The Forgotten Choice?

Rethinking Magnet Schools in a Changing Landscape

A Report to Magnet Schools of America

Erica Frankenberg & Genevieve Siegel-Hawley

Foreword by Gary Orfield

November 2008

The Civil Rights Project

Proyecto Derechos Civiles

Acknowledgments

This report stems from the analysis of a survey distributed at the spring 2008 annual meeting of the Magnet Schools of America (MSA), and we are grateful to the organization for both distributing the survey and giving us the opportunity to analyze these data. We also appreciate the time and insight provided by each of the respondents who completed the survey instrument. While we appreciate their collaboration, the analysis was conducted separately of MSA and they did not influence the conclusions we reached. The Magnet Schools of America has as its mission to "promote equity, diversity, and academic excellence." We hope that this report will help them to continue to assist magnet schools in achieving all of these important goals.

The authors would like to thank several staff members at the Civil Rights Project. Ana K. Soltero Lopez and Daniel Hagos contributed to the initial data organization and entry, providing important groundwork for the development of this study. We thank Thomas Kissling for his proof-reading and Chris Calvert for the report's layout. In addition, the report would not have been possible without the assistance of Jared Sanchez, who spent many hours assembling, entering and organizing data, along with editing and proofreading various versions of the document. We want to particularly thank Chungmei Lee for her assistance with the analysis of the NCES data and Laurie Russman for her hard work and concerted efforts, all of which helped move this project forward. We are also appreciative of Patricia Gándara's feedback.

Finally, we would like to recognize the invaluable insight and wisdom of Gary Orfield; this research would not have been possible without his guidance.

Foreword

There has been intense discussion of choice in American schools for decades. In this year's presidential campaign, the candidates of both major parties promised to increase support for one form of choice—charter schools. Yet, almost nothing was said about a system of magnet schools that enrolls more than twice as many students in "schools of choice," a policy that has produced many extremely popular and successful schools. Further, these magnet schools were designed to break down racial barriers and foster the voluntary commitment of students, parents and teachers to integrated schools offering special educational opportunities that, by their nature, could not be offered in comprehensive neighborhood schools.

The magnet school system flourished in the l970s and l980s and then lost public attention as the courts began to dismantle desegregation plans. Funds were then pumped into the expansion of charter schools, which are similar in some very important ways but differ in others. Though the story of magnet schools is a complex one, I believe that it has many positive lessons that deserve attention in the development of new federal policies, particularly as it offers important implications for future policies about charters, the new pilot schools, and other choice mechanisms. Magnet schools themselves also deserve increased support.

Large-scale choice first became part of American education when schools in the South adopted "freedom of choice" plans in the early l960s, hoping to avoid mandatory desegregation. Those plans left the system of segregation so intact that the Supreme Court later held they were inadequate in remedying illegal segregation.[1] After urban school districts were required to desegregate in the l970s, pioneering educators in Milwaukee, Cincinnati, Buffalo, and other communities invented ways to create educationally distinctive schools that worked to produce significant desegregation. This approach, supported by both liberals and conservatives, received substantial funding to expand similar models. Importantly, it showed positive impacts on support for public schools, while at the same time increasing desegregation through choice, important new educational options for families, and academic gains. Senator John Glenn sponsored new federal legislation in 1976 to grant funds to create more magnet schools, which passed with widespread support.[2] The federal Magnet School Assistance Program was very popular with school districts across the country, even with its requirements for desegregation policies. At their best, magnet schools offered special curricular offerings along with the following: integrated staffs of teachers drawn by interest, strengthened by training and curricular materials; very good parent information; free transportation to interested students; desegregation standards for student body composition; outreach to eligible students; and selection methods that relied on student interest rather than screening tests. Magnet schools provided choice with the three essential civil rights policies -- information, open access, and desegregation standards -- along with truly distinctive educational offerings. Some of these schools became extraordinarily popular.

Magnet schools deserve attention now especially since many are changing and sometimes moving away from their founding principles as a result of recent policy shifts and the Supreme Court's 2007 decision that limited the tools for voluntary integration.

---

[1] *Green v. County School Board of New Kent County,* 391 U.S. 430 (1968).
[2] Congressional Record, Aug. 27, 1976.

Both authors of this study, which analyzes a recent survey of several hundred teachers and administrators affiliated with magnet schools across the country, are among the millions of alumni of magnet schools. Erica Frankenberg attended a magnet middle school, begun in the late 1980s as part of a settlement to a long-running desegregation case in Mobile, Alabama, while Genevieve Siegel-Hawley attended an inter-district magnet high school in Richmond, Virginia. Each of these schools was explicitly focused on creating opportunities for racially diverse schooling experiences, which was also paired with a college-preparatory curriculum.

Mobile's Phillips Preparatory offered free transportation, did outreach to communities about magnet school options, selected students to roughly approximate the surrounding district or region's racial composition, and hired a racially diverse faculty and administration. It has also consistently maintained a racially-balanced school even as the district has been declared unitary (in 1997) and has transitioned to a majority black and majority low-income district.

In the metropolitan Richmond area, the Maggie Walker Governor's School for Government and International Studies provides students and families with a unique opportunity to attend a highly touted academic program, enrolling students from eleven different cities and counties in the region. The building itself is the site of one of Richmond City's historically black high schools, named for a highly successful African American businesswoman. Recently, the increasingly competitive nature of the admissions process has resulted in a sharp decline in minority student enrollment. Encouragingly, Maggie Walker has retained an educational consulting group to help research and refine its admissions procedures in an effort to more firmly adhere to the school's inclusive vision statement.

Erica and Genevieve write:

> Our experiences and the impact of the magnet schools we attended suggest that magnet schools can offer opportunities for rich educational experiences, both academically and socially, that are unparalleled, preparing us for leading universities and prompting us to become researchers studying issues of racial inequity in American public schools. Much of our understanding and deep commitment to integration comes from being white Southerners in these life-changing schools. In a society where white students are the most isolated, but where students of color will soon make up half of the nation’s enrollment, these increasingly rare integrated experiences are more needed now than ever before, especially as desegregation plans are dissolved.

It has been my great honor to teach students for more than three decades in six of the nation's leading research universities, three great private and three great public institutions. I have had countless students in my classes, read their essays, talked and debated with them about important issues, listened to their insights, and put them to work in classroom and professional research projects trying to understand important social and educational issues. Many of my best students attended magnet schools which have given them positive interracial contacts and experiences and have sharpened their perception, given them talents for effectively crossing lines of social division, and provided a rich preparation for living, working, and contributing to an extremely diverse society.

I have also seen the impact of magnet schools in my own family. Two of my daughters were part of a voluntary busing program to the Booker T. Washington magnet school in Champaign,

Illinois. The school, located in an African American community in a downstate Illinois university city, had excellent teachers and a strong principal, Hester Suggs. The magnet school provided them and our family with very positive experiences in a school that was warmly multicultural.

We are now at a stage where, for decades, the country has done almost nothing positive to produce successful interracial schooling and communities. During this time, all three branches of government have cut back the limited but important tools that existed before the Reagan era began dismantling the civil rights revolution. We should look carefully at the experience of magnet schools in creating mutually beneficial and widely accepted ways of pursuing both integration and educational choice. If we could reinforce the civil rights policies in these institutions and apply them more broadly to other systems of school choice, we could begin to reverse the trend of deepening re-segregation of American society.

Gary Orfield

Executive Summary

Magnet schools are the largest set of choice-based schools in the nation and today enroll twice as many students as the rapidly growing charter school sector. The intent of magnet schools was to use incentives rather than coercion to create desegregation. Magnet schools, then, represent a compromise between individualism (choosing one's school) and achieving community goals (diversity). Magnet schools were originally designed to incorporate strong civil rights protections (such as good parent information/outreach, explicit desegregation goals, and free transportation) and most were designed not to have selective admissions processes. This differs from more recent schools of choice that have been designed without these mechanisms. Today, in the aftermath of federal court decisions limiting race-conscious efforts by school districts, magnets comprise a diverse set of schools serving a variety of functions. Many have lost their desegregation mechanisms, which, as we will show, have made a difference in their racial diversity.

Magnet schools have been historically an important part of school districts' efforts to create desegregated, high-quality educational options for students. As the Supreme Court began limiting the extent of desegregation remedies in the 1970s, a subsequent growth in magnet schools occurred. The federal government began to provide funding for the establishment of new magnet programs, a policy that combined desegregation, innovation, and parental choice. In an era of exploding educational choice options – rapidly accelerated by the popularity of charter schools – with growing racial diversity among the under-18 population, it is worth revisiting magnet schools' efforts at integration.

This report compares the characteristics of students in magnet and charter schools, as well as exploring whether and how magnet schools may be affected by the presence of nearby charter schools. Charters have become a central focus of school choice proponents, which is highlighted by their inclusion in the education platforms of both presidential candidates during the 2008 election. President-elect Obama has suggested doubling the annual federal funding for charter schools, to $400 million annually (Hoff, 2008). As a result of these and other pressures, attention has been siphoned away from magnet schools. It is important to understand the differences between the two types of schools in an effort to grasp some of the potential effects of policy emphasis on charters.

Magnet schools were located in 31 states in 2005-06, the latest year for which there is available data, and enroll more students (just over 2 million) than charter schools. Magnets are more likely to be located in central cities than charters; both types are more likely to be in cities when compared to the location of other traditional public schools. Data indicate that the charter school population is more affluent than the magnet school population, as well as the student population in all public schools. Charters also contain a higher percentage of white students than magnet schools, while there is higher segregation of black students—and isolation of white students—in charter schools than magnet schools. Latinos are more segregated in magnet schools, which may be due to the high enrollment of Latino students in magnet schools in the western U.S. In short, in comparison to magnet schools, many charters today are enrolling a disproportionately affluent and white student population. These data suggest that it is important to consider the experiences of magnet schools alongside those of charter schools as educational choice grows.

This report is an analysis of responses to a survey of public school employees, ranging from teachers to superintendents, associated with magnet schools. The survey was administered with the cooperation of the Magnet Schools of America at its spring 2008 conference. These data have been independently analyzed by the Civil Rights Project staff. We describe a few key findings below.

The mission of magnet schools has shifted considerably from its historical focus on racial desegregation, perhaps due to realities facing magnet schools such as stagnant funding for magnet schools and a move away from focusing on race-conscious desegregation efforts in federal policy and judicial decision-making. Only one-third of schools in this sample still have desegregation goals while nearly as many schools no longer or never had desegregation goals.

The conditions under which magnet schools are structured have important implications for levels of diversity. For example, schools with desegregation goals were more likely to be substantially integrated or experiencing increasing integration. By contrast, the highest percentages of one-race schools were those that had never had any desegregation goals. Additionally, whole school magnets as compared to school-within-a-school magnets were more likely to be diverse. Competitive admissions criteria, such as using GPA or test scores as part of the admissions process, are frequently used by magnet schools and, among this sample, were used more often by a larger number of segregated schools. Most schools have at least one type of special outreach to attract students and families from racially diverse backgrounds. Schools that outreach to prospective students were more likely to have experienced increasing integration over the last decade, while one-quarter of those without special outreach were one-race schools.

Teacher training in the form of orientation, professional development and mentoring, to name a few practices, can be an important element in the preparation of teachers for racially diverse classrooms. More than one-third of all schools in this sample do not offer any kind of teacher training about creating successful race relations. Similar to other literature on teacher mobility, perceptions of teacher turnover culled from this survey were lower in magnet schools that were integrated or increasingly integrated.

Transportation has been an important provision of magnet schools, specifically to ensure that everyone who chooses what might be out-of-neighborhood schools is able to attend. We find that most schools in this sample do provide free transportation, and that such schools are less likely to be racially isolated.

We also find that demand for slots in magnets schools is more likely to increase among all groups of parents if the magnets have some desegregation goals and also specific outreach to prospective students. By contrast, higher percentages of schools without any outreach reported that this demand only increased among some types of parental groups, and that demand had declined overall in the last decade.

Magnet schools located in districts with nearby charter schools were more likely to report decreasing levels of integration than districts without charter school alternatives.

Taken together, this report suggests that conditions in magnet schools are indeed changing, thus deserving close attention in the aftermath of the Supreme Court's *PICS* decision to limit the use of race in student assignment plans. We conclude with a series of recommendations as to how we can learn from and improve upon the experience of magnet schools to continue to offer unique, high-quality diverse educational options to current and future generations of students.

The Forgotten Choice? Rethinking Magnet Schools in a Changing Landscape

Magnet schools play an historic and central role in desegregation as well as in the growth of public school choice. In an era of prolific educational options for parents, including charter, private and alternative schools, magnets stand out as the only form of choice created for the purpose of racially integrating schools. Understanding the trajectory of magnet schools - in terms of their growth, development and adherence to the core mission of desegregation - offers important lessons for advocates of public school integration in the 21st century. Moreover, grasping the implications of a shift away from the original goal of desegregation for magnet schools (Goldring and Smrekar, 2000; Steele and Eaton, 1996) becomes increasingly urgent as current political and legal circumstances offer uncertain terrain for sustaining, much less increasing, racially diverse learning opportunities. This report examines on-the-ground desegregation conditions in magnet schools in the aftermath of the Supreme Court's restrictions on using race in student assignment policies.

The reverberations from the June 2007 Supreme Court decision in *Parents Involved in Community Schools v Seattle School District (PICS)* continue to echo through the magnet school community, as well as among other educational groups. In a divided ruling, the Court reaffirmed the value of racial diversity in our nation's schools, yet limited the options available to districts interested in ensuring such diversity. Many magnet programs have traditionally relied upon race-conscious measures to promote integrated school environments. While it is too early to be able to assess the full extent of the effects of *PICS* on magnet enrollment policies,[3] we find that many magnet schools in this sample report changing desegregation goals and declining integration levels. These policy shifts have important implications for the success of the magnet concept, which was founded, in part, research findings concluding that racially diverse schools contain academic and social benefits for students (Linn & Welner, 2006; Orfield, Frankenberg & Garces, 2008).

Magnet schools are public schools that emphasize a special curricular or theme focus, traditionally in order to attract white students to schools in minority neighborhoods (Goldring and Smrekar, 2000). Magnet schools tend to be located in large, high poverty urban districts and, sometimes, in high poverty/minority areas within school districts (Levin, 1997; Goldring and Smrekar, 2000). Enrollment at magnet programs is not restricted to existing school attendance zones and (Steele and Levin, 1994). Many magnet programs – particularly at the outset of their establishment – strived to maintain a racially balanced student body (Goldring and Smrekar, 2000). In this fashion, magnets help disrupt patterns of residential segregation that give way to school segregation under neighborhood school policies. Given these structures, magnet programs have historically been a popular way for school districts to comply with desegregation orders. Today parent demand for magnets often exceeds the number of slots available (Blank, Levine and Steele, 1996), and many programs establish methods to deal with over-subscription issues (e.g. lotteries, first come-first serve, or entrance qualifications). The underlying goals of many of

[3] One of the first post-*PICS* challenges was in New York City to the Specialized High School Institute, which helps to prepare low-income and minority students for the admissions test to New York City's specialized high schools, which have extremely competitive admissions processes and have an extremely low percentage of black & Latino students in a district with 71% of such students. The Institute subsequently revised its admission criteria to eliminate consideration of students' race/ethnicity and to consider instead students' socioeconomic status.

these admissions strategies have historically been to ensure a racially diverse student body.

This study helps fill a gap in the literature about magnet schools and whether they contribute to school desegregation given changes in the legal climate and education policy arena (particularly the growth of non-magnet educational choice). What was once a popular policy option for districts interested the expansion of racially inclusive school choice has become a forgotten choice in American educational policy. In the movement away from proactive measures to improve educational equity, have we undermined one of the most popular mechanisms to ensure racially diverse, academically challenging schools? These issues will be further explored in the report.

Research Questions

This paper will assess the current desegregation conditions in magnet schools. In doing so, we answer the following research questions:

1. To what extent have magnet schools and policies been affected by the increasing legal and political constraints of the past fifteen years?
    a) How many magnet schools still operate under desegregation goals, and to what extent are these goals changing?
    b) How do these changes correspond with racial integration levels in magnet schools over the past decade?
2. To what extent do magnet schools employ policies to attract a diverse student body, and how successful are they in terms of parental demand, student diversity, and teacher turnover?
3. How do other educational choice options in the district relate to demand for magnets and their integration levels?

Other research indicates that magnet schools can have a positive impact on academic outcomes for students. This fact, alongside the early desegregation effects of magnet schools, makes a strong case for renewed policy emphasis on magnets as a major type of educational choice. Although magnet schools today comprise a diverse set of schools, the integrative success of magnets should make civil rights considerations an important component of school choice; without them, the opportunity to create and maintain racially diverse learning environments begins to fade. However, this report finds that, among those in our sample, magnet schools can quickly become susceptible to re-segregation if school structures like free transportation, desegregation goals and special outreach are scrapped in favor of less inclusive policies. Not surprisingly, then, our research shows parent demand for slots in magnets schools is more likely to increase among all groups of parents if the magnets have some desegregation goals and specific outreach to prospective students.

The report is organized into five sections. The first reviews the development and growth of magnet schools, their shifting emphasis on desegregation, the academic benefits associated with these programs, and the demographic landscape of school choice today. The second section examines racial integration levels in magnet schools, looking closely at the relationship between integration and a number of factors that might enhance the ability of these schools of choice to

attract and retain a diverse group of students. A third section of the report explores parent demand for magnets, and whether or not it is associated with racial integration levels, free transportation, and outreach. Fourth, charter schools may be a source of competition for magnet schools, and we examine how the presence of charters in a district may relate to parent demand and racial integration in magnet programs. Finally, the report closes with a brief exploration of the understanding of the recent Supreme Court decision and policy recommendations for enhancing the ability of magnet schools to create diverse schools in this new demographic and educational landscape.

Background on Magnet Schools

The development and growth of magnet schools

Although the concept of magnet school choice was put into operation as a desegregation strategy, the relationship between school choice and segregation dates back to the early days of Massive Resistance. School districts across the South sought to avoid compliance with *Brown* by adopting "freedom of choice" plans, which allowed students and families the "freedom" to choose to attend any school. In reality these plans did little to disrupt long-standing patterns of segregation, beyond a few token black students attending what were virtually all-white schools. In fact, the Supreme Court was forced to intervene as evidence mounted against the effectiveness of freedom of choice plans, ruling in 1968 that "rather than further the dismantling of the dual system, the plan has operated to simply burden children and their parents with a responsibility [that should be] placed squarely on the School Board" (see *Green v. County School Board of New Kent County,* 441-2). Parental choice under this framework simply maintained the status quo – perpetuating segregated school systems.

As politicians decried "forced busing" implemented in the early 1970s to meet desegregation requirements, magnet schools rose to prominence as a widely accepted strategy for combining desegregation with parental choice. The early failures of uncontrolled choice did not necessarily discourage conservatives from continuing to push the strategy (Orfield & Eaton, 1996), and as the judicial and political winds shifted, liberals conceded that compromises were in order (Blank et al., 1983; Frankenberg and Le, forthcoming*).*

The 1974 *Milliken* decision released suburban areas surrounding Detroit from bearing responsibility for patterns of metropolitan segregation that characterized Detroit's central city and adjacent suburbs. In essence, the Supreme Court's ruling sealed off the boundaries between many American cities and their suburbs, creating an easy (and nearby) alternative for white parents fleeing desegregation orders in urban centers (Orfield, 1996). In particular, cities in the North and Midwest (e.g. Buffalo and Cincinnati) were being asked to desegregate their schools at a time when urban housing markets were undergoing rapid racial change. These districts faced the challenge of desegregating their schools without further exacerbating white flight fueled by a tempting alternative in close proximity presented by the *Milliken* decision: participate in mandatory school reassignment to further an urban desegregation plan, or move to nearby suburbs that were almost all-white. As a result, urban districts began to offer magnet schools as a high-quality educational alternative - providing incentives for whites to remain in city systems, while, at the same time, allowing the districts to meet their desegregation requirements (Frankenberg and Le, forthcoming). Thus, many districts outside the South (where countywide

school districts existed that limited the effect of *Milliken*, along with more widespread desegregation already in place) witnessed a growth of magnet schools in the mid-1970s.

