SUMMARY

The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) provides an opening for states and local school districts to include racial and socioeconomic (SES) diversity as components of their improvement plans.

While only one state (New York) took advantage of this opportunity in the initial round of state ESSA plans, there are several ways that school districts can include integration and reduction of racial or SES isolation into their local ESSA implementation plans, consistent with the goals set out in their state plans.

Two of the most important planning documents are the Title I Comprehensive Support and Improvement Plans and the Targeted Support and Improvement Plans. Title IV of ESSA is also a potential source of integration-related funds for districts.

This guide explores some of the openings that are most apparent to the National Coalition on School Diversity (NCSD). We hope that sharing these ideas will help state and local leaders and advocates generate even more ideas.
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The purpose of district ESSA plans is to identify and remedy opportunity and outcome gaps in each state’s elementary and secondary public schools. School diversity is relevant to these goals, because racial and economic integration is one of the most effective strategies for achieving equal opportunity and closing the achievement gap. Where school integration is feasible (where there is a diverse student body within the district, or where meaningful interdistrict cooperation is possible), school district officials should seek to maximize diversity within schools and classrooms.

Integrated schools and classrooms offer a host of educational, social, and psychological benefits to students of all backgrounds. School integration is associated with higher achievement in mathematics, science, language, and reading; higher rates of high school graduation and college attendance; reduced levels of racial and ethnic prejudice; an increase in cross-racial trust and friendships among youth and adults; and a greater likelihood of living and working in integrated neighborhoods and workplaces as an adult. Conversely, policies that concentrate low-income children of color into separate schools deprive them of equal educational opportunity.

Notably, the benefits of attending desegregated schools are intergenerational and multi-faceted, extending from grandparents who attended desegregated schools, through their own children and down to their grandchildren. Students from all racial and SES backgrounds benefit from diverse schools. Low-income and disadvantaged youth of color benefit the most, but middle class white youth also benefit. Benefits accrue to all students in all grades, but are greatest in middle and high school years, suggesting that the benefits cumulate over time. The benefits of racial diversity overlap with those of SES diversity, but each offers unique effects for learners.
WHAT DOES INTEGRATION LOOK LIKE IN 2020?

As districts decide whether to include integration strategies in their ESSA plans, they are likely to begin with an exploration of the question: “What is integration?”

Integration, narrowly speaking, is the practice of bringing together students from different races, ethnicities, and socioeconomic backgrounds in an attempt to address systemic educational inequities and foster social cohesion across lines of difference. The hope is that diverse communities will work in relationship to share power and resources more equitably. Integration strategies grow out of a desire to acknowledge and directly address the many ways that segregation has shaped the landscape of opportunity throughout our nation’s history.

Integration strategies often relate to policies that determine how students are assigned to specific schools and programs. For example, districts might consider diversity when drawing school attendance boundaries or implement a "controlled choice" plan. Educators might also offer magnet schools, intentionally diverse charters, or interdistrict transfer programs to help facilitate diversity.
Of course, achieving a diverse student body is only one step in a larger process of ensuring that all students have access to inclusive, equitable, and high quality schools.

As a whole, the school integration field strongly supports a holistic, intentional approach to integration. Several NCSD members have established frameworks to help educators organize integration work.

Two of the more well known integration frameworks are the “ABCDs of Integration” (created by the Reimagining Integration: Diverse and Equitable Schools,\textsuperscript{10} or “RIDES” project at Harvard Graduate School of Education) and the “5Rs of Real Integration” (created by IntegrateNYC\textsuperscript{11} students). These frameworks may prove helpful to educators working to incorporate integration strategies into their ESSA plans.

The ABCD model grew out of the recognition that there is a difference between a “desegregated” school and a truly “integrated” one.

rides.gse.harvard.edu
WHILE THE 5Rs OF REAL INTEGRATION were developed by students in NYC in the past few years, they harken back to the so-called “Green factors” adopted by the federal courts in the 1960s and 70s for defining a fully integrated school system. The Green factors included measures of equity in facilities, student, faculty and staff assignments, transportation, and extracurricular activities. See Green v. County School Board of New Kent County, 390 U.S. 936 (1968).
There are a host of resources available to educators looking for guidance on how to craft and implement integration strategies in a holistic, aligned way. One particularly important element in successfully integrated schools is the elimination or limiting of student tracking.\textsuperscript{12}

In addition to IntegrateNYC and RIDES, the Reimagining Education project at Teachers College, Columbia University offers annual conferences for educators. Federally-funded Equity Assistance Centers are also a cost-free resource for school districts seeking assistance on integration strategies.\textsuperscript{13}

