracking process helped close the achievement gap without harming the outcomes of high achievers.⁸⁰

Not all schools that attempt to detrack, however, are able to such positive outcomes. The UChicago Consortium on School Research,⁸¹ for example, found that in urban contexts with less resourced schools, detracking may have negative effects on high-achieving minority students. This is thought to occur due to many urban schools' lack of the types of resources vital to successful detracking implementation, including teacher professional development on teaching multiple ability levels and heightened supports for low-achieving students. In turn, detracking at these schools often results in heterogeneously-grouped classes that are of lower quality than the former high-achieving tracks. Thus, data from the Consortium speak to the importance of careful implementation of the detracking process with high levels of support.

Schools can take several measures to ensure detracking runs smoothly and produces positive outcomes for all students. Factors considered essential to detracking's success include stable school leadership committed to the process, professional development and support for teachers as they adjust to heterogeneous ability groups, the elimination of just the lowest track before gradually eliminating tracks altogether, extra supports for low-achieving students, and active listening and responsiveness toward parental concerns.⁸² Crucially, infrastructure to

⁷⁹ Burris, C.C., Welner, K.G., & Bezosa, J. (2009). Universal access to quality education: Research and recommendations for the elimination of curricular stratification. *National Education Policy Center*, <http://nepc.colorado.edu/publication/universal-access>

⁸⁰ Burris, C.C. & Welner, K.G. (2007). Classroom integration and accelerated learning through detracking. (see footnote 81)

⁸² Burris, C.C. & Welner, K.G. (2007). Classroom integration and accelerated learning through detracking. (see footnote 81)

maintain these supports must remain in place long-term, allowing schools to adjust to their unique new situations in a process that may take several years.⁸³ Through these efforts, schools can both demonstrate a commitment to equity and improve student outcomes.

Conclusion: Desegregation in a Contentious Political Climate

If serious attention is paid to the prevention of race- and class-based tracking, with schools putting into place extra supports for struggling students and careful professional development designed to prepare teachers to work with a new, more diverse student population, then projects that integrate advantaged and disadvantaged student populations have high potential to close the racial and socioeconomic achievement gap. In fact, according to Richard Kahlenberg, the only other school reform that has as large a return to investment as integration is high-quality early childhood education.⁸⁴ Yet, as history has repeatedly shown, integration is also one of the most hotly contested reforms, often provoking severe political backlash in the communities where it is proposed. During the era of court-mandated desegregation the 1960s through the 1980s, the overt hostility and aggression by white families and political elites made many black families question whether integration was worth the pain they experienced.⁸⁵ And today, though less overt, the opposition towards desegregation is still politically powerful and often quite vitriolic. For example, the Wake County school system's socioeconomic integration plan, despite its many successes, has spent years at the center of fierce political debate. When a group of conservatives who fiercely opposed the integration project were backed by the Tea Party and the Koch Brothers in 2009, they overtook the school board and promptly dismantled the desegregation plan. Although support from the NAACP and Arne Duncan and publicity from

⁸³ Orfield, G. (1975). How to make desegregation work: The adaptation of schools to their newly-integrated student bodies. *Law and Contemporary Problems*, 39(2): 314-340.

⁸⁴ Kahlenberg, R.D. (2012-2013). From all walks of life: New hope for school integration. (see note 35)

⁸⁵ Cecelski, D.S. (1994). *Along Freedom Road: Hyde County, North Carolina and the fate of Black schools in the South*. The University of North Carolina Press.

the *Washington Post* and *Colbert Report* eventually turned public favor away from the new school board and led to their replacement with pro-desegregation members,⁸⁶ the district still has not fully returned to its previous levels of socioeconomic equity.⁸⁷ To avoid this fate, desegregating schools must maintain lines of communication between advocates, community groups, parent groups, and district officials in order to deliver a strong message about the benefits of their plan.⁸⁸ Decades of research have shown that students at racially isolated schools with high concentrations of poverty have poor academic and long-term life outcomes, while racial and socioeconomic desegregation has the potential to mitigate these disparities. Desegregation may also benefit middle class and white children, whose thinking is enhanced through engagement with viewpoints different from their own, and who will display fewer implicit biases and the suboptimal performance such biases entail. Further, through positive experiences with inter-race and inter-class groups, children will be more prepared for and comfortable with the diversity inherent in the 21st century global marketplace. However, for lasting success, integrating schools need long-term plans for teacher development and supports for struggling students, guided by stable and committed school leadership.

As this review has shown, the conclusion that separate is not equal rings just as true today as it did 62 years ago during *Brown v. Board of Education*. Unfortunately, as the Ogden International and Jenner Academy for the Arts currently stand, the stark contrast between these two schools represents the continued socioeconomic and, to some extent, racial segregation that belies the American public school system's supposed commitment to equal opportunity. Yet the advocates for a merger of these two schools provide hope that equity is within reach. By ending

⁸⁶ Kahlenberg, R.D. (2012-2013). From all walks of life: New hope for school integration. (see note 35)

⁸⁷ News & Observer Editorial Board. (2015). In Wake County, a school crisis and a choice about our direction. *The News & Observer*, <http://www.newsobserver.com/opinion/editorials/article31823946.html>

⁸⁸ Kahlenberg, R.D. (2012-2013). From all walks of life: New hope for school integration. (see note 35)

the isolation of the most vulnerable students from those who are most advantaged, Ogden and Jenner can potentially augment the academic achievement of low-income minority students and enhance the educational experience of middle- to upper-income and white students, while serving as a role model for other schools across the country.