In addition to the effects of the *Milliken* decision, there was also growing political resistance to far-reaching desegregation strategies. Following the implementation of several extensive desegregation court-ordered remedies, Congress passed the Eagleton-Biden Amendment in late 1977, placing severe restrictions on HEW's[4] ability to prescribe busing as a method to desegregate and comply with Title VI (Raffel, 1998). In sum, the Supreme Court's retreat from authorizing comprehensive city-suburban desegregation and the growing number of politicians who were intent on deriding the use of "forced busing" prompted liberal factions to support magnets as one of the few remaining desegregation strategies that appeared politically viable. Many conservatives touted the virtues of school choice, in part because the market-based implications of offering competitive alternatives to public schools (Chubb and Moe, 1990).

Government support for magnet programs

As the popularity of magnet schools grew in the wake of the *Swann* decision, which sanctioned cross-district student assignment for the purpose of integration (see *Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg*, 1971), the federal government passed the Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) in 1972 to assist school districts pursuing desegregation. Though the first magnet school opened several years prior to ESAA in Tacoma, Washington (Rossell, 2005), the most significant period of growth occurred after 1975 (Goldring and Smrekar, 2000). Two important events took place during this time period that spurred the magnet movement onward: first, the courts recognized their legitimacy as tools for desegregation (see Morgan v. Kerrigan, 1975); and second, in 1976 Congress amended ESAA by initiating a federal grant program for school districts interested in opening magnet programs to aid in furthering desegregation goals (Orfield, 1978). Magnet programs garnered a large share of ESAA funding through the 1970s until Reagan cut funding for desegregation in his first year in office (Orfield, 2007). Funding was partially reinstated by the passage of the Magnet Schools Assistance Program (MSAP) in the mid-1980s, with bipartisan support from Senators Daniel Patrick Moynihan and Orrin Hatch (Clinchy, 1993).

Thus, the limitations on federal efforts to support busing to further school desegregation were coupled with the new MSAP support for magnet schools. As a combination of a number of factors, then, magnet schools in districts multiplied – so much so that between 1985 and 1993, MSAP awarded grants to 117 school districts nationwide (Steele & Eaton, 1996).[5] The U.S. Department of Education estimates that over half of all large urban school systems used magnets as a tool for desegregation (Goldring & Smrekar, 2000).

The shifting purpose of magnet schools

Increased accountability and high stakes testing, the rising popularity of school choice, and the retreat from desegregation make today's educational landscape vastly different from the one in which magnet schools originated. Perhaps it is not surprising then that many magnets report a shift away from the original purpose of desegregation.

[4] The Department of Health, Education, & Welfare (HEW) was the federal agency overseeing education until the Department of Education was formed.

[5] By comparison, only 14 school districts applied for MSAP grants in 1976, the first year they were available (Blank et al., 1983).

The Department of Education has conducted three broad reviews of magnet programs established with the help of ESAA funding or MSAP grants (importantly, this is only a subset of all magnet schools that exist—magnet schools were only funded in 41 districts for the 2007-2010 MSAP funding cycle). The 1983 report found that over 60% of magnets studied were "fully desegregated," with the remainder still reporting substantial racial/ethnic diversity (Blank et al., 1983). The next evaluation, published in 1996, found less encouraging results: only 42% of new magnet programs were operating under obvious desegregation guidelines (Steele & Eaton, 1996). And finally, the latest magnet study issued by the Department of Education in 2003 found that 57% of newly founded magnet programs were making progress in combating racial isolation, while another 43% were experiencing an increase in segregation (Christenson et. al, 2003; Amicus brief of ACLU, 2006).[6] The 2003 study explicitly cited the use of race-neutral admissions criteria as a possible explanation for the fact that over 40% of 1998 MSAP awardees reported rising segregation (Christenson et. al., 2003, p. 77). The first two evaluations of magnet schools examined the extent to which MSAP awardees specifically designated desegregation as a goal of their programs. The third and final Department of Education study did not research desegregation goals, suggesting that priorities – at least at the federal level – may have been shifting. While this does not mean that the magnet programs themselves were no longer establishing desegregation goals, the Department of Education's failure to examine what had been a key focus of the first two reports is indicative of changing values. These Department of Education evaluations reinforce two key points: (1) Magnet programs by no means guarantee an opportunity for integrated schooling, and in fact may provide just the opposite; and (2) many magnets are being established without explicit goals for desegregation.

Further indication of shifting federal priorities came with a series of Supreme Court decisions in the 1990s. These rulings helped solidify the judicial retreat from desegregation begun with the 1974 *Milliken* decision; taken together they lessened the standard necessary for school districts to be judged to have completely eliminated the effects of segregation (Orfield & Eaton, 1996). The third decision, *Missouri v. Jenkins*, is particularly relevant because it focused on the establishment of magnet programs in Kansas City. As part of an effort to ameliorate widespread segregation in the Kansas City metropolitan area, the district court refused to implement a metropolitan city-suburban desegregation plan, ordering instead the creation of inter-district magnet schools. The magnet schools were designed to attract white city and suburban students to largely minority city schools and to improve the educational achievement of students. More than $1.5 billion was spent to upgrade the city schools and to provide unparalleled educational resources for these magnet schools. However, the Supreme Court rejected this remedy, finding no evidence of interdistrict responsibility for Kansas City's segregation and urged the local court to return the district to "local control" (Morantz, 1996). This case further highlights the diminished commitment to desegregation – from multiple branches of government – making the gradual shift in magnet goals becomes easier to comprehend.

Alongside the changing goals of magnet programs, there has also been an increasing emphasis on raising the academic performance of American school children. Constrained by the Supreme Court decisions in the 1990s and today's standards and accountability movement, magnets are now under pressure to perform many other duties beyond desegregation. Indeed, with each

[6] The 2003 report studied MSAP grantees from 1998-2001. While the first two Department of Education studies assessed the effectiveness of magnets in reducing or eliminating minority isolation as it related to the desegregation goals of each program, the 2003 report did not include a direct assessment of desegregation goals.

renewal of MSAP funding, magnet programs were expected to serve as beacons of innovation, reform and/or raised academic standards in addition to the goals of preventing racial isolation (Frankenberg & Le, forthcoming). As we will see in the following section, magnet programs have been relatively successful at improved academic outcomes, but the addition of these extra educational goals makes it more difficult to focus on trying to prevent segregation.

Academic benefits of magnet programs

Several studies have pointed to important academic gains for children attending magnet schools. One of the more widely disseminated reports on the educational benefits of magnet programs found evidence to support higher rates of student achievement in magnets than in regular public high schools, private or Catholic schools (Gamoran, 1996). The study also found that magnet students made faster achievement gains in most subjects – with the exception of mathematics – than high school students in other types of schools (Gamoran, 1996). In addition, the first study commissioned by the U.S. Department of Education examined the quality of education in magnets, finding that over 80% of schools surveyed had higher average achievement scores than the district average (Blank et. al, 1983; Blank, 1989). In a follow up summary of the 1983 report, the author highlighted four school districts (Austin, Dallas, San Diego, and Montgomery County, MD) where, after controlling for differences in student backgrounds, magnet programs had positive effects on achievement test scores (Blank, 1989). Research conducted in school districts in the mid 1980s and early 1990s pointed to higher reading scores for students participating in career magnet programs in New York City (Crain, 1992), as well as increased opportunity for closer student-teacher relationships and access to unique curricula (Metz, 1986). Additionally, a comprehensive 1998 study of magnet schools in Jacksonville –Duval County, Florida found that while magnet programs were struggling to effectively desegregate the school system, comparisons of the district's norm-referenced achievement tests yielded evidence of higher achievement for magnet students at all grade levels (Poppell & Hague, 2001). Finally, a 1990 study conducted in metropolitan St. Louis examined student attitudes and achievement for black students participating in St. Louis's city and suburban transfer program. This study compared students who enrolled in neighborhood schools, interdistrict suburban schools, and city magnet schools for grades 4, 6, 8 and 10. With few exceptions, the highest achievement results were found among students in city magnet schools, although some of these results may be due to the fact that students in these schools had higher achievement prior to participation in the program (Lippitz, 1992).

Methodologically, it is hard to assess the "impact" of magnet schools due to issues of self-selection. Do the improved academic outcomes occur because of the magnet school itself or is there unaccounted-for variation in those families who choose magnet schools that explains the academic gains? Magnet schools require a certain level of parental involvement or motivation in order to access information and seek admission to a non-traditional school, but it is difficult to determine how that impacts the academic outcomes of students in magnet programs (compared to regular public schools). In other words, students participating in magnets are more likely to come from backgrounds where parents were more organized and tended to be highly motivated to find high quality educational opportunities for their children, even if they did not necessarily have more financial resources (Wells, 1996, Goldring & Hausman, 1999). These characteristics, in turn, are associated with higher academic achievement (Coleman, 1966).

Nevertheless, some studies, including three outlined above (Blank et al., 1983; Blank, 1989; Crain, 1992), have attempted to account for this selection bias by examining achievement results for "winners" and "losers" in lotteries used to determine magnet school admissions. Studying the achievement patterns of lottery losers – students from families who had information and access to the choice system but who, due to oversubscription and luck of the draw, failed to secure a place at a magnet program –allows the researcher to isolate the effects of magnet schools because the students would have similar family advantages but different schools. Many of these studies, including one focused on school choice in San Diego, still find that magnets are associated with positive academic benefits. The San Diego research found that acceptance to a magnet high school via lottery was associated with positive gains in math achievement two and three years into the program (Betts, 2001).

Further evidence of positive academic gains, even after controlling for selection bias, comes from the experience of students in Connecticut's interdistrict magnet programs. As part of its compliance with a statewide desegregation case, Connecticut has established more than fifty interdistrict magnet schools in metropolitan Hartford, New Haven, and Waterbury, schools that draw students from multiple school districts with the intent of providing racially diverse schools. Through a comparison of magnet lottery "winners" and "losers", a recent analysis of the achievement of students in these interdistrict magnet schools found that magnet and high schools have positive effects on students' reading and math scores (Bifulco, Cobb, & Bell, 2008). Among middle schools, the effects are largest when the magnet school reduces the racial isolation by at least 40 points in comparison to district schools the city students would otherwise be attending. Still, other studies controlling for selection biases have found no significant differences in student achievement between magnet high schools and comprehensive high schools (Jacob, Cullen and Levitt, 2005; Ballou, Goldring, & Liu, 2006).

Most research to date, in sum, suggests that there are important academic benefits for students attending magnet schools. Of course, more research is needed to fully comprehend academic outcomes for magnets (and to understand the non-academic outcomes as well). Particularly since there has been relatively little research focus on magnet schools in recent years –especially in comparison to studies of the academic outcomes of students in charter schools[7]–it is important to carefully investigate the extent to which magnet schools affect the outcomes of students who attend them.

The following section explores the broader landscape of educational choice today. The growth of other choice options has profoundly impacted the development and expansion of magnets, and, as a result, warrants further examination.

School choice today

School choice continues to play an important role in the politics of American education. In an era when charter schools have proliferated as all kinds of educational choice options have grown

[7] A forthcoming report from the Institute on Race & Poverty examines the segregation and academic achievement of students in charter schools in the Twin Cities, where some of the first charter schools were established. This analysis finds growing segregation as some urban charter schools segregate minority students while suburban charters are havens for white students. Additionally, charter schools have poorer academic scores than traditional public schools or Choice is Yours, the Minneapolis-area choice program designed to further desegregation (see Institute on Race & Poverty, forthcoming). By contrast, a new analysis of Chicago and Florida charter schools suggests that attending charter schools improves students' chances of graduating high school and attending college (Booker, Sass, Gill & Zimmer, 2008). These vastly different findings may be partially explained by the very different nature of charter schools as established independently according to each state's charter school legislation.

in prominence and in demand by parents, funding and support for magnet programs has declined (Amicus brief of ACLU, 2006). In fact, the number of magnet schools that receive MSAP funding has declined in recent grant cycles because the overall funding level has remained stagnant and not adjusted for inflation at just over $100 million. Charter schools in most states have few of the racial/ethnic balance requirements that were often included in the design of magnet schools, and a number of studies have suggested that charter schools are, on average, more segregated than public schools (Cooper, et. al., 2000; Frankenberg & Lee, 2003; Garcia, 2007; Institute on Race & Poverty, forthcoming). As the number of charter schools has swelled in recent years, the educational options available to parents have also increased. Nationally, according to NCES data, there are 2,736 magnet schools. Magnet Schools of America's directory of magnet schools, however, lists approximately 4,000 magnet schools.[8] NCES identified nearly 4,000 charter schools. However, there were 1 million more students in magnet schools than in charter schools in 2005-06.

As seen in Table 1, black and Latino students comprise a much larger percentage of magnet and charter school students than they do among all public schools. There are more magnet students than charter students among those of every race except for American Indian students. Yet, less than one-third of all magnet school students are white. There are, in fact, more black students than whites in magnets. Latino students also comprise a large percentage of magnet school students—considerably larger than their share of charter students or among all public school students—but are slightly less than the number of white students.[9]

Table 1: Magnet & Charter School Enrollment in U.S. by Race/Ethnicity, 2005-06[10]

	White	Black	Latino	Asian	American Indian	**Total**
Magnet Schools						
Number	661,267	665,491	610,620	133,146	12,756	2,083,280
Percentage	31.7	31.9	29.3	6.4	0.6	99.9
Charter Schools						
Number	406,000	321,873	223,996	35,871	13,896	1,001,637
Percentage	40.5	32.1	22.4	3.6	1.4	100.0
All Public Schools						
Percentage	57	17	20	5	1	48,635,135

There are also differences between magnet schools and charter schools in terms of the levels of low-income students they enroll. The percentage of low-income students among all public school students have jumped in the last five years, and with it, students of every race have a higher percentage of low-income students in their schools in 2005-06 than in 2000-01 (see Orfield & Lee, 2007). Notably, however, black and Latino students attend schools that, on average, have much higher percentages of low-income students than do students of other races. This trend holds across all types of schools: magnet, charter, or public (see Table 2).[11]

[8] More information is available from MSA website (https://www.magnet.edu/modules/content/index.php?id=106).
[9] There are regional and state comparisons of the racial composition of magnet, charter and all public schools in the Appendix.
[10] The data reported in this section draw upon the magnet school and charter school designations in the NCES Common Core of Data. Since magnet schools vary widely, it is impossible to know how precisely they are identified by states who submit data counts to NCES. A school, for example, that acts as a magnet school, but is not officially labeled as such may not be designated by one state as a magnet but may be by another state. In other states, schools may not be designated as magnet schools at all for data collecting purposes. Approximately ten states do not authorize the establishment of charter schools.
[11] Both magnet and charter schools are forms of public schools.

For students of every racial group, charter schools are a place where they are less exposed to low-income students than among the entire universe of public schools.[12] The opposite is true for magnet schools for virtually every racial/ethnic group. The average Latino student attending a magnet school, for example, is in a school where two out of three students are from low-income families. Charter school Latino students, by contrast, attend programs where just over half of their peers are from low-income backgrounds. This trend is true for students of all races in charter schools in comparison to their same-race magnet school peers.

Table 2: Percent Low-Income in Schools Attended by the Average Student, by Race and Sector

Percent Low-Income	White Student	Black Student	Latino Student	Asian Student	American Indian Student
Charter Schools	22.7	51.9	52.3	35.3	34.9
Magnet Schools	35.7	61.7	67.1	46.2	46.8
All public schools	31	59	59	36	51

Data show that segregation is growing among U.S. public schools (Orfield & Lee, 2007), and this trend is reflected in magnet and charter schools as well (see Tables 3a and 3b). There are slightly higher percentages of charter schools (32% of all charter schools) and charter school students (35% of all charter students) attending 90-100% minority schools in 2005-06 than there are among magnet schools and students (29% of magnet schools and 33% of magnet students). At the same time, there is also a slightly larger percentage of charter school students attending racially isolated white schools (7%) than among magnet school students (5%). The absolute numbers of students in segregated minority or white schools is higher among magnet schools because of the larger number of such students.[13]

Among African Americans, a higher percentage of charter school students (69%) were in schools with 0-10% white students than were magnet school students (47%). The reverse pattern is true for Latino, Asian, and white students, although there were small percentages of white students in 90-100% minority magnet or charter schools. Also of note is the fact that nearly 40% of white students in magnet schools are in predominantly minority schools, which suggests that magnet schools offer opportunities for substantial interracial exposure for these white students.

[12] According to the Center for Education Reform, a school choice advocacy group, half of schools not participating in the National School Lunch Program may not for a number of reasons such as state law, lack of facilities, or lack of people to process related paperwork (http://www.edreform.com/_upload/CER_CharterSchool_FreeLunchFacts.pdf).

[13] See appendix for additional tables examining state-level comparisons of segregation for black & Latino students in magnet, charter, and all public schools.

Table 3a: Percentage of Students in Magnet Schools by School Racial Composition and Student Race/Ethnicity, 2005-06[14]

Percentage of white students in school:	White		Black		Latino		Asian		Am. Indian		Total	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
0-10%	22,222	3.4	314,733	47.3	316,123	51.8	37,715	28.3	3,077	24.1	693,870	33.3
10-50%	232,091	35.1	269,680	40.5	249,810	40.9	68,780	51.7	4,836	37.9	825,197	39.6
50-90%	312,792	47.3	79,322	11.9	42,977	7.0	25,621	19.2	4,114	32.2	464,826	22.3
90-100%	94,162	14.2	1,756	0.3	1,710	0.3	1,030	0.8	729	5.7	99,387	4.8
Total	661,267	100	665,491	100	610,620	100	133,146	100	12,756	100	2,083,280	

Table 3b: Percentage of Students in Charter Schools by School Racial Composition and Student Race/Ethnicity, 2005-06

Percentage of white students in school:	White		Black		Latino		Asian		Am. Indian		Total	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
0-10%	7,793	1.9	222,416	69.1	106,386	47.5	8,821	24.6	4,808	34.6	350,224	35.0
10-50%	65,878	16.2	63,899	19.9	75,018	33.5	12,402	34.6	3,661	26.4	220,858	22.0
50-90%	263,520	64.9	34,165	10.6	41,039	18.3	13,734	38.3	5,033	36.2	357,491	35.7
90-100%	68,809	17.0	1,393	0.4	1,553	0.7	914	2.6	394	2.8	73,063	7.3
Total	406,000	100	321,873	100	223,996	100	35,871	100	13,896	100	1,001,636	100.0

Magnet and charter schools are more likely to be located in central cities than all other public schools (Table 4). In some states, charter schools can only be established in certain urban areas (see Frankenberg & Lee, 2003). Magnet schools are even more likely than charters to be found in large cities. Two thirds of magnet schools are located in urban areas (see Table 4), while only one-tenth of magnet schools operate in small towns or rural areas. By contrast, just over half of all charter schools are found in urban areas, with nearly one fifth of charters located in small town or rural communities. Charters and magnets are found at nearly the same rates in suburban localities – with just over a quarter of both types of schools located in the suburbs—and the percentage of charter schools in rural areas is double that of magnet schools, yet both are considerably lower when compared to all other public schools.