**RESOURCES**

**LOOKING FOR GUIDANCE ON INTEGRATION STRATEGIES?**

- **INTEGRATENYC** is a “youth-led organization that stands for integration and equity in New York City schools.”
  Website: integratenyc.org

- **THE REIMAGINING INTEGRATION: DIVERSE AND EQUITABLE SCHOOLS** (“RIDES”) project serves education practitioners working to move from desegregation to true integration.
  Website: rides.gse.harvard.edu

- The **REIMAGINING EDUCATION SUMMER INSTITUTE** is an annual conference for educators, policy makers, parents, and other K-12 stakeholders hosted at Columbia University’s Teachers College. Institute participants "explore opportunities and challenges of creating and sustaining racially, ethnically and socio-economically integrated schools."
  Website: tc.columbia.edu/conferences/reimagining-education

- An **Equity-Based Framework for Achieving Integrated Schooling: A Framework for School Districts and Communities in Designing Racially and Economically Integrated Schools** is available at idraeacsouth.org/equity-based-framework-achieving-integrated-schooling. This tool was published by the **INTERCULTURAL DEVELOPMENT RESEARCH ASSOCIATION (EAC-SOUTH)** in 2018.

Under the Obama Administration, we saw leaders at the federal level recognizing the value of racial and socioeconomic integration in closing the achievement gap and bringing students together across difference. While the current Administration has sought to roll back progress on school diversity, educators and policymakers can build on this existing legacy for the benefit of all students. Despite the current Administration’s rescission of the 2011 Joint Department of Education and Department of Justice “Voluntary Use of Race Guidance,” the underlying law has not changed. In Parents Involved in Community Schools v. Seattle School District No. 1 (“Parents Involved”), a majority of the Supreme Court recognized that seeking diversity and avoiding racial isolation are compelling interests for school districts, and that school districts can voluntarily adopt measures to pursue these goals. The 2011 DOE/DOJ guidance is still an excellent tool for ensuring compliance with the law. For reference, we have archived this guidance at school-diversity.org/postpicsresources.
BACKGROUND

Title I is the primary source of federal funds for local education. It “provides financial assistance to local educational agencies and schools with high numbers or high percentages of children from low-income families to help ensure that all children meet challenging state academic standards,”\(^1\) based on a formula that directs funds to districts with the greatest weighted need, based on their concentrations of low income children.

Title I is designed to offer additional resources to schools to counteract the effects of poverty and work toward the goal of closing educational achievement gaps.\(^2\) While Title I is comprised of four parts,\(^3\) this guide primarily focuses on Part A and, to a lesser extent, Part B.

Under ESSA, states were given the ability to tailor their accountability plans to address the particular conditions affecting students’ success and to help them collect meaningful data. Each statewide assessment system was required to include five indicators, which are listed in the graphic to the right.

Once state plans have been approved by the Department of Education, state education agencies (“SEAs”) must identify underperforming schools eligible for support based on their accountability systems indicators. Under ESSA, three types of school designations qualify schools for support.
THE THREE TYPES OF SCHOOLS ELIGIBLE FOR SUPPORT

**COMPREHENSIVE SUPPORT & IMPROVEMENT (CSI)**
- The lowest-performing 5% of all Title I schools according to the SEA’s accountability system indicators,
- All high schools with 67% or less graduation rate, and
- Additional Targeted Support and Improvement schools that do not meet exit criteria within a state-determined number of years.

*This identification must be done by SEAs no less than once every three years.*

**TARGETED SUPPORT & IMPROVEMENT (TSI)**
- Any school with a subgroup of students that is “consistently underperforming” as determined by the state’s Annual Meaningful Differentiation methodology. SEAs must identify TSI schools annually.

**ADDITIONAL TARGETED SUPPORT & IMPROVEMENT (ATSI)**
- Schools that are identified by a state when any subgroup of students would, on its own, lead to identification for CSI.

ONCE SCHOOLS HAVE BEEN IDENTIFIED, the responsibility shifts to school districts (called local education agencies or “LEAs” in the statute) to submit their School Improvement Plans.
WHAT ARE DISTRICT SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLANS?

If the state has identified underperforming schools in a local school district, there are two types of plans that the districts/LEAs can submit to receive Title I funding: Comprehensive Support and Improvement Plans and Targeted Support and Improvement Plans.

Once each state has identified its underperforming schools, LEAs may apply for SEA Title I subgrants by submitting plans to improve school performance. These plans must address deficiencies in student performance that are identified as a result of the SEA accountability system and must be approved by the SEA before funds can be disbursed.

The requirements and process vary between the types of plans:

**COMPREHENSIVE SUPPORT & IMPROVEMENT PLANS** are developed by LEAs for schools within their district that have been identified for comprehensive support and improvement by the SEA.

+ Be informed by all indicators the SEA has included in its accountability system
+ Be developed in consultation with principals, educators, and parents
+ Use evidence-based practices
+ Be based on a school-level needs assessment
+ Identify resource inequities
+ Be approved by the school, the LEA, and the SEA
+ Be monitored and periodically reviewed by the SEA

**TARGETED SUPPORT & IMPROVEMENT PLANS** are developed by each school that has been identified for targeted support and additional support and must be approved by the school’s LEA.

+ Be informed by all indicators the SEA has included in its accountability system for each subgroup
+ Be developed in consultation with principals, educators, and parents
+ Include evidence-based interventions
+ Be monitored, upon submission and implementation, by the LEA
+ For Additional Targeted Support & Improvement schools, resource inequities must also be identified.
When making School Improvement Fund grants to LEAs, SEAs are responsible for ensuring that the funding goes to schools that represent the geographic diversity of a state, and that the grants are large enough for the LEAs to make the necessary impact. As part of these requirements, SEAs must not only report all LEAs and schools that received funds, including the types of strategies implemented, it must also provide evidence of how it prioritizes districts that:

- Have high numbers of identified schools;
- Show greatest need for funds;
- Show the strongest commitment to using funds to improve achievement and outcomes.

**USE AND DISBURSEMENT OF SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS AND DIRECT SERVICES FUNDS**

Once one or both of these plans have been submitted, SEAs may award funds to LEAs for school improvement pursuant to the plans. SEAs may award both School Improvement funds and Direct Student Services funds in response to these plans.

**SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS**

ESSA requires SEAs to set aside at least 7% of their Title I funds for School Improvement purposes to provide additional support for districts and schools identified as underperforming.

SEAs must:

A. Use at least 95% of this money to either:

1) Make grants to LEAs on a formula or competitive basis to schools implementing evidence-based comprehensive support and improvement activities or targeted support and improvement activities; or

2) Directly provide for these activities, or work with other entities “with expertise in using evidence-based strategies to improve student achievement, instruction, and schools” to provide for these activities (the SEA must get approval from the LEA for this use of funds).

B. Use the remaining funds to:

1) establish a method for allocating these funds;
2) monitor and evaluate the use of funds; 3) reduce barriers and provide operational flexibility for schools receiving funds.

**DIRECT STUDENTS SERVICES FUNDS**

In addition to School Improvement funds, ESSA allows SEAs to set aside 3% of their Title I funds for Direct Student Services, which expand access to advanced coursework and instructional options.

Like School Improvement funds, in distributing Direct Student Services funds, SEAs must prioritize LEAs serving the highest percentage of schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement or implementing targeted support and improvement plans.
INCORPORATING INTEGRATION STRATEGIES INTO TITLE I SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLANS

The absence of integration-explicit metrics, goals, and strategies in a state’s ESSA plan does not eliminate a district’s flexibility to include these priorities in its local school improvement plan, because school integration is so intimately connected to the achievement of other educational goals. There is a well-established research base (or “evidence base”) supporting the use of school integration strategies to accomplish ESSA’s main goals of promoting educational opportunity and improving academic outcomes. As noted earlier, school integration is associated with improved academic achievement, particularly for children in racial and SES subgroups. Low-income students in integrated schools also have higher rates of high school graduation than students in racially and economically isolated school settings.

Integration strategies might also help districts make progress on some of the “additional indicators” selected by states for their ESSA plans. For example, many states included measures of college and career readiness as indicators of school quality and student success, and will be more closely tracking access to and successful completion of advanced coursework. Research shows that "schools with high proportions of students of color are much less likely to offer advanced courses such as calculus, and, across schools, students of color are underrepresented in Advanced Placement (AP) courses and Gifted and Talented Programs." Hence, integration strategies can help open up access to these opportunities both within and between schools. Some states have simply chosen specific subject performance as their indicators and research shows that racially integrated schools are associated with achievement in specific subjects, such as science. Another common state indicator is school climate, which could be tied to the reduction of racial prejudice and the increase in cross-racial friendships associated with school integration.