Table 4: Percentage of Students in Public, Charter and Magnet Schools by Locale, 2005-06

	Public[15]		Charter		Magnet	
	Freq.	Percent	Freq.	Percent	Freq.	Percent
Urban	20,903	23.8	1,998	54.2	1,720	63.4
Suburban	29,542	33.7	928	25.2	703	25.9
Large Town	964	1.1	31	0.8	9	0.3
Small Town	7,865	9.0	187	5.1	69	2.5
Rural areas	28,432	32.0	546	14.8	211	7.8

These contemporary numbers, along with the prior history of magnet schools, indicate that, despite a huge investment in the development of charter schools, magnet schools hold continued

[14] Tables 3a and 3b show, reading across the rows, the number and percentage of students of each racial/ethnic group in schools in the four categories of schools, which are defined by the percentage of white students in the left column.
[15] For brevity of terminology, public here refers to all non-charter, non-magnet public schools

significance – in terms of the number of students enrolled, popularity, longstanding and continued federal support, and their historical ability to encourage racial diversity - in the array of educational choices now available (Christenson et al, 2003).

Data and Methods

The data for this paper was obtained through the distribution of a survey instrument containing 19 items covering a range of issues related to racial integration and diversity efforts in magnet schools and programs. Respondents answered questions regarding their understanding of the Supreme Court decision, school and district policy responses to date, the current status of racial outreach and desegregation goals, teacher turnover rates and training practices, and changes in parent demand and racial composition.

The survey was disseminated at the annual Magnet Schools of America (MSA) conference in April 2008 in Chattanooga, Tennessee, attended widely by administrators, teachers and district officials in the magnet community. The MSA conference provided the researchers with a unique opportunity to gather important and relevant information regarding desegregation conditions in the aftermath of *Parents Involved* from a large group of magnet school stakeholders. Though these distribution parameters necessarily precluded a random sample of the magnet community, 236 completed, anonymous surveys were returned to conference organizers, who forwarded them to the research team. More than 1,000 people attended the conference, many of them as teams from districts. In such instances, only one person per district may have completed a survey. Though this final group cannot be considered representative of the extensive, diverse group of magnet schools, it is a sampling of those at this important meeting.

While the sample limits the ability to generalize from our findings, we are able to explore important questions about the ways in which magnet schools are currently operating, an area which has not been the subject of much recent research. Further, these responses do represent the opinion of hundreds of people associated with many magnet schools educating thousands of students across the country. Even with the sample limitations, at the moment there is no other on-the-ground data focusing on integration and experiences in magnet schools post-*Parents Involved*. Thus, cognizant of these shortcomings, we report the trends while recognizing the need for further, more systematic investigation of the current environment in magnet schools.

Respondents had the option of identifying the name of their respective school or district.[16] As a result, the research team was able to match reported racial/ethnic and free and reduced lunch data for a subset of the magnet schools and districts in this sample with the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), Common Core of Data. We merged the dataset from the survey with both 1995-96 and 2005-06 school and district racial and poverty composition. Using data that spanned a decade allowed us to analyze how respondents' views of the racial transition their school was (or was not) experiencing compared to the actual changes in student demographics. With the 2005-06 data, we could also analyze, for example, responses from those who said they were associated with a "one-race" school and from those who, according to the CCD, worked in a school that was 90-100% white or non-white (our definition of "one-race").[17] These data allowed

[16] This was not a required question with the intention that, without reporting this information, respondents might give more candid responses.

[17] The term "one-race" school does not mean to imply intentional discrimination has resulted in these schools being largely of one race but instead refers to the demographic patterns of students. We used the term "one race" here because that was the terminology used on the questionnaire. These

the team to evaluate both respondents' perceived racial/ethnic trends and the actual demographic trends of their schools and districts.

Our analysis uses descriptive statistics[18] to summarize the characteristics of variables, and cross-tabulations and means comparison primarily to describe relationships among different sets of variables.

Sample Characteristics. Among those who reported their district identification, there were respondents from more than 60 districts and from every region across the country. The magnet schools that respondents were associated with combined to educate approximately 400,000 students. The majority of survey respondents were teachers (34.7%), followed by principals and assistant principals (24.2%) and magnet coordinators (15.7%) (see Table 5). The preponderance of teachers and principals in the sample may have provided strong insight into building level magnet school conditions and perhaps a slightly more limited perspective on district policy decisions.

Table 5: Job Responsibility of Respondents

	Frequency	Percent
No Response	15	6.4
Teacher	82	34.7
Principal/Asst. Principal	57	24.2
Superintendent/Asst. Supt.	6	2.5
Administrator	11	4.7
Magnet coordinator	37	15.7
Other non-teaching coordinator	28	11.9
Total	236	100.1

Although there was considerable variation among school and district student composition, respondents' reported, on average, that their magnet schools were comprised of student populations that were 31% white and 63.5% low-income (as measured by free and reduced price lunch status). These numbers closely approximated the actual NCES figures (see Table 6).

On average, respondents described their districts as containing student populations that were 37.1% white and 61.2% low income. While the numbers approximating the percentage of white students were fairly close to NCES figures, respondents tended to overestimate the figures for students qualifying for free and reduced priced lunch at the district level.

schools could be racially isolated minority or racially isolated white schools though it is impossible to determine which of these (rather different) types of schools the respondents intended by the category "one race". .

[18] Descriptive statistics show relationships between different variables, but do not show causation (e.g., that one variable causes certain responses to another question).

Table 6: Student characteristics of respondents' schools and districts

	Self-reported	NCES, 2005-06
Percentage of white students, school	31.0 (N=176)	31.4 (N=109)
Percentage of white students, district	37.1 (N=109)	39.5 (N=152)
Percentage of low-income students, school	63.5 (N=165)	58.8 (N=98)
Percentage of low-income students, district	61.2 (N=91)	52.9 (N=151)

We compared respondents' perceptions of racial integration of their school(s) to both their self-reported estimates of racial and socioeconomic composition and, when possible, to NCES data from their school. We now turn to an analysis of the magnet survey data, starting with an exploration of the current level of racial integration in magnets.

Racial Integration Levels in Magnet Schools

Magnet schools have traditionally been successful in creating diverse student bodies because magnet schools, particularly those that are or were once part of desegregation plans, were designed with certain features to try to attract students of all racial/ethnic backgrounds. These programmatic features include: explicit desegregation goals; school design; certain admissions criteria; free transportation; and outreach to the public. We will examine each one below as they relate to the integration levels of magnet schools in this sample. In subsequent sections, we will examine parental demand and the relationship between magnet schools and other types of school choice, particularly charter schools. First, however, we examine the demographics of magnet schools in this survey.

Demographic Snapshot of Magnet Schools in Sample

In the bulk of this section on integration changes in magnet schools, we analyze responses by answers detailing how integration has changed in their school(s) in the last decade. Is integration increasing, decreasing, or remaining the same? Are the schools stably integrated or largely one-race schools? In this first subsection, we examine how these different categories of integration levels relate to self-reported and U.S. Department of Education data about school composition to get a fuller understanding of how respondents may be viewing these categories. Importantly, these tables include only a subset of responses since not all of the respondents completed the question asking for the racial and socioeconomic composition of their school(s).

In Table 7 below, the category of schools that is notably different are the one-race schools, which combine a very low percentage of white students, on average, with a high percentage of low-income students. One concern about magnet schools has been that they might "cream" more educationally advantaged students from non-magnet schools in the district. Similar to the connection between concentrations of nonwhite students and low-income students in public schools has been found in other research (see Orfield & Lee, 2007, 2005), these figures suggest that among this sample, largely one-race magnet schools are not "creaming" middle-class minority students to any significant extent.

In contrast, magnet schools described as substantially integrated by respondents were schools that had the highest percentage of white students and the lowest percentage of low-income students, on average. In fact, survey respondents labeling their magnet school(s) as substantially integrated

were schools that contained, on average, a white student population comprising roughly 40% of the total enrollment. For comparison, it is worth noting that even among these substantially integrated magnet schools there are a much lower percentage of white students than among all public school students (57% white).

Table 7: Self-reported magnet student characteristics in 2005 by categories of integration change over last decade

Integration Changes		% White	% Black	% Latino	% Asian	% Low-income
Substantially integrated	Mean	38.8	38.3	18.3	4.6	60
	N	60	59	57	52	53
One-race school	Mean	6.8	70.7	21.7	1.4	80.4
	N	16	16	14	14	14
Increasing integration	Mean	31.5	46.4	19.7	3.7	62.4
	N	56	56	55	55	55
Decreasing integration	Mean	25.5	55.1	17.8	7.4	64.5
	N	32	32	31	28	30
Total	**Mean**	**30.6**	**47.6**	**19**	**4.5**	**63.7**
	N	**164**	**163**	**157**	**149**	**152**

When matching the responses regarding the school(s) integration levels with the NCES racial composition figures, substantial declines in the overall percentage of white students attending magnets over the last ten years are evident. Since the 1995-96 school year, the average magnet program considered "substantially integrated" has a ten percentage point decline in its white student population (see Table 8). For schools described by respondents as having increasing integration, the decline is even more rapid: 14.4%. The declines in white percentage among the magnet schools' surrounding districts were larger, on average, except in schools that were characterized as decreasing levels of integration. Thus, respondents' categorization of their own school's diversity may be influenced by the perception of the school in relation to the surrounding district. Nationally, due to demographic changes across the country (see Orfield and Lee, 2007; Frey, 2001), the overall percentage of white students in public schools has decreased by about 6% in the last decade (Frankenberg, 2008). The disproportionately large decline in the percentage of white students at magnet schools suggests that at least some magnet schools among this sample are losing their ability to attract students from all racial/ethnic groups.

Table 8: Change in white percentage from 1995 to 2005, by categorization of school diversity

		Change from 1995-2005 in white percentage	
		School level	District level
Substantially integrated	Mean	-10	-12.2
	N	30	43
One-race school	Mean	-13.7	-16.3
	N	9	11
Increasing integration	Mean	-14.4	-14.5
	N	26	50
Decreasing integration	Mean	-16.1	-13
	N	8	31
Total	Mean	-12.7	-13.6
	N	73	135

Desegregation Goals

The legal, political, and educational landscape has changed dramatically in the four decades in which magnet schools have been in existence. Given that many magnet schools were created as a tool to further desegregation, it is worthwhile to examine how many programs still operate under such goals, as well as how a shift away from desegregation goals may have impacted integration levels.

The Department of Education evaluations – described above in the introduction – are some of the only sources of information regarding the quantity of magnet schools with desegregation goals. The 1996 Department of Education's evaluation of magnet schools receiving MSAP funding identified the extent to which magnet schools had explicit desegregation objectives – which was criteria for being selected for funding – and found that only 37% had explicit desegregation objectives, while another 21% had desegregation goals that could be inferred from program materials. The desegregation objectives included goals of reducing existing minority isolation, reducing projected minority isolation, or eliminating racial isolation. The report does not compare the success of magnet schools with desegregation objectives to those without them. The evaluation found that schools were more successful in making progress towards their objectives rather than actually meeting the specific enrollment targets, the latter of which were often more ambitious. Yet, even among the 58% of schools with desegregation objectives, only two-thirds met their objective by the end of the funding period (Steele & Eaton, 1996). Further, the report found that in districts where magnets were part of a voluntary desegregation plan there was more progress towards meeting desegregation objectives than among mandatory desegregation districts, although these differences were not statistically significant.

Although not specific to magnet schools, the experiences of districts that are no longer operating under desegregation plans also seem useful to consider. These districts, while under a court-ordered desegregation plan, often had explicit desegregation goals that they were required to meet before they could be released from court supervision.[19] Once these districts were declared unitary,

[19] It is likely that some of the magnet schools that are part of this sample originated in districts under such plans.

or had been judged to eliminate prior vestiges of segregation, they were no longer required to take active efforts to maintain desegregated schools. For some districts, desegregation was replaced with other efforts, such as race-neutral goals like socioeconomic integration, and in other instances with goals that de-emphasized racial or socioeconomic concentrations of students altogether. In several prominent districts (i.e., San Francisco, Charlotte) that changed from race-conscious goals, there has been a decline in the integration of students in their schools (Biegel, 2005; Brief of ACLU, 2006; Brief of Swann Fellowship, 2006; Lee, 2006).

Nearly one third of magnet programs in this sample reported that they still had desegregation goals – either under court order, under the Department of Education's Office for Civil Rights (OCR) agreements, or because of local voluntary action. Yet, the combined number of respondents whose magnet schools no longer had desegregation goals or who never had desegregation goals amounted to more than 40% of all responses. Another 12% report that they are in the process of changing or have already changed to race-neutral factors (i.e. poverty status or geography). In sum, results from this sample of magnet schools suggest that considerable changes either have occurred or are occurring in terms of desegregation goals for these programs.

Table 9: Number and Percentage of magnet programs reporting desegregation goals

	Number	Percent
School(s) has desegregation goals – either under court order or voluntary	74	31.5%
School(s) no longer has desegregation goals, but did in the past	61	26.0%
School(s) have such goals but they are in the process of being changed OR have been changed to race-neutral factors	29	12.3%
School(s) never had desegregation goals	40	17.0%
Did Not Reply	31	13.2%
Total	235	100.0%

Given these changing desegregation goals, we next examine how magnet school desegregation goals relate to their level of integration. More than three-quarters of schools with desegregation goals are either substantially integrated under current policy or experiencing a gradual increase in levels of integration, which is considerably higher than among all respondents in this survey. While schools with desegregation goals had the highest share of schools that were also substantially integrated (38.6%), the second-highest category of schools that were integrated were schools without any desegregation goals (see Table 10).

Just over 35% of magnet schools that are in the process of changing goals or have already changed to race-neutral ones report a decrease in integration levels. Yet, an equal percentage report rising integration. These schools also had the lowest percentage considered substantially integrated. This suggests that changing goals may be less compatible with maintaining stable integration, at least among this set of schools, although there is obviously a fair amount of variation among this group. This would be expected depending on what types of goals they were switching to, how long ago these goals were changed, or other factors.

In this sample, ten percent of schools that never had goals report being one-race schools, and approximately seven percent that never had goals or are in the process of changing them are also one-race schools. These figures are considerably higher than those schools that do have

desegregation goals—less than 3% of those are considered to be predominantly of one race. In addition, a disproportionately high percentage, 31%, of schools that no longer have desegregation goals (but did in the past) report a decrease in integration levels.

Table 10: Desegregation goal of schools by changes in integration levels over last decade

		Substantially integrated	Largely one-race school	Increasing Integration	Decreasing Integration	Did Not Reply	Total
School(s) has desegregation goals	Count	29	2	29	12	3	75
	%	38.7	2.7	38.7	16.0	4.0	100.0
School(s) have changing/ race-neutral goals	Count	5	2	11	11	2	31
	%	16.1	6.5	35.5	35.5	6.5	100.0
School(s) dropped desegregation goals	Count	14	4	19	19	5	61
	%	23.0	6.6	31.2	31.2	8.2	100.0
School(s) never had desegregation goals	Count	14	4	11	5	6	40
	%	35.0	10.0	27.5	12.5	15.0	100.0
Did Not Reply	Count	8	5	6	1	9	29
	%	27.6	17.2	20.7	3.5	31.0	100.0
Total	Count	70	17	76	48	25	236
	%	29.7	7.2	32.2	20.3	10.6	100.0

Among this sample of magnet schools we see that a third of schools still maintain desegregation goals while even more-- nearly 40%-- once had desegregation goals but have either abandoned them or have changed them to race-neutral goals. In other words, then, we see a reflection in this sample of the larger federal movement away from focusing on desegregation as a goal of magnet schools. Yet, the above data demonstrate a relationship among schools which have desegregation goals with schools that have experienced substantial or increasing levels of integration.

Type of Magnet

Magnet programs traditionally follow one of two configurations. Some magnets are established as schools unto themselves, and districts tend to allow these programs individual school buildings; for this reason, schools such as these are referred to as "whole school magnets" in our survey. The second type of magnets are those programs placed in a traditional zoned school, where some students apply to attend a magnet program with a special theme, while other students go to the same school for non-themed education. This is referred to here as "school within a school." There is not much prior literature that systematically evaluates whether whole-school magnets differ from "school within a school" magnets in terms of integration. One of the Department of Education evaluations found that magnet schools that were dedicated, whole-school magnets were more likely to meet their desegregation objectives than school within a school magnets, as well as attendance zone magnets (magnet programs serving children in a particular neighborhood) (Steele & Eaton, 1996).[20] Further, there are issues of within-school equity that arise in such programs since minority students may be prevented from enrolling in unique, high

[20] An early evaluation of magnet schools concluded that whether magnets were whole-school or partial magnets did not affect the educational quality of the schools, but this did not address the integration of such schools or whether everyone had access to the quality educational offerings (Blank et al., 1983).

quality magnet options in their own schools while out-of-neighborhood white students are allowed to attend. As a result, even if these schools are diverse at the school building level, racially isolated classrooms remain inside the school (Orfield & Eaton, 1996). For example, classes in the magnet program might be predominantly white while regular classes outside the magnet component are nonwhite—though there may be some elective classes such as band that enroll a more diverse group of students. The following tables examine how these trends and issues apply to magnet programs in our sample.

Whole school magnets, by far, comprise the largest number of schools participating in the study (70.2%).[21] Survey participants from "school within a school" magnets made up 15% of respondents. Finally, the minority of respondents who answered "both" work with both types of magnet schools.

Table 11: Number and Percentage of Magnet Types

Type of Magnet	Number	Percent
Whole School Magnet	165	70.2
School within a School Magnet	36	15.3
Both	29	12.3
Did Not Reply	6	2.6
Total	235	100.0

Two-thirds of whole school magnets (66.1%) reported substantial integration under their current policy or a gradual increase in integration levels. Only half of the "school within a school" magnets were similarly integrated (see Table 12).

Importantly, 16.6% of school within a school magnets report being one-race schools, which suggests that these magnet programs are less effective than whole school magnets, among the magnet schools in this survey, in creating racially diverse schools. Additionally, there are a disproportionately lower percentage of within-school magnets that reported increasing integration during the last decade (only 22%). By contrast, 35% of whole-school magnets reported increasing integration during this time period.

[21] A 1994 Department of Education evaluation estimated that 58% of magnet schools were whole-school magnets and 38% were school-within-a-school (Steel & Levine, 1994).

Table 12: Magnet type by changes in integration levels over the past ten years

		Substantially integrated	Largely one-race school	Increasing Integration	Decreasing Integration	Did Not Reply	Total
Whole School Magnet	Count	51	10	58	30	16	165
	%	30.9	6.1	35.2	18.2	9.7	100.0
School within a school magnet	Count	10	6	8	7	5	36
	%	27.8	16.6	22.2	19.4	13.9	99.9
Both	Count	7	1	9	10	2	29
	%	24.1	3.5	31.0	34.5	6.9	100.0
Did Not Reply	Count	2	0	1	1	2	6
	%	33.3	0	16.6	16.6	33.3	99.8
Total	Count	70	17	76	48	25	236
	%	29.7	7.2	32.2	20.3	10.6	100.0

According to respondents' descriptions of their schools' student racial composition, white students comprise about a third of the average whole school magnet's student body, but only 20% of the average school-within-a-school magnet's students (Table 13). Differences between types of schools in terms of low-income students are much smaller. This further corroborates earlier findings suggesting that many whole school magnets do a better job of racially integrating students.

Table 13: Magnet Type by Self-Reported Student Composition of School

Magnet Type		Self-reported by respondent	
		% school white	% school low-income
Whole school magnet	Mean	33.4	61.9
	N	128	121
School within a school magnet	Mean	19.7	64.5
	N	30	24
Both	Mean	32.9	68.2
	N	14	15
Did Not Reply	Mean	33.3	81.3
	N	3	4
Total	Mean	31.0	63.5
	N	176	165

Thus, while there may be classes that are diverse—not to mention other enriched educational options these schools may offer some students— school-within-a-school magnets are less effective at creating integration among schools in this sample.

Admissions Criteria

Early desegregation plans (e.g., court-ordered or HEW/OCR agreements) specified that student assignment for schools, including magnet schools, should be on the basis of interest, not ability. Although originally most magnet programs did not have admissions criteria, today magnet schools may have a variety of factors they consider in selecting students for enrollment,

particularly if demand exceeds the number of available seats. Some factors, such as preference for siblings that are current students or the consideration of geographic proximity, may be used by other district schools. Other factors may be unique to magnet schools and may relate to a magnet's particular theme, such as auditions for a performing arts magnet school. An earlier estimate suggested that one-third of magnet schools used selective criteria for admissions (Smrekar & Goldring, 1999).

Specialty schools that use selective or competitive admissions criteria - such as grade point averages, test scores, or essays – arose separately from and prior to modern magnet programs (Dentler, 1991). There are a small number of specialty schools that have existed for a very long time, schools that are nationally prominent and were intentionally elite public schools. For an example of two such schools, we briefly focus on Boston Latin School in Massachusetts and Lowell High School in San Francisco, two of the oldest and most prestigious public schools in the country (Ming, 2002; Dentler, 1991). Under Boston's court-ordered desegregation plan and San Francisco's desegregation consent decree, the two schools' admissions criteria were changed to comply with desegregation efforts. In the late 1990s, however, the admissions processes of both exam schools, each of which were aligned with diversity goals, were challenged.[22] The resulting judicial decisions, along with others, struck down the use of racial/ethnic preferences in a competitive admissions process in K-12 schools,[23] heralding a new era for exam schools.

Boston Latin School and Lowell High School have experienced significant resegregation since the courts issued their 1999 decisions. In 1995, prior to the litigation, Boston Latin boasted a racially diverse student population, with white students making up just over half of the student body (Table 14). Black and Hispanic students combined to comprise over a third of students attending Boston Latin, with Asians accounting for the remaining share (roughly 17%). Ten years later, and six years after the court's ruling removing racial/ethnic goals from admissions' consideration, Boston Latin reported a significant decline in the enrollment of black and Hispanic students (Table 14). Combined, black and Latino students accounted for one out of three students in 1995 at Boston Latin, but only one out of six students in 2005. The figures for San Francisco's Lowell High School are less dramatic, though they still portray a decline in racial diversity after 1995. In particular, the percentage of black and Hispanic students fell, with black students making up just under 3% of the student body in 2005 (Table 14).

Table 14: School enrollment by race/ethnicity at Boston Latin & Lowell, 1995 and 2005

	Asian (%)	Latino (%)	Black (%)	White (%)
Boston Latin School				
1995	16.9	11.0	21.6	50.4
2005	28.9	6.8	9.6	54.5
Lowell High School				
1995	68.1	9.7	4.6	17.5
2005	74.9	6.1	3.0	15.9

[22] *Wessman v. Gittens* (1999) was a decision by the First Circuit Court that determined the Boston Latin School's quota system for setting aside seats for under-represented minority groups was illegal. Boston, however, had been declared unitary in 1987, and in 1990 federal court oversight was entirely removed. In *Brian Ho v. SFUSD* (1999), the district court ordered San Francisco Unified School District to remove race as a factor in the student assignment system. The court's decision stemmed from a complaint filed by a group of Chinese American parents concerned about race-conscious admissions policies at Lowell High School.

[23] *Eisenberg v. Montgomery County Public Schools* (1999) & *Tuttle v. Arlington County School Board* (1999) were decisions by the Fourth Circuit that invalidated the use of race-conscious criteria by school districts for alternative schools and approving student transfers. For further discussion see Ma & Kurlaender, 2005.

These percentages are particularly striking considering the fact that, in 2005-06, three-fourths of Boston Public School district students are black or Latino, along with 37% of San Francisco Unified students. Although it is impossible to know what would have happened to these numbers had the decisions not occurred during this time period, the decline in underrepresented minority groups at specialty high schools with competitive admissions criteria and no racial/ethnic guidelines is an example of how such criteria may limit the racial diversity of such schools.

We examine among magnet schools in this sample whether there is a relationship between integration levels and the use of selected types of competitive admissions criteria by magnet schools.[24] Today, competitive admissions criteria are often used by magnet schools. However, recipients of MSAP funding are not allowed to use any such criteria. They can, however, use lotteries to allocate seats in cases in which student demand exceeds capacity.

The five types of criteria we look at and their frequency of use among respondents' schools in this sample are:

- Test scores, 16.1%;
- Essays, 8.1%;
- Grade Point Average (GPA), 10.6%;
- Interviews, 11.9%; and
- Auditions, 12.3%.

For comparison, we also look at magnet schools with open enrollment policies, which account for 27% of respondents, and those using a lottery system, 63% of respondents. It is important to note that these criteria are not mutually exclusive. In fact, it is quite likely that schools may use the lottery system in combination with another factor.

Among the magnet schools respondents to this survey were affiliated with, higher percentages of schools using essays and interviews as part of their admissions criteria reported that they were substantially integrated or had increasing integration during the last decade. None of the schools using essays as part of their magnet admissions process reported being a largely one-race school, while almost three-quarters of these schools were substantially integrated or had experienced increasing levels of integration in the last decade. Similarly, nearly half of magnet schools using interviews as a factor guiding student admissions reported increased integration over the last decade—the highest percentage among all types of admissions criteria—while only 14.8% of these schools reported a gradual decrease in integration levels (see Table 15).

By contrast, magnet schools using test scores and/or auditions as factors in determining admission report lower levels of integration. More than one-tenth of respondents affiliated with magnet schools using test scores or auditions report that their schools are largely one-race. In addition, just over half of the schools using such admissions criteria reported that their schools were either substantially integrated or increasingly integrated, which is considerably lower than the 74% of schools using essays. Further, schools using GPA as an admissions factor were the highest share of schools that were experiencing decreasing integration (24%).

[24] Respondents were allowed to select as many criteria as they wanted, because many schools use more than one factor for admissions.

For further comparison, we also looked at the reported integration levels for schools that had non-competitive admissions criteria, using either a lottery (in cases where there is more demand than available seats) or open enrollment. Many of these patterns support the conclusion that non-competitive admissions schools are more integrated. For example, fewer schools using a lottery were one-race than virtually every type of competitive admissions criteria used by magnet schools. Open enrollment magnets in this sample have the highest percentage of schools described as substantially integrated and one of the lowest percentages of schools that have decreasing levels of integration.

Table 15: Magnet schools using competitive & noncompetitive admissions criteria by integration changes over the 10 years

		Substantially integrated	Largely one-race school	Increasing Integration	Decreasing Integration	Did Not Reply	Total
Test Scores	Count	9	4	13	8	4	38
	%	23.7	10.5	34.2	21.1	10.5	100.0
Essays	Count	6	0	8	4	1	19
	%	31.5	0	42.1	21.1	5.3	100.0
GPA	Count	7	2	10	6	0	25
	%	28.0	8.0	40.0	24.0	0	100.0
Interviews	Count	6	2	13	4	3	28
	%	21.4	7.1	46.4	14.3	10.7	99.9
Auditions	Count	8	4	8	6	3	29
	%	27.6	13.8	27.6	20.6	10.3	99.9
Open Enrollment	Count	21	6	21	10	6	64
	%	32.8	9.4	32.8	15.6	9.4	100.0
Lottery	Count	41	6	53	33	15	148
	%	27.7	4.1	35.8	22.3	10.1	100.0
Total, All Schools	Count	70	17	76	48	23	236
	%	29.7	7.2	32.2	20.3	9.7	100.1

We should be careful in interpreting these results, as they represent small numbers of responses. Yet, these trends point to an uneven landscape of integration opportunities for magnet schools using competitive admissions criteria. Higher percentages of schools using interviews and essays as part of their admissions process have greater racial integration than those schools using test scores or GPA. Further, schools in this sample using non-competitive admissions—open enrollment and lottery—were somewhat more likely to be integrated and less likely to be one-race schools or experiencing decreasing integration.

Outreach

Although there are limits placed on magnet schools (and, indeed, most public schools) in *Parents Involved*, racially targeted outreach is explicitly recognized by Justice Kennedy's controlling opinion as a legal mechanism to enhance the racial diversity of all schools. Outreach to families and communities is an important component in providing all children equal access to magnet school opportunities (Wells & Crain, 1997; Fuller, Elmore & Orfield, 1996). Students cannot be selected for magnet schools if they do not know about them and submit applications by the relevant deadline. In addition, since information about schools is often passed through networks among parents (Holme, 2002), outreach to different sectors of the community can help ensure that a broad range of students know about the different magnet school opportunities a district

may offer. Outreach may take the form of information sessions or fairs at different locations in the community, a parent information center (Cookson, 1994; Glenn et al., 1993), dedicated district employees for outreach, or publications promoting awareness about the school. This section examines how outreach relates to parent demand for magnet programs in this sample, as well as the potential relationship between integration levels and the presence of outreach.

The vast majority of respondents in this sample reported that their schools had some type of outreach, leaving a small number of schools without any outreach activities. Special outreach to attract students to magnet schools was associated with more extensive integration levels among the magnet school respondents participating in this study. In particular, over 65% of schools with outreach described their programs as substantially integrated or experiencing increasing integration, by far the largest share of schools in that category (Table 16). By contrast, one quarter of schools without some form of special outreach were considered largely one-race schools, which was much higher than the share of one-race schools (5%) that did outreach to attract students.

Outreach efforts might be in place in schools as a result of two contrasting trends. For example, we see that over one-fifth of schools with special outreach report decreasing integration. On the other hand, a small fraction of schools without some form of special outreach reported an increase in integration levels and forty percent of schools without outreach efforts describe their program as substantially integrated under current policy. These trends may be due to complacency with their present levels of integration, reducing the urgency of conducting special outreach.

Table 16: Schools reporting special outreach to attract students to magnet program(s) from other racial/ethnic groups by changes in integration levels over the past 10 years

		School is substantially integrated under current policy	Largely one-race school	Increasing Integration	Decreasing Integration	Did Not Reply	Total
School(s) has some form of special outreach	Count	61	11	74	46	17	209
	%	29.2	5.3	35.4	22.0	8.1	100.0
School(s) does not have some form of special outreach	Count	8	5	1	1	5	20
	%	40.0	25.0	5.0	5.0	25.0	100.0
Did Not Reply	Count	1	1	1	1	3	7
	%	14.3	14.3	14.3	14.3	42.9	100.1
Total	Count	70	17	76	48	25	236
	%	29.7	7.2	32.2	20.3	10.6	100.0

Looking more in-depth at outreach to different groups, survey respondents were asked to specifically describe what type(s) of outreach their magnet schools employed.[25] Nearly two-thirds of respondents reported that there were parent information centers and information sessions in the community; over half of respondents also reported additional publicity about magnet schools (Table 17). Slightly less than half of respondents indicated that they employed staff members for recruitment purposes.

[25] Respondents were asked to circle all that applied.

For magnet programs in this sample, less than one in four schools with staff members for recruitment or using other non-specified types of outreach (designated as an "other" category in the survey question) reported substantial integration under their current policies, which is lower than the share of integrated schools with other types of outreach. On the other hand, nearly 40% of respondents from magnet programs using other types of outreach reported rising levels of integration, suggesting that some of these methods might be more effective than others. "Other" types of outreach included use of websites, mailings, TV & radio advertising, visits to feeder schools and magnet fairs & showcases.

Interestingly, while all types of outreach are related to higher levels of increasing integration than those schools without outreach (see above table for comparison), they were also connected to disproportionately high levels of decreasing integration in these schools. Approximately one tenth of schools in the total sample are experiencing decreasing levels of integration, yet over twenty percent of schools in every type of outreach category report declining integration levels. These numbers may reflect two types of situations: (1) where some magnet programs that have chosen to proactively engage in outreach efforts did so because they were already experiencing a decrease in integration; and (2) where schools' outreach efforts may have helped to increase the magnet schools' levels of integration. Of course, it is also possible outreach efforts are or have been in place, but they have not been successful at attracting a racially diverse group of students.

Table 17: Types of outreach by integration levels

		School is substantially integrated under current policy	Largely one-race school	Increasing Integration	Decreasing Integration	Did Not Reply	Total
Parent Information Center	Count	45	7	53	37	12	154
	%	29.2	4.5	34.4	24.0	7.8	99.9
Info Sessions in the Community	Count	45	7	51	34	12	149
	%	30.2	4.7	34.2	22.8	8.1	100.0
Staff Members for Recruitment	Count	28	5	41	27	13	114
	%	24.6	4.4	36.0	23.7	11.4	100.1
Publicity about magnet(s)	Count	37	7	49	30	12	135
	%	27.4	5.2	36.3	22.2	8.9	100.0
Other Type of Outreach	Count	5	1	8	5	2	21
	%	23.8	4.8	38.1	23.8	9.5	100.0
Total	Count	70	17	76	25	48	236
	%	29.7	7.2	32.2	10.6	20.3	100.0

Results from this section suggest that special outreach can have positive impacts on integration levels in magnet schools – though some types of outreach were more effective in increasing demand among all groups than others for schools in this sample.

The Role of Teachers

Both the racial composition of faculty members and the training of teachers for diverse schools have been important elements of fully desegregating schools and ensuring that diverse schools are able to effectively educate students from all backgrounds. Having a racially diverse staff is important for students of all backgrounds, and the Supreme Court's *Green* decision in 1968 required that desegregation plans have faculty integration as part of their overall desegregation efforts. In early magnet schools, principals were sometimes given the ability to select teachers on the basis of teachers' interest and, if under desegregation plan, to reflect the demographics of the

students to comply with the *Green* decision (1968). Due to teacher transfers and retirements, even in schools where there was an initial selection of interested teachers and training provided, magnet school faculties today may not have as strong a focus on preparing and training teachers for diversity in the classroom. Further, there are other magnet schools that may have been set up without a desegregative purpose, or where an existing school was hastily converted to a magnet school without any substantive changes to the school, including the faculty. In other districts there may be union restrictions that prohibit teachers applying and being selected for magnet schools. In addition, ESAA funds that helped to train all teachers, including magnet school teachers, in race relations techniques are no longer available and there has been a de-emphasis of desegregation in subsequent reauthorizations of MSAP. All of these conditions make the ability of magnet administrators to select teachers specifically for the magnet school much more limited and the training for diversity rarer today for teachers, even as the student population becomes more racially diverse (see Frankenberg & Siegel-Hawley, 2008).

On a more positive note, one of the differences between magnet schools and other types of schools is that usually teachers apply to teach in magnet schools, while there is less choice—at least in larger districts where there are often multiple schools at each grade level— for teachers in non-magnet schools. Similar to theories about parental choice discussed later in the report, there is some support for the idea that teachers who choose their schools (as compared to those who are assigned) may be more committed (Raywid, 1989), which among other things may mean that teachers remain there longer. Magnet school teachers may also benefit from more resources at their school and higher percentages of the faculty may have more advanced degrees and certification (Smrekar & Goldring, 1999).

Given this context, we asked about different types of training for teachers in magnet schools. This section will examine how teacher training relates to integration levels, and we begin by examining the frequency of each type of training. They are[26]:

- Orientation included information on promoting successful race relations, 20%;
- Staff development focused on promoting successful race relations, 38%;
- Teacher mentors engaged with the topic of promoting successful race relations, 14%;
- Policies were developed to recruit and retain racially diverse faculty, 21%;
- Other types of training were offered about promoting successful race relations, 7%; and
- No training in techniques promoting successful race relations was offered, 34%.

Among the magnet schools in this sample that offered some type of training about race relations, the most common type of training was staff development, with nearly forty percent of schools reporting this type of activity. Importantly, more than a third of schools did not offer any training in techniques promoting successful race relations. The lack of professional development opportunities in the area of race relations is of concern in any type of school, but perhaps particularly so given the traditional commitment to desegregation and racial diversity that spurred the development and spread of magnet schools.

We examine the relationship between types of training and integration levels in the table below.

[26] Teachers were asked to circle as many as applied.

More than one in four schools that were substantially integrated had teacher recruitment policies; lower percentages of one-race schools and schools with declining integration had such policies.

Of note, while less than half of respondents in each type of school reported no training regarding race relations, except for respondents associated with decreasingly integrated magnets, there were a larger number of respondents selecting "no training" than any one particular type of training. The trend of no training in these environments is troubling, given the reported levels of diversity at the magnet schools in question. An exception to these trends is that a substantial majority of respondents in schools that were experiencing decreasing integration reported staff development about race relations.

Largely one-race schools report disproportionately low percentages of professional development for racial diversity in all categories, with the exception of teacher orientation, where nearly twenty four percent of respondents say that orientation is available, compared to 19.9% for the category. By contrast, however, only about one in six respondents in largely one-race schools reported staff development around issues of race relations, which was considerably lower than the percentages of respondents in other types of schools. Further, almost half of respondents in racially isolated schools reported no training, perhaps suggesting that such training is not viewed as necessary in more segregated contexts.

Table 18: Teacher Training Opportunities and Racial Integration

	Substantially integrated	Largely one-race school	Increasing Integration	Decreasing Integration	Did Not Reply	Total
Mentors	10	2	12	4	4	32
	14.3%	11.8%	15.8%	8.3%	16.0%	13.6%
Staff development	19	3	29	30	8	89
	27.1%	17.6%	38.2%	62.5%	32.0%	37.7%
Orientation	16	4	14	10	3	47
	22.9%	23.5%	18.4%	20.8%	12.0%	19.9%
Teacher recruitment	19	3	17	6	5	50
	27.1%	17.6%	22.4%	12.5%	20.0%	21.2%
Other types of training	6	0	2	8	0	16
	8.6%	0.0%	2.6%	16.7%	0.0%	6.8%
No training	25	8	31	10	5	79
	35.7%	47.1%	40.8%	20.8%	20.0%	33.5%
All teachers	**70**	**17**	**76**	**48**	**25**	**236**

While training is important, the stability of teachers, particularly after schools invest in further development for these teachers, is also important for magnet and non-magnet schools alike. This may be even more significant for magnet schools with a particular educational theme, which, in combination with any training teachers may receive about race relations, means that these teachers may be more difficult to replace.

We examined the turnover of teachers in magnet schools in comparison to surrounding schools. This, it should be noted, only asked about perceptions of how turnover rates compared and did not draw on any administrative data to corroborate these perceptions. Yet these perceptions are important to consider because a school with even a perception of high teacher turnover—in comparison to other area schools—may have difficulty attracting teachers and students.

Importantly, lower teacher turnover is associated with substantially integrated magnet schools in this sample. More than a third of schools report a lower rate of teacher turnover than surrounding

schools are substantially integrated under their current policies, which is a disproportionately high share of such schools. Further, nearly 70% of schools with lower teacher turnover rates are either experiencing increasing integration levels or are already substantially integrated (Table 19).

Conversely, schools reporting higher rates of teacher turnover had disproportionately higher percentages of one race schools. Larger percentages of schools experiencing turnover were one-race schools (10.3%) than were the percentage of schools experiencing lower turnover that were one-race schools (3%). In addition, more than one-fifth of schools with greater teacher turnover levels report decreasing integration levels, which is disproportionately higher than their overall percentage of schools in this sample.