While each LEA must tailor their plans to their unique needs, there are some common areas of concern that could be linked to racial and SES integration strategies, including:

+ Reducing resource inequities across subgroups;
+ Remediating achievement gaps;
+ Addressing discipline disparities;
+ Supporting a diverse educator workforce as a critical component of all strategies.
RESOURCES

SOCIOECONOMIC INTEGRATION PILOT PROGRAM GRANT

THE NEW YORK STATE ESSA PLAN incorporates school diversity as an explicit equity goal, affirms the use of Title I School Improvement Funds “to support the efforts of districts to increase diversity and reduce socio-economic and racial/ethnic isolation,”45 commits the state to developing a measure of school diversity as an indicator of overall school quality, and pledges to “attract more diverse, culturally competent, and highly effective teachers, principals, and other school leaders.”46 The plan also provides that “New York State will also provide grants to districts to promote diversity and reduce socio-economic and racial-ethnic isolation, as part of a comprehensive school improvement strategy.”47

When determining metrics that might be used to assess progress and outcomes on integration, a few resources might be helpful:

+ THE REIMAGINING INTEGRATION: DIVERSE AND EQUITABLE SCHOOLS (“RIDES”) project at the Harvard Graduate School of Education is engaged in a project with Panorama Education to develop assessments to help educators collect accurate and reliable feedback from students about their in-school experiences of diversity, equity, and inclusion,48 particularly with respect to two aspects of the RIDES integration framework: commitment to dismantling racism and appreciation of diversity. The Panorama Equity and Inclusion Survey is available at panoramaed.com/equity-inclusion-survey.

+ THE NEW ORLEANS-BASED BELOVED COMMUNITY An Equity Audit developed by the New-Orleans-based Beloved Community offers "a comprehensive benchmarking tool that assesses diversity, equity, and inclusion," providing "over 180 customized indicators to assess governance, operations, program/pedagogy, adult culture and, where applicable, student culture." See wearebeloved.org/equity-audit for more information.

+ THE MASSACHUSETTS CONSORTIUM FOR INNOVATIVE EDUCATION ASSESSMENT (MCIEA) “is a partnership of MA public school districts and their local teacher unions, joined together to create a fair and effective accountability system that is guided by a set of principles and offers a more dynamic picture of student learning and school quality than a single standardized test. MCIEA seeks to increase achievement for all students, close inequitable achievement gaps, and better prepare students for college, career, and life.”49

Website: mciea.org
HOW CAN I GET INVOLVED IN SHAPING MY DISTRICT’S SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLANS?

In order to receive its share of Title I funds, an LEA must submit an application to its SEA describing its process for developing a school improvement plan. You can play a role in shaping your LEA’s plan.

MY INVOLVEMENT CHECKLIST

1. Find out whether your district is required to submit a Comprehensive Support and Improvement Plan and if your school is required to submit a Targeted Support and Improvement Plan.
   - Check your state’s Department of Education website
   - Contact the SEA or your school district to request information
   - A district-level improvement plan may affect your school, even if your child’s individual school has not been identified. Advocacy and engagement in ESSA process is still critical.

2. The school district is required to consult with the public and various stakeholders during the development of the school improvement plans.
   - Required stakeholders for district plans: parents, teachers, principals, other school leaders, specialized instructional support personnel, charter school leaders, administrators
   - Required stakeholders for school plans: parents, teachers, principals, and other school leaders
   - Check the website and/or contact the local school board to identify the timeline and process for stakeholder engagement and plan development
   - Coordinate with additional stakeholders to develop collaborative strategy and share information about meetings. Some examples include: parent advocacy groups, local chapters of NAACP, National Urban League, ACLU, etc.

3. LEAs must select interventions with a strong evidence base showing school improvement.
   - During stakeholder engagement meetings, lift up the evidence base that supports integration as a strategy, as described in the section Incorporating Strategies Into Title I School Improvement Plans of this document. Focus on research and interventions that seem the most relevant to your context.
PREPARE AND FORMULATE A STRATEGY TO ENGAGE

If the district or school has not yet reached out to you, you can request a meeting through the identified process. This will likely include submitting a formal request in writing and could be done through a letter writing campaign with fellow advocates. Be sure to reference that you are "seeking consultation" on the ESSA plan.

Spend some time documenting your own stories and thoughts about why integration matters.

Find out more about the racial and socioeconomic profile of your school, district, and region and its history with respect to integration efforts.

Find out more about your district’s student assignment plan, and any past and present efforts to integrate.