Table 19: Teacher Turnover & Integration Levels in Magnet Schools

Teacher Turnover	Substantially integrated	Largely one-race school	Increasing Integration	Decreasing Integration	Did Not Reply	Total
Greater	8	3	10	6	2	29
	27.6%	10.3%	34.5%	20.7%	6.9%	100.0%
About the Same	28	11	33	24	6	102
	27.5%	10.8%	32.4%	23.5%	5.9%	100.0%
Lower	34	3	33	18	11	99
	34.3%	3.0%	33.3%	18.2%	11.1%	100.0%
Did Not Reply	0	0	0	0	6	6
Total	**70**	**17**	**76**	**28**	**25**	**236**
	29.7%	**7.2%**	**32.2%**	**11.9%**	**10.6%**	**100.0%**

These trends indicate that lower rates of turnover are associated with more extensive integration of magnet schools, while higher rates of teacher turnover are found in magnet schools with decreasing integration levels and racial isolation.

Transportation

The provision of free transportation to students granted school transfers to increase desegregation in the South was first required in the HEW[27] 1965 school desegregation guidelines, which explained what was necessary for district compliance with the 1964 Civil Rights Act (Orfield, 1969).[28] Thus, free transportation has long been considered one of the conditions under which schools can help ensure that everyone is able to attend a school of choice, regardless of family situation, language differences, socioeconomic status, or racial/ethnic isolation (Wells, 1996). A study of magnet schools in two large Midwestern districts found that particularly among minority parents, the availability of transportation was a consideration in choosing a magnet school for their children (Smrekar & Goldring, 1999). This percentage may increase as the number of households with a parent or guardian at home dwindles.

Transportation to schools that may be at a geographic distance from some students' homes (as compared to closer neighborhood school options) is particularly important in an era where households have multiple earners and where parents may not have work schedules that allow them to transport children to these schools. Yet, at the same time, as fuel costs rise, transportation costs for school districts are sky-rocketing, and transportation for out of zone students—such as

[27] HEW stands for Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

[28] Compliance with the 1964 Civil Rights Act became particularly important for districts after the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act the following year, which increased federal funding for schools, but contained a provision that allowed the withholding of money if the district was not in desegregation compliance.

magnet school students—has been the focus of a number of school districts across the nation as they look to cut costs. In the last few months, a search of newspaper articles revealed that large districts in Alabama, Florida, Connecticut, Massachusetts, North Carolina, Georgia, and Wisconsin have all contemplated cutting or otherwise altering the transportation they provided to magnet school students. Since this concern is recent, caused by the spiking fuel costs, it is not clear the extent to which these transportation policy changes may be impacting the diversity of magnet schools.

In this survey, conducted prior to recent concerns regarding fuel costs, we asked about the provision of transportation to magnet schools. Since free transportation would provide greater access to the magnet program of a families' choosing, the following tables examine the extent to which transportation is associated with changes in integration levels. Nearly 12% of schools that did not provide free transportation to their students were largely one-race, considerably higher than the percentage of schools that did provide transportation that were also one-race (6.4%). On the other hand, roughly 35% of magnet programs in this sample that did not offer free transportation to students reported increasing integration levels, which was slightly higher than the percentage of schools that did offer free transportation and reported increasing integration (see Table 20). Although it is impossible to know from the survey data why this pattern exists, possible explanations include location in a dense urban area that makes it possible for students to walk to school, the ability to use a student ID to ride a public bus cheaply, or location near work places that makes the school attractive to parents from a variety of backgrounds.

Table 20: Access to free transportation to magnet program(s) for all students by changes in integration levels over the past 10 years

		Substantially integrated	Largely one-race school	Increasing Integration	Decreasing Integration	Did Not Reply	Total
School(s) provides free transportation	Count	58	12	61	39	19	189
	%	30.7	6.4	32.3	20.6	10.1	100.0
School(s) does not provide free transportation	Count	11	5	15	7	4	42
	%	26.2	11.9	35.7	16.7	9.5	100.0
Did Not Reply	Count	0	0	0	0	5	5
	%	0	0	0	0	100.0	100.0
Total	**Count**	**69**	**17**	**76**	**46**	**28**	**236**
	%	**29.2**	**7.2**	**32.2**	**19.5**	**11.9**	**100.0**

Among this sample, most (approximately 80%) schools provided free transportation for all students. Surprisingly, schools that did not provide transportation for students reported a higher percentage of respondents who felt that parental demand had increased among all groups in the last decade (Table 21). And one out of eight respondents with schools that provide transportation reported that parental demand declined. Perhaps this is indicative of other school features that are or are not a bigger attraction to parents. It is important to note that the vast majority of schools do offer transportation for students.

Table 21: Transportation to magnet program(s) by changes in parent demand over past 10 years

		Parental Demand:				Did Not Reply	**Total**
		Stayed the Same	Increased in All Groups	Increased in Some Groups	Declined		
School(s) provides free transportation	Count	27	88	37	24	13	189
	%	14.3	46.6	19.6	12.7	6.9	100.0
School(s) does not provide free transportation	Count	6	24	7	1	4	42
	%	14.3	57.1	16.7	2.4	9.5	100.0
Did Not Reply	Count	0	2	1	0	2	5
	%	0	40.0	20.0	0	40.0	100.0
Total	**Count**	**33**	**114**	**45**	**25**	**19**	**236**
	%	**14.0**	**48.3**	**19.1**	**10.6**	**8.1**	**100.0**

Differences in student composition exist among schools that provide free transportation and those that do not. White students make up nearly a third of the student body in the average magnet program offering free transportation, compared to 23% in magnets that do not provide free transportation (see Table 22). Magnet programs with free transportation also have a lower percentage of low-income students, suggesting that these schools are better at "magnetizing" – attracting students from a variety of racial and socioeconomic backgrounds to their program.

Table 22: Transportation policy by school and district racial composition

Transportation policy		**% school white**	**% school low-income**
Program(s) offer free transportation	Mean	32.7	62.0
	N	147	138
Program(s) do not offer free transportation	Mean	22.8	71.0
	N	28	26
Total	**Mean**	**31.0**	**63.5**
	N	**176**	**165**

Trends contained in this section suggest that higher percentages of magnet schools that do not providing free transportation to students are more likely to be largely one-race magnet programs. Findings regarding the relationship between transportation and parental demand are more mixed and somewhat contradictory to prior literature on this topic. Particularly given the increasing cuts to transportation due to financial costs, it is important to further study how transportation may relate to demand, access, and diversity.

At the close of this section, there are several important trends for racial integration levels in magnet schools that are worth quickly reviewing. First, many magnet programs in this sample reported declining levels of integration. Further exploration reveals that programs struggling to maintain racial diversity are associated with one or more of the following: changing or abandoned race-conscious desegregation goals; school within-a-school magnets; higher teacher turnover; and a lack of access to free transportation. Magnet schools created expressly for desegregation purposes a generation ago often had policies to make sure these structures were in place—structures designed to broaden access to these schools of choice for all students.

Parental Demand for Magnet Schools

Demand for schools and programs are important to any school choice policy. In order for magnet schools to be successful, demand from a wide variety of parents is necessary to ensure diversity. This is one reason that magnet schools often have unique educational themes— to attract a range of parents and students. There has often been considerable demand for magnet schools, which is likely a reason that contributed to their growth and popularity. For example, one analysis found that three-quarters of districts with magnet schools had more demand than available seats (Blank, Levine, & Steel, 1996).

In almost any complex choice system, there are some options that experience more demand than others. With the case of magnet schools, some programs are more "magnetic" in terms of attracting students and in creating demand for attending the school. There may also be varying levels of demand across racial and socioeconomic groups as families may have different preferences based on factors such as a school's theme, reputation, or geographic location. This variation is important to keep in mind when we look at parent demand for the schools in this sample, as the figures reported here represent an average of demand across many groups and interests as well as schools with varying degrees of success at "magnetizing."

Demand for magnet schools can become unstable once racial desegregation goals are removed. In places where there is particularly intense parent demand for a certain program(s), families from groups that are more organized – or with more resources – tend to displace those who have less access and information. When these patterns create schools that are no longer magnetic, policies should be enacted quickly to restore balance, otherwise the schools lose their ability to desegregate.

This survey sought to quantify some of these trends by drawing a distinction between demand for magnets from all groups of parents versus demand from some groups of parents. If respondents reported that parental demand was increasing among some groups of parents, which was a separate choice than increasing demand among all parents, this signaled a decline among other parent groups. We found that the vast majority of survey respondents indicated that parent demand for magnet schools had increased in the last decade. However, while almost half reported that demand had increased among all groups of parents, another 19% reported demand had increased among some groups, suggesting that some schools of respondents in this sample are having trouble attracting a broad range of parents. Only one in ten respondents reported a decline among all groups (see Table 23).

Importantly, among all schools in the sample, the highest percentages of schools experiencing increasing parental demand were schools with increasing integration. Approximately 80% of schools experiencing a gradual increase in integration also reported an increase in parent demand, including almost two-thirds reporting increased demand among all groups. The incidence of increased parental demand was lower—but still higher than for other types of schools—in schools that had been substantially integrated over the last decade. Almost half of substantially integrated schools report that demand increased among all groups of parents.

Schools with decreasing levels of integration reported the largest decline in parent demand among schools of any of the categories of integration change (18.8%). Further, less than a third of schools with decreasing integration (and/or increasing racial/ethnic isolation) reported

increased demand among all groups. By contrast, schools with increasing integration had twice the percentage of schools (61%) with increased demand among all groups.

Interestingly, among schools that remained largely comprised of one racial group, the highest percentage of respondents reported that demand remained constant. These facts together suggest that, within this sample, increasing parent demand is associated with schools experiencing increasing integration or schools that are substantially integrated. Parent demand for a more segregated context, however, remains somewhat consistent for schools in the sample, perhaps suggesting that parent groups already participating in these programs are satisfied with the current racial/ethnic composition. Yet, when schools in this sample are moving from diverse to less diverse contexts, demand seems to wane.

Table 23: Parent demand for magnet programs by changes in integration levels over the past 10 years

		Parent demand:				Did Not Reply	Total
		Stayed the Same	Increased in All Groups	Increased in Some Groups	Declined		
Substantially integrated	Count	14	34	10	8	4	70
	%	20.0	48.6	14.3	11.4	5.7	100.0
Largely one race school	Count	5	7	3	2	0	17
	%	29.4	41.2	17.6	11.8	0	100.0
Increasing integration	Count	7	47	13	5	4	76
	%	9.2	61.8	17.1	6.6	5.3	100.0
Decreasing integration	Count	7	15	16	9	1	48
	%	14.6	31.3	33.3	18.8	2.1	100.1
Did Not Reply	Count	0	11	3	1	10	25
	%	0	44.0	12.0	4.0	40.0	100.0
Total	**Count**	**33**	**114**	**45**	**25**	**19**	**236**
	%	**14.0**	**48.3**	**19.1**	**10.6**	**8.1**	**100.0**

Next, we examined whether parental demand varied by the presence of desegregation goals. Given public opinion—among respondents of all races— valuing the importance of diverse schools for children's learning and social science evidence affirming the many ways in which students in diverse schools benefit from this racial diversity (see, e.g., Linn & Welner, 2007; Orfield, Frankenberg & Garces, 2008), how salient are magnet schools' desegregation goals to parental demand for magnet programs?

In all schools except for those never operating with desegregation goals, more than two-thirds of respondents reported that there had been increased parental demand for magnet schools in the last decade, at least among some groups. The highest percentage of respondents reported parental demand increasing among all groups were those associated with magnet schools still under desegregation goals, which in this survey could be either associated with court-ordered or voluntary desegregation (Table 24). Fifty-seven percent of schools with desegregation goals have experienced increased demand among all groups, and another 16% of these schools saw demand increase among some groups.

Schools that used to have desegregation goals that had been changed or were removed altogether had the highest shares of respondents who reported a decline in parental demand. Further, a disproportionately low percentage (38%) of schools that no longer have desegregation goals report that parental demand increased among all groups—the lowest share among schools by the

category of desegregation goals. These trends may be the result of other factors in these communities, but schools that no longer have desegregation goals and have waning demand from some or all groups in the community may find it challenging to maintain diversity.

Table 24: Schools' desegregation goal by changes in parental demand over the past 10 years[29]

		Parental demand:				Did Not Reply	Total
		Stayed the Same	Increased in All Groups	Increased in Some Groups	Declined		
School(s) has desegregation goals	Count	9	42	12	7	4	74
	%	12.2	56.8	16.2	9.5	5.4	100.1
School(s) have changing/ race-neutral goals	Count	4	12	8	5	2	31
	%	12.9	38.7	25.8	16.1	6.5	100.0
School(s) dropped desegregation goals	Count	9	23	18	8	3	61
	%	14.8	37.7	29.5	13.1	4.9	100.0
School(s) never had desegregation goals	Count	10	20	5	1	4	40
	%	25.0	50.0	12.5	2.5	10.0	100.0
Did Not Reply	Count	0	17	2	3	8	30
	%	0	56.7	6.7	10.0	26.7	99.9
Total	**Count**	**32**	**114**	**45**	**24**	**21**	**236**
	%	**13.6**	**48.3**	**19.1**	**10.2**	**8.9**	**100.0**

As discussed in a prior section, magnet programs can be either whole school magnets or magnet programs placed within a larger school. Most of the respondents to this survey were affiliated with whole school magnets, though more than one-quarter were associated with within-school magnets. Despite a lower prevalence of within-school magnets among these survey respondents, there was increased demand for such schooling options. A higher percentage of respondents associated with school-within-a-school magnets reported an increase in parental demand (see Table 25). In fact, over 60% of these within school programs reported demand increased among all groups. Further, a smaller percentage of respondents associated with school-within-a-school magnets reported a decline in parental demand compared to the share of respondents in whole school magnets. It is possible that within-school magnet programs have appeal to certain groups of parents because, as smaller programs, they are able to better maintain a focus on the magnet school's particular theme and/or may appear to have extra educational resources.

Two-thirds of respondents affiliated with whole-school magnets reported increased demand, although more than 20% of respondents said that demand only increased among some groups. The highest percentage reporting a decline in demand was from survey respondents whose districts had both a whole magnet program and a school within a school magnet (20.7%).

[29] Some respondents selected multiple answers.

Table 25: Magnet type by parental demand changes over the past ten years

		Parental demand:				Did Not Reply	Total
		Stayed the Same	Increased in All Groups	Increased in Some Groups	Declined		
Whole school magnet	Count	23	75	35	17	15	165
	%	13.9	45.5	21.2	10.3	9.1	100.0
School within a school magnet	Count	5	22	5	2	2	36
	%	13.9	61.1	13.8	5.6	5.6	100.1
Both[30]	Count	4	14	4	6	1	29
	%	13.8	48.3	13.8	20.7	3.4	100.0
Did Not Reply	Count	1	3	1	0	1	6
	%	16.7	50.0	16.7	0	16.7	100.1
Total	**Count**	**33**	**114**	**45**	**25**	**19**	**236**
	%	**14.0**	**48.3**	**19.1**	**10.6**	**8.1**	**100.0**

Also noted in a prior section, the vast majority of schools in this sample reported some type of special outreach to attract students. We next examine among this group of magnet schools whether outreach efforts are related to parental demand. Overall, considerably higher percentages of survey respondents reported that parental demand had increased for all groups in schools that employed some form of special outreach (Table 26). This pattern is not unexpected and suggests outreach among this sample is particularly strongly related to increasing demand among all groups.

For magnet schools without some form of outreach, parental demand was more likely to increase among some groups (40.0%) than all groups (20.0%). Schools not using some form of special outreach reported a decline in parental demand (15.0%) at greater rates than the percentage for the category (10.6%). These patterns suggest that outreach may be associated with greater levels of parental demand for all groups of students, while a lack of special outreach may mean that demand increases among some groups, but not others. These findings underscore the importance of equal access to information about magnet programs and affirm efforts to spread information about these programs, at least for schools in this sample.

Table 26: Schools reporting special outreach to attract students to magnet program(s) from other racial/ethnic groups by parental demand over the past ten years

		Parental demand:				Did Not Reply	Total
		Stayed the Same	Increased in All Groups	Increased in Some Groups	Declined		
School(s) has some form of special outreach	Count	29	104	40	22	13	208
	%	13.9	50.0	19.2	10.6	6.2	99.9
School(s) does not have some form of special outreach	Count	4	4	8	3	1	20
	%	20.0	20.0	40.0	15.0	5.0	100.0
Did Not Reply	Count	0	2	1	0	5	8
	%	0	25.0	12.5	0.0	62.5	100.0
Total	Count	33	110	49	25	19	236
	%	14.0	46.6	20.8	10.6	8.1	100.0

[30] E.g., for respondents whose answers pertained to more than one school.

Given the trends above showing higher parental demand in magnet schools with outreach, we also examined whether particular types of outreach were related to increased parental demand. Approximately 60% of schools that use publicity about magnets and other types of outreach such as websites, TV advertising, visits to feeder schools, and magnet school fairs report that parental demand has increased for magnet schools among all parents in their community. Notably, schools with parent information centers had the lowest percentage of respondents reporting that demand increased among all groups, perhaps because they might have limited hours or their existence may not be fully known to those in the community because the families may need to be sought out in their neighborhoods. However, for every type of outreach, schools had higher demand from all groups and lower percentages of respondents reporting a decline in parental demand.

Table 27: Parental Demand by Different Types of Outreach

		Parental demand:				Did Not Reply	Total
		Stayed the Same	Increased in All Groups	Increased in Some Groups	Declined		
Parent Information Center	Count	22	75	33	14	10	154
	%	14.3	48.7	21.4	9.1	6.5	100.0
Info Sessions in the Community	Count	23	78	27	13	8	149
	%	15.4	52.3	18.1	8.7	5.4	99.9
Staff Members for Recruitment	Count	17	58	19	10	10	114
	%	14.9	50.9	16.7	8.8	8.8	100.1
Publicity about magnet(s)	Count	17	77	22	14	5	135
	%	12.6	57.0	16.3	10.4	3.7	100.0
Other Type of Outreach	Count	2	13	4	2	0	21
	%	9.5	61.9	19.0	8.5	0	99.9
Total	**Count**	**33**	**114**	**45**	**25**	**19**	**236**
	%	**14.0**	**48.3**	**19.1**	**10.6**	**8.1**	**100.1**

An overwhelming majority of respondents reported that parental demand for magnets has risen over the last decade. Increased demand for magnet programs among all groups of parents in this sample is associated with stable or rising integration levels, as well as the presence of desegregation goals. These patterns may suggest that parents value the emphasis that many magnets have traditionally placed on creating racially diverse school environments. Additionally, types of magnets and special outreach to families and students play a role in shaping parental demand. School within a school magnets tend to be related to strong demand in this sample, and outreach also appears to boost parental demand. The viability of magnets as desegregation tools and choice options depends on family demand for these programs. Understanding and capitalizing on the above patterns may help to ensure a stable future for magnet schools.

Charter Schools: Another Type of Public School Choice

Magnet schools, of course, are far from the only educational choice option available to families. Other options include charter schools (which are allowed in most but not all states), private schools (including a few voucher programs that provide tuition for eligible students to attend private schools), and other choice options (such as controlled choice policies adopted by school districts). While there are some similarities between magnet schools and charter schools—both are public schools and schools of choice—there are a number of differences, which have important implications for diversity. Most significantly, charter schools were not begun with any intent to

desegregate, but rather as a way to allow for choice and innovation within public schools.[31] This difference in mission between the historical focus of magnet schools and the focus of new schools of choice means that many of the ways in which magnet schools were successful in creating diverse student bodies were not included in the federal legislation authorizing charter schools. Additionally, many of the states that have since allowed charter schools have not established nor enforced regulations pertaining to racial diversity (see Frankenberg & Lee, 2003).

Nevertheless, charter schools remain a popular educational alternative. Having already examined the composition and segregation of charter schools and magnet schools earlier in this report, this section explores how magnet schools are affected by the presence of other educational choice options in the surrounding area; we particularly focus on magnet schools by whether or not charters are in proximity.

Competing Choice Options: Demand and Outreach

A majority of respondents to this survey–almost two-thirds–reported that their districts or surrounding areas contain charter schools.[32] We first look at how the presence of charter schools might be affecting parental demand for magnet schools over the span of the last decade, a time period that witnessed rapid growth in the number of charter schools. Has demand for magnet schools declined in areas with more school choice options?

There are somewhat contradictory findings about how the presence of charter schools relates to demand for magnets among schools in this sample. Parental demand for magnet schools without a nearby charter school is more likely to remain constant than for magnet schools where there is a nearby charter school. By contrast, higher percentages of respondents in districts or surrounding areas containing charter schools reported fluctuations in demand for magnet schools – meaning it both increased and decreased – than respondents in districts that did not contain charter schools (see Table 28). In comparison to magnet schools without nearby charter schools, slightly higher percentages of respondents in districts with charter schools found that there was increased demand for magnets among all groups (50%) or among some groups (21%). But there were also more respondents from this same group saying that magnet demand had declined (12%). It seems that the presence of charter schools is more likely to change demand for magnet schools, but the directions of the trends are mixed, perhaps due to community factors and other schooling options. This variance in trends could also stem, in part, from factors such as outreach efforts by charter schools as well as the particular themes, locations, and reputations of magnet and charter schools in these communities.

[31] A notable exception to this trend is the concept of pilot schools – public schools that remain part of a school district, but are allowed important autonomies in certain areas (e.g. staffing and budgeting). Recent studies of pilots participating in Boston Public Schools suggest that pilot school enrollment largely mirrors the racial/ethnic and SES composition of the district (Feldman et. al., 2003; Tung & Ouimette, 2007). Many pilots control oversubscription issues by using a lottery system, which may help promote diversity. Pilots are an alternative to charters (which tend to be more segregating); they help foster autonomy and innovation, at the same time reflecting existing diversity in a district.

[32] In most instances, charter schools are not part of school districts, but are separate, single-school districts. Thus, charter schools could theoretically pull students from a number of different districts. For linguistic brevity, we will refer to "district" below, since district and surrounding area have the same meaning for our purposes.

Table 28: Parental demand over the past decade for magnet schools by charter school alternatives in the district

		Parental Demand:				Did Not Reply	Total
		Stayed the Same	Increased among all groups	Increased among some groups	Declined		
District contains charter schools	Count	17	73	31	18	7	146
	%	11.6	50.0	21.2	12.3	4.8	99.9
District does not contain charter schools	Count	16	40	14	7	6	83
	%	19.3	48.2	16.9	8.4	7.2	100.0
Did not reply	Count	0	1	0	0	6	7
	%	0	14.3	0	0	85.7	100.0
Total	**Count**	**33**	**114**	**45**	**25**	**19**	**236**
	%	**14.0**	**48.3**	**19.1**	**10.6**	**8.1**	**100.0**

While we first examined schools and districts containing a nearby charter school, private schools are actually the most the most frequent choice option in districts containing the magnet schools in this sample. Approximately two-fifths of all respondents reported that there were private schools in their district.

When comparing magnets in districts with public school choice options to all magnets or to magnets in districts with private schools, we see that a disproportionately high percentage of respondents report that demand declined. For example, in districts with charter schools nearby, 12.3% of respondents report decreasing parent demand, along with 16.4% of respondents in districts with controlled choice policies (Table 29). The lower reported decline for districts with private schools (10.4%) may reflect the cost of tuition while parental demand may decline more steeply for magnets when there are other free public school choice options. Additionally, charter schools may represent a "newer" choice option since the first charter schools began in the early 1990s.

There were slightly higher percentages of respondents in each category with additional school choice options reporting demand had increased among all parents than there were among all respondents. However, respondents from districts that contained private schools alongside magnets were the most likely to report that demand increased among all parents, which again may be indicative of the fact that private schools are not necessarily a choice option for those who would be interested in magnet schools. A slightly higher percentage of respondents in districts also containing charter schools reported that demand increased among some groups, which may suggest that charter schools are appealing to some but not all groups in these communities (see Frankenberg & Lee, 2003). A word of caution, however, as the differences discussed here are modest, and would warrant further investigation to more firmly draw conclusions.

Table 29: Parental demand over the past decade for magnet schools, by school choice options in district

		District contains charter schools	District contains private schools	District operates under controlled choice policy	All schools in sample
Parental demand stayed the same	Count	17	27	11	33
	%	11.6	14.1	9.8	14.0
Parental demand increased among all groups	Count	73	100	55	114
	%	50.0	52.1	49.1	48.3
Parental demand increased among some groups	Count	31	38	21	45
	%	21.2	19.8	18.8	19.1
Parental demand declined	Count	18	20	18	25
	%	12.3	10.4	16.4	10.6
Did not reply	Count	7	7	7	19
	%	36.8	3.7	6.3	8.1
Total	**Count**	**146**	**192**	**112**	**236**
	%	**99.9**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**

In analyses not shown here, lower percentages of magnet respondents from districts containing charter schools reported specific outreach activities to attract potential families and students. While overall outreach activities were less frequent in magnet districts with charters, those that did have outreach chose multiple activities. Substantially higher percentages of magnet school respondents in districts with a charter school presence reported that they held community information sessions, had staff members responsible for parent information or recruitment, and publicized to promote the school.

Integration

Having examined how the presence of charter schools, and to some extent other educational choice options, relate to demand and outreach, we now turn to integration levels. In a system of educational choice, racial integration is dependent upon outreach to families of all backgrounds in order to ensure that there is widespread information regarding choice options like magnet and charter schools.

Respondents from magnets operating in districts that did not contain charters were more likely consider their programs integrated (37.7%) than districts containing charters (25.7%). There were similar—though less extreme—differences among schools which reported increasing levels of integration during the last decade (Table 30).

A disproportionately high percentage of magnet school respondents in districts where there were also charter school options reported that integration had declined over the last decade. In these districts with charter schools, nearly 28% of respondents believed that integration had declined, which was three times the share of schools experiencing decreasing integration among magnets in districts without charter schools. Recall from above that magnet districts with charter schools reported a higher percentage of respondents who described parental demand as declining over the last decade and a lower percentage who thought that demand had remained the same. Perhaps these differences in parental demand relate to the declining integration seen here.

It is important to note again that these findings do not prove causation and, in fact, represent a small percentage of communities and districts. However, other studies of different types of choice

plans have found that the presence of charter schools can act as a segregating mechanism (Betts et al., 2006; Frankenberg & Lee, 2003; Cobb & Glass, 1999), which may adversely affect the integration of other schools including magnets.

Table 30: Changes in integration levels over the past decade by presence of charter schools in the district

		Substantially integrated	Largely one-race school	Increasing Integration	Decreasing Integration	Did Not Reply	Total
District contains charter schools	Count	37	12	45	40	10	144
	%	25.7	8.3	31.3	27.8	6.9	100.0
District does not contain charter schools	Count	32	5	30	8	10	85
	%	37.7	5.9	35.3	9.4	11.8	100.0
Did Not Reply	Count	0	1	1	0	5	7
	%	0.0	14.3	14.3	0.0	71.4	100.0
Total	**Count**	**70**	**17**	**76**	**48**	**25**	**236**
	%	**29.7**	**7.2**	**32.2**	**20.3**	**10.6**	**100.0**

Similar to the trends above, when we compared demographic data for magnet schools in areas with charter schools to those without charter schools, magnet districts without charter schools had a higher percentage of white students in their schools, on average (Table 31). However, it is important to note that the white percentage for magnet schools—among those who reported approximate racial composition figures—was low. With that caveat, however, magnet schools in districts with charter schools appear to be less integrated than magnet schools in districts without charter schools. There is also a larger gap between school and district white percentage for magnet schools in places where the district contains charter schools, which may reflect within-district segregation. Additionally, magnet schools in districts with charter schools, on average, have a slightly lower percentage of low-income students though the differences are rather small.

Table 31: Presence of Charter Schools by School and District Racial Composition[33]

Charter schools		Self-reported by respondent		NCES Common Core	
		% school white	% school low-income	% district white	% district low-income
District contains charter schools	Mean	27.3	62.0	38.0	52.4
	N	109	104	99	98
District does not contain charter schools	Mean	36.9	65.9	42.7	53.4
	N	66	60	51	51
Did not reply	Mean	45	70	29	66
	N	1	1	1	1
Total	**Mean**	**31.0**	**63.5**	**39.5**	**52.9**
	N	**176**	**165**	**152**	**151**

In conclusion, it appears that the presence of alternative public school choice options—and this section largely focused on one type of option, charter schools—in this sample was related to changing demand (both declining and increasing) for magnet schools. Additionally, their presence was related to lower levels of integration. More investigation of these trends is needed to understand precisely how charter schools may be affecting existing magnet schools' efforts at

[33] School-level student composition figures are taken from respondents' self-reporting, while district-level figures are taken from the 2005-06 NCES Common Core of Data. For both school and district composition, the N is lower than the entire sample (N=236).

creating racially diverse schools, especially with the recent restrictions on creating diversity by the Supreme Court.

Knowledge of Supreme Court decision

Finally, we turn to the recent Supreme Court decision, *Parents Involved*, which examined two race-conscious student assignment plans that were adopted by Jefferson County, Kentucky (metropolitan Louisville) and Seattle, Washington in an effort to create racially diverse schools. Although these plans applied to the entire district, the intent of the two plans was similar to that of magnet schools aiming to create racially diverse student bodies.

The 2007 Supreme Court decision garnered significant attention from educators around the country because it threatened the viability of many school districts' student assignment plans, which also included the way in which magnet schools selected their students. The decision itself was lengthy, with five separate decisions being written by differing combinations of Justices, creating considerable confusion as to what was or was not still permitted. Justice Kennedy wrote the controlling opinion, siding with Justice Breyer (and three other members who joined his dissent) about the compelling governmental interest in establishing and maintaining racially diverse schools and preventing schools of racial isolation. At the same time, Justice Kennedy agreed with Chief Justice Roberts' opinion that the two school districts' voluntary integration plans were unconstitutional. While it is certain that specific race-conscious policies like those in question are no longer allowed, in his opinion, Kennedy outlined several promising options that he thought might be permissible (i.e., siting & zoning schools, recruitment of teachers and students). It is not yet known, however, whether a majority of Justices would endorse such options and what they might look like if implemented.

The survey of magnet school personnel was administered slightly less than a year after the Supreme Court decision was released. One of the questions asked respondents about their district's understanding of the effects of the Supreme Court decision. We have chosen to analyze the responses of those who identified as a school or district leader, and have removed teachers and those for whom a job title was not specified. Among these 82 respondents, nearly 40% reported either somewhat low or low knowledge about the decision's effect. Only one-third rated their understanding at high or very high.[34] Thus, among this sample of magnet school leaders there is considerable lack of understanding the decision's effect.

Table 32: Understanding of Supreme Court Decision's Effect

		Understanding of Decision's Effect:					Did Not Reply	All
		Very high	High	Moderate	Somewhat low	Low		
School or District administrators	Count	9	18	20	11	21	3	82
	%	11.0	22.0	24.4	13.4	25.6	3.7	100.1

Following the query concerning the recent Supreme Court decision, the survey also included an open-ended response question regarding current discussions about changes to magnet school policies in respondents' districts. Over half of all participants took the time to answer this

[34] Among all who answered this question—including teachers—an even higher percentage of respondents thought their district had relatively low understanding of the voluntary integration decision.

question, suggesting that change is afoot in many of the communities represented by the survey participants.

Approximately ten percent of the open-ended responses dealt directly with racial desegregation issues. Some participants indicated that their districts were in the process of considering socioeconomic status as a factor in magnet admissions. Several more participants indicated that they were committed to maintaining racial balance in the magnet system. Finally, the potential impact of the recent *PICS* decision was noted in some responses, along with the Connecticut court's decision in *Sheff v. O'Neill*, which mandated an increase in inter-district magnet options as a way to expand integrated educational opportunities for children in Hartford.

The open-ended responses regarding current discussions of changes in magnet school policies also revealed that many districts participating in this sample are interested in expanding their magnet programs. Twenty-seven respondents – almost 20% of those answering the question - mentioned that their district has a renewed interest in increasing magnet opportunities. Of course, some survey participants may be reporting on discussions occurring in the same district described by other participants, making it difficult to calculate an exact estimate of districts considering magnet expansion.

On a less positive note, a few responses expressed concern regarding the overall impact of budget cuts on magnet programs – with several more referencing the impending impact of proposed budget cuts on transportation for magnets. It is unknown, however, whether respondents from non-magnet schools might also report similar concern. Others reported increased scrutiny from local and state officials regarding the effectiveness and/or impact of district magnet programs. With states and local communities being affected by the nationwide economic downturn, it will be important to continue to monitor how this affects support for magnet schools and their ability to try to attract diverse groups of students.

Discussion and Policy Recommendations

The Supreme Court in *Parents Involved* declared that school districts have a compelling interest in creating and maintaining diverse schools and in preventing racial isolation. While the Court reaffirmed its commitment to integrated schooling, it also took away important tools that districts have traditionally used to try to accomplish these compelling interests and goals. Given these restrictions and the growth of educational choice, it is important to ponder how choice can be used to further racial diversity in this new legal context. After decades of existence and millions of alumni later, magnet schools are a prime example of harnessing school choice in a manner that fosters diverse schools. Yet the experiences of magnet schools are now largely being ignored as the number of charter schools rises dramatically. Despite their success, magnet schools are the forgotten choice of the 21st century.

Promoting school choice has been the educational mantra of politicians on both sides of the aisle. During this election year, for example, both political parties prioritized school choice—almost entirely in the form of charter schools, but also with vouchers—in their education platforms. Furthermore, No Child Left Behind legislation, signed into law in January 2002, endorsed choice as a major mechanism to pressure underperforming schools to improve, although the ability of students to use the choice provision as a way to transfer to successful schools remains limited (Center for Education Policy, 2006; Sunderman, Kim, and Orfield, 2005). Countless non-governmental groups support the spread of school choice, and school districts across the country

have stepped up efforts to create alternatives to traditional public schools in recent years, even though all of these efforts may be harmful to racial diversity or promote isolation within a district.

Although the federal courts have never recognized the right of parents to choose one's school, plaintiffs in the Seattle integration case (*Parents Involved*) argued that their right to do so was being violated by district policies. This contention is reminiscent of stances taken a generation ago by groups arguing for neighborhood schools, even though in both instances unfettered school choice and neighborhood schools are likely to lead to further segregation. Freedom of choice is one such policy that the Supreme Court ultimately ruled was not effective enough to remedy segregation. While choice plans may result in some families being able to choose which schools their children attend, these options may unfairly disadvantage those with fewer resources or connections. Furthermore, in exacerbating segregation, choice plans may disadvantage the wishes of many community members who might desire diverse schools.

In contrast to the growth of charters and vouchers, magnet schools were born as part of a strategy to accommodate parents' school preferences, at the same time accomplishing district goals of remedying segregation and promoting racial diversity. Given separate, racially identifiable city and suburban districts and judicial decisions limiting the extent of desegregation remedies, magnet schools grew rapidly as a way to attract white students to schools with unique educational themes. In addition to admissions processes designed to select a diverse group of students according to districts' desegregation goals, schools engaged in other efforts (many of which are not race-conscious in nature) to attract students from all groups: providing free transportation for students accepted to magnet schools; extensive outreach efforts to attract people of all backgrounds; and often, selecting and training a diverse teaching staff. Unfortunately, increasing judicial reluctance over the last two decades to support race-conscious desegregation efforts—even when adopted voluntarily by school boards—along with the growth of other forms of public school choice and the continued persistence of residential segregation creates a difficult climate for today's magnet schools to grow and flourish. This report underlines some of the key challenges facing magnet programs, but it also provides insight into the strengths of the magnet model, suggesting that these programs have continued relevance for the national education agenda. As the country transitions to a new administration, it becomes ever more critical to understand the implications of choice without appropriate civil rights considerations.

This report has begun to explore the role of magnet schools in this new legal, policy, and demographic landscape, analyzing the responses of several hundred magnet school practitioners. While largely descriptive and not generalizable, this report extends upon earlier studies of magnet schools in terms of examining parent demand and factors that might relate to racial diversity, such as the presence of desegregation goals or the provision of free transportation. Research has suggested that magnet schools with unique educational offerings can provide enhanced academic outcomes for students—in addition to the educational and social benefits for students attending magnet or non-magnet schools that are racially diverse. Promoting the development of magnet schools, along with sustaining and improving existing programs, should be one of the most popular strategies on the school choice agenda, not one that has been largely forgotten.

One of this report's findings was that magnet schools, with their historical emphasis on providing quality education for diverse groups of students, struggle to maintain racial diversity in districts that also contain charter schools. Parental demand for magnet schools was also slightly more likely to decrease in districts where charters were also an alternative to public schools. Perhaps

fueled by this trend, charter schools were more likely to enroll student populations of higher average socioeconomic status—a trend seen among nationwide data as well. The impact of opening a new charter school on the racial diversity efforts of surrounding schools and districts should be an important consideration for state governments before granting a charter. Once opened, continued monitoring should assess the charter school's impact.

As noted previously, a key difference between charter schools and magnet schools is the lack of civil rights provisions and structures that were part of the original design of many magnet schools. Some magnet schools, perhaps those that have been more recently established or those without a particular desegregative intent, no longer have these provisions as well. This analysis finds, however, that certain conditions were more likely to produce higher levels of integration for the magnet schools in this sample. One such condition, the presence of desegregation goals, was disproportionately linked to more integrated school environments. Yet this study suggests that magnet programs are increasingly less likely to operate under such goals and a number of schools are in the process of changing their goals to meet race-neutral criteria. Integration levels were also linked to admissions criteria, special outreach to racially diverse communities and the provision of free transportation. Magnet programs employing competitive admissions criteria, especially auditions, test scores and grade point averages, were less likely to be integrated than schools using interviews and essays. On the other hand, magnet schools controlling admission through lotteries or open enrollment procedures reported the highest levels of integration. Programs conducting outreach to diverse communities were more strongly associated with higher levels of racial integration, as were schools providing free transportation to all students. The type of magnet – whole school versus school-within-a-school – also appears to be associated with integration levels. More whole school magnets in this sample were experiencing increasing integration or maintaining substantially integrated environments than their "school within a school" counterparts.

In addition, the aftermath of the *Parents Involved* decision appears to be largely characterized by confusion regarding the legality of race-conscious policies. Just over one-tenth of respondents in the sample reported high levels of understanding of the recent Supreme Court decision that limited the use of race in student assignment policies.

This analysis also demonstrates the importance of maintaining racially diverse schools, finding that lower teacher turnover and higher rates of parent demand among all groups are associated with the sample's integrated magnet programs. Teachers play a critical role in creating a stable and positive school climate and despite the fact that many magnet schools were begun as a way to further integration and may be among the most diverse schools in their district, we find trends that mirror the teacher population at large. This study found that, on the whole, magnet programs in this sample are providing teachers with little-to-no training for racially diverse classrooms. Largely one-race schools were associated with the highest number of respondents reporting no training. In terms of teacher turnover rates at the magnets sampled (compared to schools in the surrounding areas), lower levels of turnover were disproportionately found in more integrated schools. While these trends are certainly of concern to magnet schools, which may be bringing together students from a wide range of backgrounds who are experiencing diversity for the first time, this is emblematic of a nationwide lack of preparation of teachers for any diverse schools despite demographic trends showing a rising percentage of nonwhite students.