- Check your district’s website for information
- Have any books or articles been written about segregation/desegregation in your state, region, or district?
- Has your district ever been under a desegregation order, or adopted a voluntary plan?^52
- How does your district assign students to schools?^53

Learn the basics about your state’s ESSA plan, e.g. see if your state has a fact sheet summarizing its ESSA plan so that you know which indicators your state has chosen. Here are some places you might look:

- The ESSA State Plan Submissions are available on the U.S. Department of Education’s website
- Your state department of education’s website will probably have a page dedicated to its ESSA submission, which will be updated periodically. Such pages often include information about public engagement (e.g. meetings, public comment opportunities, etc.)
- Your state/local teachers unions and/or other local educational groups also often publish fact sheets and related tools on education policy

Get familiar with the research base on integration (school-diversity.org/research-briefs) – what is the connection between this evidence and the indicators your state has chosen to assess academic outcomes?

Contact NCSD members and integration supporters in your area. To find out whether any NCSD members or affiliated researchers are near you, visit school-diversity.org/member-organization-resources and school-diversity.org/rap-members.
TITLE IV: 21ST CENTURY SCHOOLS

Title IV of ESSA is comprised of a series of grant programs that can help fund additional school integration strategies and interventions. The Magnet Schools Assistance Program (Part C) and the Charter School Program (Part D) are the most directly applicable to integration, but there are also ways to incorporate integration strategies into the Student Support and Academic Enrichment Program (Part A) and the 21st Century Community Learning Program (Part B).

PART A: STUDENT SUPPORT AND ACADEMIC ENRICHMENT GRANTS (SSAE)

Student Support and Academic Enrichment (SSAE) grants are geared toward: 1) providing access to a well-rounded education for all students; 2) improving school conditions for student learning by fostering safe, healthy, supportive, and drug-free environments; and 3) increasing access to technology and learning experiences supported by technology. LEA applications must also include assurances that they will prioritize distribution of funds to schools:

+ with the greatest needs, as determined by the LEA;
+ with the highest numbers of students from low-income families;
+ that are identified for comprehensive support and improvement plans;
+ that are implementing targeted support and improvement plans; or
+ that have been identified as persistently dangerous.

In addition to these application requirements, ESSA requires SEAs to review existing resources and programs across the state and coordinate any new plans and resources under the SSAE program with existing resources and programs. Guidance issued on Title IV encourages states to conduct a needs assessment to determine the best utilization of the funds.

The most apparent connection between SSAE grants and school integration relates to SSAE’s goal of “providing access to a well-rounded education for all students.” SSAE is designed to support LEAs in providing programs and activities that offer educational experiences to all students, particularly those “often underrepresented in critical and enriching subjects.”
Examples of programs to enhance a well-rounded educational experience include high-quality courses in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics, including computer science; activities and programs in music and the arts; and “social emotional learning.”

In addition to the “well-rounded education” focus of the SSEA grants, school districts can also connect integration strategies to the SSEA’s other two goals of “fostering safe, healthy, supportive, and drug-free environments” and “increasing access to technology and learning experiences supported by technology.” This is particularly true if LEAs are using one of the more holistic frameworks for integration, as outlined in earlier sections.

**PART B: 21ST CENTURY COMMUNITY LEARNING PROGRAM**

The 21st Century Community Learning Program provides grants to local school districts and community learning centers for afterschool and summer programs serving students in low-performing schools. Afterschool and summer programs are especially valuable for school integration because they can more easily be implemented across school district lines. Such programs must be focused on academic enrichment that is designed to reinforce and complement the regular academic program.

Once states receive this funding, they may provide subgrants to community learning centers. Eligible entities applying for funds must include in their applications assurances that their program will target students who primarily attend schools eligible for schoolwide programs under
section 1114, which are schools that serve “an eligible school attendance area in which not less than 40 percent of the children are from low-income families, or not less than 40 percent of the children enrolled in the school are from such families.” Note, however, that this targeting requirement does not mean that the programs need to be physically located near high needs schools, or be composed of only low income children.

A model for how integration might be incorporated into the 21st Century Community Learning program exists in the Interdistrict Cooperative Grant Program (ICGP) in Connecticut, which has funded economically and racially integrated summer programs, nature’s classroom retreats, sister school activities, etc. Examples of programs that blend intergroup contact strategies with curriculum designed to support well-rounded education include the Mosaic Project in Oakland, CA; RE-Center in Hartford, CT (formerly known as the Discovery Center); and summer camp programs throughout the country that seek to bring children from different cultural and class backgrounds together.

RESOURCES

RE-WEAVING THE SOCIAL FABRIC THROUGH INTEGRATED SCHOOLS: HOW INTERGROUP CONTACT PREPARES YOUTH TO THRIVE IN A MULTIRACIAL SOCIETY by Linda R. Tropp and Suchi Saxena summarizes social science research that demonstrates the importance of fostering sustained interracial contact between youth in order to prepare them to thrive in a multiracial society. Find it at school-diversity.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/NCSD_Brief13.pdf.
PART C: EXPANDING OPPORTUNITY THROUGH CHARTER SCHOOLS

Under ESSA, the Charter Schools Program, which provides resources for “planning, program design, and initial implementation of charter schools,” now includes racial and socioeconomic diversity as a priority.70

Although charters are generally more racially isolated than local district schools, there is a growing movement in the charter school field to expand racial and economic diversity.71 This trend is represented by the 125 intentionally diverse charter schools that have committed themselves to diversity and have instituted racially integrated enrollment.72 It is crucial, however, that charter school diversity efforts are coordinated with their local school districts, to avoid undermining ongoing diversity and targeted school improvement efforts by pulling higher SES families out of the traditional public schools in the district.73

After funds are allocated to states under this Part, states must award no less than 90% of charter grant funds to “eligible applicants” to support startups, replicate or expand high-quality charters, helping charters acquire and renovate facilities, as well as dissemination of best practices, evaluation, and strengthening charter school authorizing practices.74

PART D: MAGNET SCHOOLS ASSISTANCE PROGRAM (MSAP)

The Every Student Succeeds Act included some important revisions to the Magnet Schools Assistance Program (Part D), which provides grants to magnet schools, defined as public schools or education centers that offer “a special curriculum capable of attracting substantial numbers of students of different racial backgrounds.”75

Magnet schools are intended to attract children of different socio-economic backgrounds, race, and academic achievement levels. They are public schools, accountable to state standards. Most are open to all students, with enrollment determined by lottery, although some magnet schools still use admission criteria (such as auditions for performing arts schools). As with charter schools, coordination and intensive marketing and outreach to very low income families is important to avoid
As the only current federal grant program that is specifically designed to foster integration, MSAP grants provide funding to districts using magnet schools to reduce racial isolation or implement a desegregation plan. LEAs can apply for funds individually or as a consortium of agencies. Applications must include descriptions of how funds will be used to promote desegregation and how the applicant will monitor and evaluate the impact of funds on integration efforts.

Some of the major ESSA revisions include:

1. Adding a priority for socioeconomic diversity, in addition to racial diversity;
2. Extending the possible grant term from 3 to 5 years;
3. Explicitly recognizing interdistrict and regional approaches as allowable uses of funds; and
4. Allowing funding to be used for the development and implementation of transportation services.

RESOURCES

MAGNET SCHOOLS OF AMERICA is a national nonprofit professional education association that represents and serves as a resource to magnet schools, parents, teachers, school boards, administrators, business leaders, community organizations, and institutions of higher education. MSA offers conferences and events throughout the year to build and expand members’ expertise and skills, including annual policy training and technical assistance conferences as well as an annual national conference.

Website: magnet.edu

THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR MAGNET SCHOOL LEADERSHIP (NIMSL) is the technical assistance arm of Magnet Schools of America. NIMSL’s mission is to provide professional expertise to MSA member districts and their schools. Some of the services they offer are:

- training teachers, administration and district leadership,
- assisting in the development of state and/or regional associations,
- providing technical assistance to local school districts through on-site leadership training and evaluation of magnet school programs and
- reviewing policies and procedures relating to theme selection, marketing, and student assignment.

THE MAGNET SCHOOLS ASSISTANCE PROGRAM TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE CENTER (MSAP Center) supports the U.S. Department of Education’s Office of Innovation and Improvement by providing assistance to grantees of the Magnet Schools Assistance Program (MSAP). The MSAP Center serves as a resource for MSAP grantees and the greater magnet school community.

Website: msapcenter.com
CONCLUSION

As America’s school-aged population grows more diverse, it is increasingly important that we find a way to address longstanding issues of educational inequality. As a whole, students of color have not been served well by our educational systems.

Racial and socioeconomic segregation continue to pose challenges for educators. Despite the strong evidence that the racial and socioeconomic composition of schools influences short- and long-term outcomes and that segregation is harmful for all students, our policies tend to reinforce exclusion and separation, and disproportionately assign students of color to high-poverty schools. ESSA provides an opportunity for SEAs and LEAs to employ evidence-based practices to ensure that integrated schools and classrooms are part of an overall effort to provide a quality education for all children.