Several policy recommendations follow from these findings to suggest that districts build a comprehensive magnet school strategy to design admissions criteria, outreach, and other aspects that together will help create equitable and diverse access to magnet schools:

1. Renewed commitment to creating magnet schools with guidelines for racial diversity that fall within the bounds of the recent Supreme Court decision. Support for magnet programs that emphasize non-competitive admissions policies like open enrollment (with the important caveat that all racial/ethnic groups are receiving equal information, otherwise groups with more information are privileged under a first-come, first-served system) and lottery systems. For magnets that retain competitive criteria, interviews and essays could be included to offset the segregating effects associated with the consideration of test scores, GPAs, and audition performances. The addition of race, geography (e.g., neighborhood residence), and/or socioeconomic status as one or more factors in these competitive admissions processes would also be worth considering to attain the district's diversity goals.
2. Increased funding for Magnet School Assistance Program. Current funding levels have not even been adjusted for inflation, and the most recent cycle of grants only went to magnet schools in 41 school districts, a number which has decreased in recent funding cycles. In the 2008 fiscal year, magnet school funding was just over $100 million. By contrast, President-elect Obama has proposed doubling charter school funding to $400 million. Increasing magnet school funding can help to enhance school choice options while also helping schools and districts reduce minority isolation.
3. Continued funding for districts to provide free transportation to magnet school students, even in the face of rising fuel costs. In an effort to help minimize the impact of rising fuel costs, districts should begin thinking about alternate ways of transporting students to increase efficiency (e.g., the use of geo-coding, consolidating bus routes, or using public transit options where available).
4. Continued and increased use of special outreach to attract students from a variety of backgrounds. Parent information centers should be accompanied by more comprehensive publicity efforts, such as directly mailing brochures (in English as well as other languages if applicable), advertisements in a variety of media outlets, or community presentations.
5. Increased support for the creation of whole school magnet programs as opposed to school-within-a-school magnets. Though it may be logistically easier to establish the latter, research shows that these school-within-a-school programs tend to be segregating mechanisms, racially sorting students into two schools sharing the same roof.
6. An increasing emphasis on teacher training for racially diverse learning environments. This is a vital strategy in ensuring that teachers are prepared for existing integration at magnet schools. Magnet schools may even serve as a model for more comprehensive training at other area schools. On-going training is important so that faculty transfers, retirements, and new hires will not diminish the focus on preparedness to educate a diverse group of students.
7. This report has emphasized the complex group of schools referred to as "magnet schools." In this changing environment, an updated federal evaluation of the racially integrative impact of magnet schools is needed to deepen our understanding about which conditions

in schools of choice should operate under in order to be "magnetic" and attract a diverse group of students. These findings should inform subsequent reauthorizations of federal education policy, such as NCLB and/or the Magnet School Assistance Program, to make sure that educational choice does not make it more difficult to create racially diverse schools. Targeted funding should go to successful magnet schools identified by the evaluation, and to help design new magnet schools effectively since some studies suggest the initial set-up of magnet schools is 10% more costly than traditional schools (e.g., selecting and training teachers, publicity, etc). The research discussed at the beginning of this report suggests that in addition to the benefits of increased integration, magnet schools help improve the academic outcomes of students, which indicates that they may be wise investments as we aim to dramatically decrease the dropout rates for all students.

8. As the growth of charter schools continues, federal and state charter school legislation should contain some recognition and enforcement of equity provisions from magnet school history.
9. Recent studies from Boston have indicated that pilot schools may serve as an innovative twist on the traditional magnet model. Pilot schools have been in existence for over a decade and in Boston educate more than 10% of district students. They offer parents extended school choices, but, due to lottery admissions policies, tend to enroll student populations reflective of the district as a whole. Like charter schools, pilots promote innovation and autonomy, but unlike charters, they do so within the public school system and with a commitment to equity.
10. Interdistrict magnet schools, established with the intent of bringing students together across district lines, offer a solution in segregated metropolitan areas where there may be school districts of vastly different demographics in close proximity. Since much of existing school segregation occurs between districts (instead of within a single district), interdistrict magnets may help alleviate those patterns. Interdistrict magnet schools are relatively infrequent, but there have been a number of such schools established in Connecticut as part of the remedy in a statewide desegregation case. Several examples of statewide magnet schools also exist (such as Illinois, North Carolina, and Alabama) though these schools often have competitive admissions criteria.

In sum, the role that magnet schools have had in creating innovative, racially diverse schools and in combining parental choice with explicit goals and structures to attain that diversity, has waned in both policy discussions and in financial support for such schools. In this age of ever-growing educational choice, magnet schools and, perhaps more specifically, their desegregation objectives, are the forgotten choice, symptomatic of the movement away from desegregation among all public schools. Schools and districts have many competing objectives in an era of tightening budgets, which may make many of the civil rights provisions in the design of successful magnet schools appear to be to be a luxury rather than an essential component of these schools. However, in the long term, this research and related studies suggest getting rid of civil rights provisions for magnet schools that have been extremely popular in many communities would be a mistake. Particularly now, with the changing demographics of the student population, the increasing importance of attending integrated schools for the life opportunities of students, and the challenging legal climate for some race-conscious school policies, magnet schools with appropriate civil rights structures may be one of the few opportunities to meet these challenges.

Bibliography

Ballou, D., Goldring, E., & Liu, K. (2006). *Magnet schools and student achievement.* National Center for the Study of Privatization in Education. NY: Teachers College, Columbia University.

Betts, J, Zau, A.C., & Rice, L.A. (2003). *Determinants of student achievement: New evidence from San Diego.* San Francisco, CA: Public Policy Institute of California.

Betts, J., Rice, L. A., Zau, A.C., Tang, Y. E. & Koedel, C. R. (2006). *Does school choice work?: Effects on student integration and achievement.* San Francisco, CA: Public Policy Institute of California.

Biegel, S. Annual Report No. 22 of the Consent Decree Monitor, 2004-2005 submitted in *San Francisco NAACP v. San Francisco Unified Sch. Dist.,* No. C-78 1445 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 1, 2005).

Bifulco, R., Cobb, C. D., Bell, C. (2008). *Do magnet schools outperform traditional public schools and reduce the achievement gap? The case of Connecticut's interdistrict magnet school program.* Occasional Paper No. 167. New York: National Center for the Study of Privatization in Education.

Blank, R. (1989). *Educational effects of magnet high schools.* Madison, WI: National Center on Effective Secondary Schools.

Blank, R. K., Dentler, R., Baltzell, D. C., Chabotar, K (1983*). Survey of magnet schools. Analyzing a model for quality integrated education.* Final Report of a National Study 10-11 (U.S. Dept. of Ed.).

Blank, R., Levine R., & Steele, L. (1996). After fifteen years: Magnet schools in urban education. In B. Fuller, R.F. Elmore, & G. Orfield (Eds.), *Who chooses? Who loses? Culture, institutions, and the unequal effects of school choice* (pp. 154-172). New York: Teachers College Press.

Booker, K., Sass, T.R., Gill, B., & Zimmer, R. (2008). *Going Beyond Test Scores: Evaluating Charter School Impact on Educational Attainment in Chicago and Florida.* Occasional Paper No. 169. New York: National Center for the Study of Privatization in Education.

Brian Ho v. San Francisco Unified School District, et al., 147 F.3d 854, (9th Cir. 1998).

Brief of the American Civil Liberties Union in Support of Respondents, *Parents Involved in Community Schs. v. Seattle Sch. Dist. No. 1 and Crystal D. Meredith v. Jefferson County Bd. of Educ.,* Nos. 05 908 & 05-915 (Sp. Ct. 2006) ("ACLU Brief").

Brief of the Swann Fellowship in Support of Respondents, *Parents Involved in Community Schs. v. Seattle Sch. Dist. No. 1 and Crystal D. Meredith v. Jefferson County Bd. of Educ.,* Nos. 05-908 & 05-915 (Sp. Ct. 2006) ("Swann Brief").

Center for Education Policy (2006, March). *From the capital to the classroom: Year 4 of the No Child Left Behind Act.* Washington, D.C.: Center for Education Policy.

Christenson, B., Eaton, M., Garet, M., Miller, L., Hikowa, H., DuBois, P. (2003). *Evaluation of the Magnet Schools Assistance Program* (U.S. Dept. of Ed., Office of the Under Secretary, Washington, D.C.)

Chubb, J. E. & Moe, T. M. (1990). *Politics, markets, and America's schools.* Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution.

Clinchy, E. (1993, December 8). Magnet schools matter. *Education Week.*

Cobb, C. D. & Glass G. V. (1999, January). Ethnic segregation in Arizona charter schools. *Education Policy Analysis Archives,* 7, No. 1.

Coleman, J. S., Campbell, E. Q., Hobson, C. J., McPartland, F., Mood, A. M., Weinfeld, F. D., et al. (1966). *Equality of educational opportunity.* Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Cookson, P. (1994). *School choice: The struggle for the soul of America education.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Crain, R. L. (1992). *The effectiveness of New York City's career magnet schools: An evaluation of ninth grade performance using an experimental design.* Berkeley, CA: National Center for Research in Vocational Education.

Cullen, J. B., Jacob, B. A., & Levitt, S. D. (2005, June). *The impact of school choice on student outcomes: An analysis of the Chicago Public Schools.* Journal of Public Economics, Elsevier, 89 (5-6), 729-760.

Dentler, R. A. (1991). *The national evidence on magnet schools.* Los Alamitos, California: Southwest Regional Laboratory for Educational Research and Development.

Doyle, M., Feldman, J., Ouimette, M., Wagner, S. & Tung, R. (2003, April). *Students speak: School choice in the Boston pilot high schools.* Paper presented at the meeting of the New England Educational Researchers Organization, Amherst, MA.

Eisenberg v. Montgomery County Public Schools, 197 F.3d 123 (4th Cir. 1999), *cert. denied,* 529 U.S. 1019 (2000).

Frankenberg, E. (2008). School Segregation, Desegregation, and Integration: What do these terms mean in a post-PICS, racially transitioning society? *Seattle Journal for Social Justice 6*(2): 553-590.

Frankenberg, E. & Le, C. Q. (forthcoming). The post-*Seattle/Louisville* challenge: Extra-legal obstacles to integration. *Ohio State Law Journal.*

Frankenberg, E. & Lee, C. (2003) *Charter schools and race: A lost opportunity for integrated education.* Education Policy Analysis Archives, 11, no. 32.

Frankenberg, E., with Siegel-Hawley, G. (January 2008). *Are Teachers Prepared for America's Diverse Schools? Teachers Describe their Preparation, Resources and Practices for Racially Diverse Schools.* Los Angeles: Civil Rights Project/ Proyecto Derechos Civiles.

Frey, W. H. (2001, June). *Melting pot suburbs: A census 2000 study of suburban diversity.* Census 2000 Series. The Brookings Institution Center on Urban and Metropolitan Policy.

Fuller, B., Elmore, R. F. & Orfield, G. (Eds). (1996). *Who chooses? Who loses? Culture, institutions, and the unequal effects of school choice.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Gamoran, A. (1996). Student achievement in public magnet, public comprehensive, and private city high schools. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 18, 1–18.

Garcia, D. (2008). *The impact of school choice on racial segregation in charter schools.* Educational Policy 22:805.

Glenn, C., McLaughlin, C, & Salganik, L. (1993). *Parent information for school choice: The case for Massachusetts.* Boston: Center on Families, Communities, Schools and Children's Learning.

Goldring, E., & Hausman, C. (1999). Reasons for parental choice in urban schools. *Journal of Education Policy,* 4(5), 469-490.

Goldring, E. & Smrekar, C. (2000). Magnet Schools and the Pursuit of Racial Balance. *Education andUrban Society,* 33(17).

Green v. County School Board of New Kent County, 391 U.S. 430 (1968).

Hoff, D. J. (2008, November 12). Obama gets to work on transition. *Education Week* 28 (12): 1, 24-25.

Holme, J. J. (2002, Summer). Buying homes, buying schools: School choice and the social construction of school quality. *Harvard Educational Review* 72: 177-205.

Institute on Race & Poverty. (forthcoming). *Failed Promises: Assessing Charter Schools in the Twin Cities.* Minneapolis, MN: Institute on Race & Poverty at University of Minnesota Law School.

Lee, C. (2006). *Denver public schools: Resegregation, Latino style.* Cambridge, MA: The Civil Rights Project at Harvard University.

Levine, R. (1997). *Research on Magnet Schools and the Context of School Choice.* Paper presented at the Citizens' Commission on Civil Rights Issues Forum: Magnet Schools and the Context of School Choice: Implications for Public Policy, April, Washington DC.

Linn, R. L., & Welner, K. G. (Eds.). (2007). *Race-conscious policies for assigning students to schools: Social science research and the Supreme Court cases.* Washington, DC: National Academy of Education.

Lissitz, R. W. (1992, January). *Assessment of student performance and attitude: St. Louis metropolitan area court ordered desegregation effort.* Report submitted to the Voluntary Interdistrict Coordinating Council. St. Louis: Voluntary Interdistrict Coordinating Council.

Ma, J. S. & Kurlaender, M. (2005). The future of race-conscious policies in K-12 public schools: Support from recent legal opinions and social science research. In J. C. Boger & G. Orfield (Eds.), *School resegregation: Must the south turn back?* (pp. 239-60). Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press.

Metz, M. H. (1986). *Different by design: The context and character of three magnet schools.* Boston, MA: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Milliken v. Bradley, 418 U.S. 717 (1974).

Ming, R. (2000). Desegregation in a diverse and competitive environment: Admissions at Lowell High School. *Urban Education,* 37, 173-192.

Missouri v. Jenkins, 515 U.S. 70 (1995).

Morantz, A. (1996). Money and choice in Kansas City: Major investments with modest returns. In G. Orfield & S. E. Eaton (Eds.), *Dismantling desegregation: The quiet reversal of Brown vs. Board of Education* (pp. 241–263). New York: The New Press.

Morgan v. Kerrigan, 421 U.S. 963 (1975).

Orfield, G. (1969). *The reconstruction of southern education: The schools and the 1964 Civil Rights Act.* New York: Wiley Interscience.

Orfield, G. (1978). *Must we bus? Segregated schools and national policy.* Washington D.C.: The Brookings Institution.

Orfield, G. (1996). Turning back to segregation. In G. Orfield & S. E. Eaton (Eds.), *Dismantling desegregation: The quiet reversal of Brown vs. Board of Education* (pp. 1–22). New York: The New Press.

Orfield, G. (2007). Prologue: Lessons Forgotten. In E. Frankenberg & G. Orfield (Eds.), *Lessons in integration: Realizing the promise of racial diversity in American schools* (pp. 1-6). Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press.

Orfield, G. & Eaton, S. E. (1996). *Dismantling desegregation: The quiet reversal of Brown v. Board of Education.* New York: The New Press.

Orfield, G., Frankenberg, E., & Garces, L. M. (2008). Statement of American Social Scientists of Research on School Desegregation to the U.S. Supreme Court in *Parents v. Seattle School District and Meredith v. Jefferson County. Urban Review* 40: 96-136.

Orfield, G. & Lee, C. (2005). *Why segregation matters: Poverty and educational inequality.* Cambridge, MA: The Civil Rights Project at Harvard University.

Orfield, G. & Lee, C. (2007). *Historic reversals, accelerating resegregation, and the need for new integration strategies.* Los Angeles: The Civil Rights Project/ Proyecto Derechos Civiles, UCLA.

Parents Involved in Community Schools, Petitioner v. Seattle School District No. 1, et al.; Meredith v. Jefferson County Board of Education, 551 U.S. (2007).

Poppell, J. and Hague, S. (2001, April). *Examining indicators to assess the overall effectiveness of magnet schools: A study of magnet schools in Jacksonville, Florida.* Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, Seattle, Washington, 10-14.

Raffel, J. A. (1998). *Historical dictionary of school segregation and desegregation: The American experience.* Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Raywid, M. A. (1989). *The case for public schools of choice.* Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.

Rossell, C. H. (2005, Spring). Magnet Schools: No Longer Famous, But Still Intact. *Education Next,* 44-45.

Smrekar, C., & Goldring, E. (1999). *School Choice in Urban America: Magnet Schools and the Pursuit of Equity.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Steele, L. & Eaton, M. (1996). *Reducing, Eliminating, and Preventing Minority Isolation in American Schools: The Impact of the Magnet Schools Assistance Program.* American Institutes for Research, U.S. Dept. of Ed., Office of the Under Secretary, Washington, D.C.

Steele, L. & Levine, R. (1994). *Educational innovations in multiracial contexts: The growth of magnet schools in American education,* 49-50 (U.S. Dept. of Ed., Office of the Under Secretary).

Sunderman, G. L., Kim, J. S., and Orfield, G. (2005). *NCLB meets school realities: Lessons from the field.* Thousands Oak, CA: Corwin Press.

Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg, 402 U.S. 1 (1971)

Tung, R. & Ouimette, M. (2007). *Strong results, high demand: A four year study of Boston's pilot high schools.* Boston, MA: Center for Collaborative Education.

Tuttle v. Arlington County School Board, 195 F.3d 698 (4th Cir. 1999) (per curiam), *cert. dismissed,* 529 U.S. 1050 (2000).

Wells, A. S. (1996). African-American students' views of choice. In B. Fuller, R. Elmore, & G. Orfield, *Who chooses? Who loses? Culture, institutions, and the unequal effects of school choice* (pp. 25-49). New York: Teachers College Press.

Wells, A. S. and Crain, R. (1997). *Stepping Over the Color Line: African-American Students in White Suburban Schools.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Wells, A. S., Holme, J. J., Lopez, A., & Cooper, C. W. (2000). Charter schools and racial and social class segregation: Yet another sorting machine? In R. Kahlenberg (Ed.), *A notion at risk: Preserving education as an engine for social mobility* (pp. 169-222). New York, NY: Century Foundation Press.

Wessman v. Gittens, 160 F.3d 790 (1st Cir. 1998).

Appendix

Further analysis of NCES Common Core Data, 2005-06, finds important differences in racial composition and segregation among public, magnet, and charter schools at the regional and state level.

Racial Composition of Students in Public, Magnet & Charter Schools

In each region of the country, magnet school students out-number charter school students. The gap is particularly large in the South. Further, the percentage of white magnet schools students in the South most closely approximates the percentage of white students among all public school students (excluding Alaska). In the West and the Northeast, the percentage of white charter school students is higher than the percentage of white magnet school students. In fact, charter schools in the West have a higher percentage of white students than all public schools, which is contrary to the nation-wide trend in racial composition.

Table A-1: Public School Enrollments by Race/Ethnicity and Region, 2005-06

Region	% White	% Black	% Latino	% Asian	% American Indian	Total (by Region)
West	45.3	6.5	37.8	8.3	2.1	11,356,210
Border	67.6	21.2	5.3	2.3	3.7	3,530,810
Midwest	73.3	14.9	8.1	2.7	0.9	9,756,674
South	49.6	26.8	20.6	2.5	0.4	15,382,983
Northeast	64.5	15.6	14.4	5.2	0.3	8,240,086
Alaska	57.7	4.6	4.2	6.9	26.6	133,292
Hawaii	19.8	2.3	4.5	72.7	0.6	184,925
Total	57.1	17.2	19.8	4.6	1.2	48,584,980

Table adapted from Orfield & Lee, 2007.