Not only does the evidence support the value of diverse and integrated schools and classrooms for all children, but it also suggests that an integrated education fosters greater adherence to democratic values and enhances a person’s propensity for civic engagement. The academic and non-academic benefits of a diverse and integrated school and classroom should encourage all those committed to ensuring the quality education of all students to urgently implement these strategies so that upcoming generations have the opportunity to succeed to their fullest potential.
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21 ESSA § 1111(c)(4)(B). States have also chosen other indicators, including chronic absenteeism, school climate, and success in particular subject area classes.

22 ESSA § 1111(c)(4)(D)(i)-(ii). Based on a state’s system of annual meaningful differentiation, states are minimally required to identify schools as described above. For example, states may choose to identify more than 5% of schools, include non-Title I schools in school identification, or identify higher graduation rate thresholds. States may also include additional statewide categories of schools.

23 ESSA § 1111(c)(4)(C)(iii). Any school in which any subgroup of students is consistently underperforming, as determined by the State, must be identified by the SEA on an annual basis.

24 ESSA § 1111(c)(2).

25 ESSA § 1111(d)(2)(C). Any school in which any subgroup of students would, on its own, lead to identification under § 1111(c)(4)(D)(i)(I) using the State’s Annual Meaningful Differentiation methodology shall be designated for ATSI and be required to identify resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of a TSI plan.

26 ESSA § 1112(a)(1).

27 ESSA § 1111(d)(1)(B) and (d)(2)(B).

28 Although ESSA uses the term “teachers,” it also recognizes the value of other education stakeholders, whom we refer to here collectively as “educators,” including Education Support Professionals (ESPs) such as custodians, secretaries, bus drivers, cafeteria staff, and others who work in schools.

29 ESSA § 1111(d)(2)(B).

30 ESSA §1111(d)(1)(B).

31 ESSA §1003(a). The equivalent program used to be called School Improvement Grant (SIG), which provided funding for SEAs to make competitive subgrants to LEAs. Under SIG, money was provided to LEAs that demonstrated: 1) the greatest need for the funds; and 2) the strongest commitment to use the funds to provide adequate resources in order to substantially raise the achievement of students in their lowest-performing schools.

32 ESSA § 1003(b)(1)(A).

33 ESSA § 1003(b)(1)(B).

34 ESSA § 1003(b)(2).

35 ESSA § 1003(b)(2)(A)(i).

36 ESSA § 1003(b)(2)(A)(ii).

37 ESSA § 1003(f).

38 ESSA § 1003A.

39 ESSA § 1003A(b)(2).


42 “A large body of research has shown that students have differential access to college preparatory curriculum and to high-quality career-technical programs that can lead to skilled employment in the modern economy. For example, schools with high proportions of students of color are much less likely to offer advanced courses such as calculus, and, across schools, students of color are underrepresented in Advanced Placement (AP) courses and Gifted and Talented Programs—the kinds of settings in which higher order skills are most purposefully developed. Research has also found that schools serving African American, Latinx, and Native American students are ‘bottom heavy’—that is, they offer fewer academic courses or high-end career-technical options and more remedial and vocational courses training for low-status occupations." Id. at 22. (referencing Jeannie Oakes, Keeping Track: How Schools Structure Inequality 78 (2nd ed. 2005); U.S. Dep’t of Educ., A First Look: Key Data Highlights on Equity and Opportunity Gaps in Our Nation’s Public Schools (2016), https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/2013-14-firstlook.pdf). Also see Philip Tegener, Roslyn Arlin Mickelson & Martha Bottia, Nat’l Coalition on Sch. Diversity, What We Know About School Integration, College Attendance, and the Reduction of Poverty (2011), https://www.school-diversity.org/pdf/DiversityResearchBriefNo4.pdf.


46 N.Y. DOE Revised State Template, supra note 45 at 146.

47 Id. at 99.


50 Under ESSA § 1112(a)(1), “A local educational agency may receive a subgrant under this part for any fiscal year only if such agency has on file with the State educational agency a plan, approved by the State educational agency, that—(A) is developed with timely and meaningful consultation with teachers, principals, other school leaders, paraprofessionals, specialized instructional support personnel, charter school leaders (in a local educational agency that has charter schools), administrators (including administrators of programs described in other parts of this subchapter), other appropriate school personnel, and with parents of children in schools served under this part....

51 ESSA § 1111(d)(2)(B) (“Each school receiving a notification described in this paragraph, in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parents), shall develop and implement a school-level targeted support and improvement plan.”).


53 Refer to your school and district/LEA websites for this information. Vox developed a tool that allows you to compare your district’s school assignment zones to underlying patterns of residential segregation. Alvin Chang, We Can Draw School Zones to Make Classrooms Less Segregated, Vox, Aug. 27, 2018, https://www.vox.com/2018/1/8/16822374/school-segregation-gerrymander-map.

54 For helpful resources related to this section of ESSA, see ESSA, Title IV, Part A, Student Support and Academic Enrichment (SSAE) Program, NAT’L CTR. ON SAFE SUPPORTIVE LEARNING ENVIRONMENTS, https://safesupportivelearning.ed.gov/ESSA-TitleIVPartA-SSAE (last visited Oct. 1, 2019).

55 Under ESSA § 4103(c)(1), “In order to receive an allotment under this section for any fiscal year, a State shall submit a plan to the Secretary, at such time and in such manner as the Secretary may reasonably require.” A listing of estimated 2017 and 2018 SSAE grant allocations by state can be found at https://www2.ed.gov/about/overview/budget/statetables/18stbyprogram.pdf at 14. Grants to Local Educational Agencies, U.S. DEPT’ OF EDUC. (2017). Additional information and resources are available at https://www2.ed.gov/programs/ssae/resources.html. Student Support and Academic Enrichment Program, U.S. DEPT’ OF EDUC. (last visited Oct. 1, 2019).

56 ESSA § 4104(a)(1).

57 Under ESSA § 4106(b), LEAs can choose to form a consortium with others surrounding LEAs and combine SSEA funds each agency receives to jointly carry out SSAE activities.

58 ESSA § 4106(c) and (d).

59 Per ESSA § 4106(e)(2)(A)(v), designations for “persistently dangerous” schools are determined under section 8532.

60 ESSA § 4103(c)(2)(C)(i).

The most apparent connection between SSAE grants and school integration relates to SSAE’s goal of “providing access to a well-rounded education for all students.” ESSA § 4104(b)(3)(A).

ESSA § 4104(b)(3)(A)(i). “offer well-rounded educational experiences to all students...including female students, minority students, English learners, children with disabilities, and low-income students who are often underrepresented in critical and enriching subjects”.

ESSA § 4104(b)(3)(A)(ii).

ESSA § 4104(b)(3)(B) and (C).

ESSA § 4201(a).

ESSA § 4202(c)(1); ESSA § 4204(a).

ESSA § 4201(b)(2)(F).

The ICGP was established “for the purpose of assisting local and regional boards of education, regional educational service centers and nonsectarian, nonprofit organizations with programs that increase student achievement and reduce racial, ethnic and economic isolation.” The primary goals of this grant are to: 1) reduce racial, ethnic, and economic isolation; and 2) increase academic achievement. The Commissioner “shall not award a grant for a program, other than a lighthouse school, in which more than 80 percent of the students are from one school district.” Interdistrict Cooperative Grant Program, STATE OF CONN., https://portal.ct.gov/SDE/Office-of-Strategic-Planning/Interdistrict-Cooperative-Grant-Program (last visited Oct. 1, 2019).

In awarding grants under this section, the Secretary shall give priority to eligible entities that— plan to operate or manage high-quality charter schools with racially and socioeconomically diverse student bodies...”.

See, e.g., HALEY POTTER & KIMBERLY QUICK, THE CENTURY FOUNDATION, DIVERSE-BY-DESIGN CHARTER SCHOOLS (2018) [hereinafter POTTER & QUICK, DIVERSE-BY-DESIGN CHARTERS], https://tcf.org/content/report/diverse-design-charter-schools. See also POVERTY AND RACE RESEARCH ACTION COUNCIL & THE CENTURY FOUNDATION, DIVERSE CHARTER SCHOOLS (2012), https://prrac.org/pdf/DiverseCharterSchoolsReport.pdf; What We Do, DIVERSE CHARTER SCHOOLS COALITION (last visited Mar. 31, 2020)“(The vision of DCSC is that an ever-growing number of American public schools, including many charter schools, will embody the diversity of our nation’s people – across race, socioeconomic status, language and abilities – while preparing the children in their care to pursue higher education, meaningful and sustainable work in a global economy, and an equal role in a more cohesive and connected participatory democracy.”).

Potter & Quick, Diverse-by-Design Charters, supra note 71.


ESSA §§ 4303(b)(1) and 4303(c)(1)(A).

ESSA § 4402.

The Cambridge Public Schools provide a good model for an equitable choice system, with a strong and inclusive family information and outreach built into their controlled choice plan.

ESSA § 4403.

ESSA § 4404.
79 ESSA § 4405(b).

80 ESSA, §4406(4).

81 ESSA, §4408(a)

82 ESSA, §4407(a)(8).

83 ESSA, §4407(a)(9).