Table A-2: Magnet School Students, 2005-06, by Race/Ethnicity and Region

Region		White	Black	Latino	Asian	American Indian	Total
West	Number	129,578	80,744	370,544	75,011	5,159	661,036
	%	19.6	12.2	56.1	11.3	1.0	100.0
Border	Number	29,889	26,411	2,474	1,690	146	60,610
	%	49.3	43.6	4.1	2.8	.02	100.0
Midwest	Number	185,841	165,238	97,924	20,610	3,841	473,454
	%	39.3	34.9	20.7	4.4	.1	100.0
South	Number	273,694	323,080	99,778	28,798	1,943	727,293
	%	37.6	44.4	13.7	4.0	.03	100.0
Northeast	Number	39,603	69,677	39,508	6,710	980	156,478
	%	25.3	44.5	25.2	4.3	.1	100.0
Alaska	Number	2,662	341	392	327	687	4,409
	%	60.4	7.7	8.9	7.4	15.6	100.0
Total	Number	661,267	665,491	610,620	133,146	12,756	2,083,280
	%	31.7	31.9	29.3	6.4	0.6	

Table A-3: Charter School Students, 2005-06, by Race/Ethnicity and Region

Region		White	Black	Latino	Asian	American Indian	Total
West	Number	180,151	35,154	121,173	17,020	9,190	362,688
	%	49.7	9.7	33.4	4.7	2.5	100.0
Border	Number	6,749	30,441	4,086	641	325	42,242
	%	16.0	72.1	9.7	1.5	1.0	100.0
Midwest	Number	87,255	118,773	17,183	6,512	2,057	231,780
	%	37.6	51.2	7.4	2.8	1.0	100.0
South	Number	88,778	77,981	62,457	4,564	1,016	234,796
	%	37.8	33.2	26.7	1.9	.04	100.0
Northeast	Number	37,960	59,229	18,653	2,818	312	118,972
	%	32.0	49.8	15.7	2.4	.03	100.0
Alaska	Number	3,183	191	187	193	906	4,660
	%	68.3	4.1	4.1	4.1	19.4	100.0
Hawaii	Number	1,924	104	257	4,123	90	6,498
	%	29.6	1.6	4.0	63.5	1.4	100.0
Total	Number	406,000	321,873	223,996	35,871	13,896	1,001,637
	%	40.5	32.1	22.4	3.6	1.4	

Table A-4: Enrollment & Racial Composition of Students in Magnet Schools by State, 2005-06

State	White	Black	Latino	Asian	American Indian	Total
Alabama	33.3	62.7	1.2	2.5	0.3	19,002
Alaska	60.4	7.7	8.9	7.4	15.6	4,409
Arkansas	28.9	65.6	2.8	2.2	0.4	7,104
Arizona	54.3	6.4	31.9	2.7	4.8	33,845
California	17.2	12.6	57.8	11.9	0.6	621,020
Colorado	69.8	5.1	18	6	1.1	3,384
Connecticut	29.9	44.9	22.5	2.3	0.4	15,527
District of Columbia	11.3	79.3	5.7	3.7	0.1	1,149
Delaware	80.6	14	3.9	1	0.5	1,188
Florida	37.7	38.6	20.8	2.6	0.2	312,900
Georgia	25.5	67.3	4.6	2.4	0.2	57,933
Illinois	15.1	45.4	34.9	4.4	0.2	237,366
Indiana	39.6	51.2	8	0.9	0.3	13,178
Kansas	49.4	25.4	17.9	5.3	2	9,878
Kentucky	62.9	30.7	3.4	2.9	0.1	39,067
Louisiana	26.6	70.2	1	2.1	0.2	39,451
Massachusetts	40.3	11.7	44.4	3.6	0	1,156
Maine	94.3	0	1.9	3.8	0	105
Michigan	70.7	21.7	4.1	2.2	1.3	181,496
Minnesota	35.6	28.3	15.5	18	2.7	29,707
Missouri	22	69.5	5.3	2.6	0.5	19,206
Mississippi	26.9	70.5	1.2	1.3	0.2	4,658
North Carolina	37.6	48.3	9.4	4.3	0.4	106,453
New Mexico	43.3	1.5	45.5	2.2	7.5	134
New York	21.8	43.1	30.2	4.1	0.8	112,985
Pennsylvania	36.6	51.8	5	6.4	0.2	26,705
South Carolina	38.2	55.6	3.4	2.7	0.2	18,758
Tennessee	36	59	2.3	2.6	0.2	16,592
Utah	76	2.5	14.8	5.3	1.5	2,653
Virginia	46.7	30.5	13.9	8.6	0.3	144,442
Wisconsin	59.3	21.9	14.3	3.9	0.6	1,829

Table A-5: Enrollment & Racial Composition of Students in Charter Schools by State, 2005-06

State	White	Black	Latino	Asian	American Indian	Total
Alaska	68.3	4.1	4	4.1	19.4	4,660
Arkansas	65.6	30.2	2.5	1.3	0.4	4,006
Arizona	53.1	6.7	32.4	2.4	5.5	90,597
California	39.9	12.5	39.7	6.6	1.3	189,552
Colorado	64.5	8.7	22.2	3.4	1.2	44,254
Connecticut	20.4	57.3	20.7	1.2	0.4	2,927
District of Columbia	1.6	84.8	12.9	0.5	0.2	17,260
Delaware	52.1	40.6	2.6	4.2	0.4	6,566
Florida	44.9	24.2	28.9	1.6	0.3	92,335
Georgia	47.2	37.9	10.1	4.6	0.2	25,484
Hawaii	29.6	1.6	4	63.5	1.4	6,498
Iowa	58.5	26.3	13.7	1.3	0.2	520
Idaho	93.4	1	3.3	1.5	0.8	8,003
Illinois	7.5	65.1	25.6	1.7	0.1	16,637
Indiana	35.8	58.6	4.9	0.5	0.2	7,409
Kansas	82.5	5.9	7.8	1.5	2.2	1,886
Louisiana	25.2	70.5	2.2	1.7	0.4	8,315
Massachusetts	47.7	26.5	21	4.4	0.4	21,168
Maryland	21.3	71.9	5.1	0.8	1	3,363
Michigan	35.4	55.7	5.4	2.6	0.9	91,145
Minnesota	47.6	30.3	7.4	11	3.6	20,603
Missouri	9.4	83.7	5.1	1.6	0.2	10,972
Mississippi	56.1	39.3	1.9	2.7	0	374
North Carolina	58.9	34.7	3.5	1.5	1.3	27,441
New Hampshire	97.5	1.5	0.5	0.5	0	200
New Jersey	9.9	66.7	20.9	2.5	0.1	14,937
New Mexico	35.1	3	53.5	1.6	6.8	8,595
Nevada	60.6	15.1	18.4	3.9	2	4,818
New York	12.7	67.7	17.9	1.4	0.3	21,539
Ohio	41.9	54.7	2.8	0.4	0.2	66,130
Oklahoma	31.9	37.6	23.3	2.1	5.1	4,081
Oregon	82.1	4.6	5.8	2.9	4.6	5,192
Pennsylvania	39.7	48.2	9.9	2	0.2	55,630
Rhode Island	29.9	23.6	42.5	3.1	0.9	2,571
South Carolina	57.1	40.3	1.4	0.8	0.3	4,051
Tennessee	1.5	97.6	0.9	0.1	0	1,685
Texas	16.5	36.5	44.9	1.7	0.3	70,895
Utah	87.6	1.6	6.3	3.1	1.4	11,439
Virginia	66.7	31.4	0.5	1	0.5	210
Wisconsin	42.7	37	14.8	4.5	1	27,450
Wyoming	52.1	1.7	6.3	0	39.9	238

Racial Segregation of Students in Public, Magnet & Charter Schools

Table A-6: Percentage of Latino students in 90-100% minority schools by state & type of school, 2005-06

State	% of Latino students in Public Schools (excluding magnets & charters)	% of Latino Magnet Students	% of Latino Charter Students
Nation	38.4	51.8	47.5
Alabama	8.2	12.7	n/a
Alaska	1.6	0.3	0.0
Arkansas	2.2	16.3	1.0
Arizona	34.6	10.0	33.0
California	48.4	58.2	51.7
Colorado	17.7	0.0	18.5
Connecticut	25.5	21.2	63.6
District of Columbia	81.7	66.2	93.2
Delaware	4.8	0.0	33.1
Florida	25.3	48.5	25.3
Georgia	23.4	10.4	32.9
Hawaii	11.3	n/a	9.7
Iowa	0.0	n/a	0.0
Idaho	0.1	n/a	0.0
Illinois	38.9	61.7	93.2
Indiana	7.4	16.4	29.1
Kansas	6.7	0.0	0.0
Kentucky	0.0	0.0	n/a
Louisiana	6.7	10.1	36.4
Massachusetts	21.1	0.0	37.7
Maryland	28.5	n/a	56.5
Maine	0.0	0.0	n/a
Michigan	9.7	18.5	45.6
Minnesota	4.4	31.2	57.3
Missouri	6.6	8.6	68.1
Mississippi	9.4	11.1	0.0
Montana	0.3	n/a	n/a
North Carolina	9.1	28.0	44.8
North Dakota	0.8	n/a	n/a
Nebraska	2.1	n/a	n/a
New Hampshire	0.0	n/a	0.0
New Jersey	40.9	n/a	83.5
New Mexico	30.4	39.3	35.3
Nevada	14.5	n/a	21.2
New York	59.8	43.5	73.3
Ohio	4.1	n/a	16.0
Oklahoma	4.4	n/a	2.5
Oregon	0.3	n/a	1.3
Pennsylvania	26.1	15.2	60.2
Rhode Island	31.9	n/a	12.3
South Carolina	2.9	22.7	15.5
South Dakota	0.1	n/a	n/a
Tennessee	9.0	22.1	100.0
Texas	50.4	n/a	72.0
Utah	0.7	18.6	0.0
Virginia	2.9	5.7	0.0
Vermont	0.0	n/a	n/a
Washington	10.3	n/a	n/a
Wisconsin	14.4	0.0	49.4
West Virginia	0.0	n/a	n/a
Wyoming	0.1	n/a	26.7

Table A-7: Latino Exposure to White Students by State and Type of Public School, 2005-06

State	% White in School of Average Latino Student in Public Schools (excluding magnets & charters)	% White in School of the Average Latino Magnet Student	% White in School of the Average Latino Charter Student
Nation	31.2	16.8	23.6
Alabama	61.8	44.4	n/a
Alaska	56.8	48.4	68.3
Arkansas	57.9	29.8	55.3
Arizona	28.7	40.2	30.5
California	18.9	12.1	22.1
Colorado	41.1	56.2	39.9
Connecticut	35.7	29.5	16.1
District of Columbia	5.7	12.6	2.3
Delaware	45.2	79.1	51.8
Florida	33.1	24.0	29.2
Georgia	39.0	33.4	32.2
Hawaii	22.8	n/a	33.8
Iowa	68.0	n/a	23.8
Idaho	70.7	n/a	91.8
Illinois	31.9	13.3	4.3
Indiana	58.7	39.2	45.0
Kansas	48.3	39.9	56.4
Kentucky	71.9	55.7	n/a
Louisiana	48.7	40.8	30.9
Massachusetts	39.7	37.0	22.7
Maryland	30.6	n/a	28.8
Maine	89.9	94.3	n/a
Michigan	58.4	51.7	32.5
Minnesota	65.2	24.9	21.5
Missouri	65.5	23.2	11.5
Mississippi	54.6	36.6	56.1
Montana	83.7	n/a	n/a
North Carolina	47.5	31.0	36.1
North Dakota	84.8	n/a	n/a
Nebraska	53.9	n/a	n/a
New Hampshire	81.9	n/a	93.8
New Jersey	28.2	n/a	8.1
New Mexico	24.4	36.5	25.9
Nevada	33.0	n/a	53.2
New York	19.3	17.5	9.5
Ohio	62.6	n/a	44.7
Oklahoma	46.9	n/a	30.0
Oregon	59.8	n/a	75.9
Pennsylvania	40.1	28.1	19.9
Rhode Island	28.8	n/a	16.9
South Carolina	53.3	32.5	60.5
South Dakota	82.0	n/a	n/a
Tennessee	56.4	33.9	1.9
Texas	20.2	n/a	11.0
Utah	64.5	62.2	80.9
Virginia	48.1	37.5	94.4
Vermont	93.6	n/a	n/a
Washington	48.7	n/a	n/a
Wisconsin	54.8	54.1	25.4
West Virginia	86.3	n/a	n/a
Wyoming	79.5	n/a	65.6

Table A-8: Percentage of Black Students in 90-100% Minority Schools, by State & Type of School, 2005-06

State	% of Black students in Public Schools (excluding magnets & charters)	% of Black Magnet Students	% of Black Charter Students
Nation	36.1	47.3	69.1
Alabama	44.6	56.4	n/a
Alaska	2.2	0.3	2.6
Arkansas	21.1	29.7	20.2
Arizona	15.4	4.3	18.5
California	35.2	57.4	54.3
Colorado	14.3	0.0	25.4
Connecticut	29.9	31.0	82.6
District of Columbia	90.7	77.5	97.6
Delaware	3.1	0.0	77.4
Florida	29.2	41.1	39.7
Georgia	38.5	57.2	44.0
Hawaii	8.0	n/a	8.7
Iowa	1.4	n/a	0.0
Idaho	0.0	n/a	0.0
Illinois	54.1	81.7	96.1
Indiana	21.2	45.7	75.4
Kansas	6.9	0.0	0.0
Kentucky	0.0	0.0	n/a
Louisiana	29.2	58.3	74.3
Massachusetts	24.3	0.0	56.9
Maryland	52.3	n/a	83.1
Maine	0.0	n/a	77.5
Michigan	56.7	50.4	n/a
Minnesota	10.2	26.9	73.9
Missouri	40.3	33.9	87.1
Mississippi	45.2	49.5	0.0
Montana	0.2	n/a	n/a
North Carolina	13.4	31.0	51.7
North Dakota	0.5	n/a	n/a
Nebraska	6.4	n/a	n/a
New Hampshire	0.0	n/a	0.0
New Jersey	46.4	n/a	93.5
New Mexico	8.8	0.0	26.1
Nevada	9.9	n/a	56.1
New York	62.9	44.6	83.0
Ohio	35.6	n/a	62.6
Oklahoma	13.5	n/a	50.5
Oregon	4.5	n/a	35.4
Pennsylvania	46.3	22.5	71.5
Rhode Island	18.8	n/a	3.6
South Carolina	18.2	19.1	32.5
South Dakota	0.1	n/a	n/a
Tennessee	44.3	33.0	100.0
Texas	36.7	n/a	82.5
Utah	0.1	4.6	0.0
Virginia	15.4	11.7	86.4
Vermont	0.0	n/a	n/a
Washington	7.3	n/a	n/a
Wisconsin	36.9	0.0	78.6
West Virginia	0.0	n/a	n/a
Wyoming	0.0	n/a	0.0

Table A-9: Black Student Exposure to White Students by State & Type of Public School, 2005-06

State	% White in School of Average Black Student in Public Schools (excluding magnets & charters)	% White in School of the Average Black Magnet Student	% White in School of the Average Black Charter Student
Nation	28.0	20.1	14.4
Alabama	30.0	22.0	n/a
Alaska	53.9	57.1	66.3
Arkansas	36.8	24.8	25.8
Arizona	40.8	42.7	40.7
California	22.8	12.9	21.2
Colorado	43.3	61.0	31.8
Connecticut	33.8	21.9	8.2
District of Columbia	2.5	9.9	1.2
Delaware	48.0	77.7	18.1
Florida	34.2	24.7	26.6
Georgia	28.8	14.3	24.3
Hawaii	29.9	n/a	37.4
Iowa	69.2	n/a	43.6
Idaho	82.9	n/a	91.8
Illinois	23.3	6.0	4.2
Indiana	41.4	26.3	12.5
Kansas	51.3	42.8	61.4
Kentucky	65.3	56.0	n/a
Louisiana	32.6	15.5	11.1
Massachusetts	38.6	40.7	19.6
Maryland	22.3	n/a	8.0
Maine	83.4	n/a	n/a
Michigan	24.9	21.9	10.2
Minnesota	51.8	24.3	13.4
Missouri	36.2	19.1	6.8
Mississippi	25.8	18.7	56.1
Montana	84.6	n/a	n/a
North Carolina	40.6	28.3	25.3
North Dakota	86.6	n/a	n/a
Nebraska	49.1	n/a	n/a
New Hampshire	85.0	n/a	93.6
New Jersey	26.0	n/a	3.6
New Mexico	36.8	44.3	31.1
Nevada	35.5	n/a	30.3
New York	18.3	17.1	6.7
Ohio	34.1	n/a	16.2
Oklahoma	41.9	n/a	16.2
Oregon	56.2	n/a	50.8
Pennsylvania	31.1	27.6	14.1
Rhode Island	39.4	n/a	16.9
South Carolina	38.8	31.0	38.3
South Dakota	81.3	n/a	n/a
Tennessee	29.9	23.0	1.5
Texas	26.6	n/a	8.0
Utah	70.4	72.9	84.7
Virginia	40.5	33.1	20.2
Vermont	90.2	n/a	n/a
Washington	52.9	n/a	n/a
Wisconsin	33.0	45.2	10.5
West Virginia	78.6	n/a	89.0
Wyoming	79.3	n/a	66.3

Table A-10: Relationship between Racial and Socioeconomic Composition of Students in Charter Schools, 2005-06

Percentage of students who are low-income	Percentage of students who are black & Latino:										
	0-10%	10-20%	20-30%	30-40%	40-50%	50-60%	60-70%	70-80%	80-90%	90-100%	Total
0-25%	404	203	121	84	55	54	39	42	52	204	1,258
	54.4	**46.9**	**40.5**	**35.2**	**26.8**	**33.8**	**25.8**	**21.2**	**21.7**	**20.4**	**34.3**
25-50%	110	82	59	33	25	6	8	11	10	13	357
	14.8	**18.9**	**19.7**	**13.8**	**12.2**	**3.8**	**5.3**	**5.6**	**4.2**	**1.3**	**9.7**
50-75%	121	93	70	65	50	35	25	23	27	61	570
	16.3	**21.5**	**23.4**	**27.2**	**24.4**	**21.9**	**16.6**	**11.6**	**11.3**	**6.1**	**15.5**
75-100%	108	55	49	57	75	65	79	122	151	723	1,484
	14.5	**12.7**	**16.4**	**23.9**	**36.6**	**40.6**	**52.3**	**61.6**	**62.9**	**72.2**	**40.5**
Total	743	433	299	239	205	160	151	198	240	1,001	3,669
	20.3	11.8	8.2	6.5	5.59	4.4	4.1	5.4	6.5	27.3	100
	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Table A-11: Relationship between Racial and Socioeconomic Composition of Students in Magnet Schools, 2005-06

Percentage of students who are low-income	Percentage of Students who are black & Latino										
	0-10%	10-20%	20-30%	30-40%	40-50%	50-60%	60-70%	70-80%	80-90%	90-100%	Total
0-25%	104	56	30	17	13	12	9	9	9	16	275
	32.4	**35.9**	**16.0**	**8.4**	**6.0**	**5.0**	**3.5**	**3.7**	**3.3**	**2.7**	**10.3**
25-50%	64	48	73	54	26	11	6	3	0	1	286
	19.9	**30.8**	**38.8**	**26.7**	**11.9**	**4.6**	**2.3**	**1.2**	**0**	**0.2**	**10.7**
50-75%	106	31	61	100	105	94	68	35	18	29	647
	33.0	**19.9**	**32.5**	**49.5**	**48.2**	**39.5**	**26.5**	**14.5**	**6.7**	**4.9**	**24.1**
75-100%	47	21	24	31	74	121	174	195	243	545	1,475
	14.6	**13.5**	**12.8**	**15.4**	**33.9**	**50.8**	**67.7**	**80.6**	**90.0**	**92.2**	**55.0**
Total	321	156	188	202	218	238	257	242	270	591	2,683
	12.0	5.8	7.0	7.5	8.1	8.9	9.6	9.0	10.1	22.0	100
	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100