

STYMIED by Segregation



How **Integration** Can Transform North Carolina Schools and the Lives of Its Students

education policy PERSPECTIVES FROM THE  **Education & Law Project**

Stymied by Segregation:

How **Integration** Can Transform North Carolina Schools and the Lives of Its Students

By **Kris Nordstrom, Policy Analyst**

919/856-3195

kris@ncjustice.org



PO Box 28068

Raleigh, NC 27611-8068

www.ncjustice.org

Introduction

The Supreme Court's 1954 unanimous ruling on *Brown v. Board of Education* famously concluded that segregation of children in public schools solely on the basis of race deprives the children of the minority group of equal educational opportunities. The case established that school segregation is unjust and morally wrong. Just over 10 years later, the *Coleman Report* revealed that socioeconomic diversity is the key to removing racial inequalities in education and established that racial and economic segregation is also counterproductive to having schools that help *all* children reach their potential.

Despite half a century of law, policy, and growing understanding of the moral and pragmatic justifications for eliminating segregated schools, achieving a fully-integrated public school system remains an unfinished act. In the six decades following *Brown*, demographic shifts, residential segregation patterns, and changing political attitudes have all affected the extent to which schools have been integrated.

This report looks specifically at trends in school segregation in North Carolina over the past 10 years. The analysis shows that during this time:

- The number of racially and economically isolated schools has increased
- Districts' racial distribution is mixed, but economic segregation is on the rise
- Large school districts could be doing much more to integrate their schools
- School district boundaries are still used to maintain segregated school systems
- Charter schools tend to exacerbate segregation

These trends carry important implications for state and local policymakers, particularly as the North Carolina General Assembly increasingly considers bills that would further exacerbate school segregation.



The Battle for Integrated Schools in North Carolina

In North Carolina, school segregation remains a contentious subject. Following *Brown*, de-segregation was vigorously opposed by state leaders. In 1956, Governor Luther Hodges called a special session of the General Assembly to adopt a state plan in response to the *Brown* decision, which he described as “one of the greatest crises which North

Carolina has ever experienced.”¹ The state’s subsequent plan for opposing integration—known as the Pearsall Plan—allowed districts to shutter schools that became integrated, and provided state-funded vouchers to allow white students to flee integrated schools. The Pearsall Plan, which required a constitutional amendment, was overwhelmingly supported by North Carolina voters.²

Despite voter sentiment following *Brown*, many leaders across the state fought courageously to integrate North Carolina’s public schools. Attorney Julius Chambers filed hundreds of desegregation lawsuits, refusing to be cowed by Klan terrorists who bombed his car and home, and also targeted the homes of NAACP leadership.³

The Pearsall Plan was finally declared unconstitutional in 1969 in *Godwin v. Johnston County Board of Education*. In 1971, a team of NAACP lawyers led by Chambers successfully

argued in *Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education* that the district had to use student assignment and busing to integrate its schools. Subsequently, Charlotte became a national leader for school integration.

Other North Carolina districts followed suit. School district boundaries that had previously been drawn to isolate students of color in sub-standard schools were erased. In 1975, North Carolina had 35 counties with split “city” school districts. Today, just 11



counties have multiple school districts. Wake County merged its city and county school districts, and implemented school assignment policies to ensure no school had more than 40 percent of its students eligible for free or reduced lunch.

Progress was sidetracked in 2001 when the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals declared Charlotte-Mecklenburg's racial integration plan illegal. Since then, school boards have swung back and forth in their willingness to use school assignment plans or managed public school choice to create racially and economically-balanced public schools.

The new millennium has brought forth a swelling body of research supporting the benefits of school integration. Yet state leaders are increasingly sponsoring bills that would only exacerbate segregation.⁴ While most of these bills failed to pass in 2017, the General Assembly has created the Joint Legislative Study Committee on the Division of Local School Administrative Units, which many advocates fear is an attempt to begin the process of re-segregating urban school districts.



What do we know about school segregation and integration?

Research on school segregation and integration has reached general consensus on three points:

1. School segregation has *negative* impacts on low-income students and students of color.
2. School integration has *positive* impacts on low-income students and students of color.
3. School integration *does not have negative* impacts on high-income white students.

School segregation is associated with increasing racial achievement gaps, dropout rates, and incarceration rates. The negative impacts of school segregation are effectively highlighted by a 2013 Harvard study examining the impact of the re-segregation of schools in Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools. The end of the integrated busing program in Charlotte led to an increase in racial achievement gaps as well as increased arrest and incarceration

rates for male students of color.⁵ These results are consistent with national research that finds within-district segregation is the biggest predictor of racial achievement gaps.⁶ Additional research has shown that the end of school de-segregation orders led to increased dropout rates for Black and Hispanic students.⁷

By contrast, **there are considerable benefits associated with school integration.** For instance, a study in Maryland found that students from low-income families that were randomly assigned to low-poverty schools experienced large, persistent test-score gains compared to similar students assigned to high-poverty schools.⁸ Another study estimates that desegregation efforts of the 1970s decreased the dropout rates for Black students by two to three percentage points.⁹ The benefits of school integration can be quite substantial over the long-term, with one study finding that attending a desegregated school increased annual earnings by 30 percent for Black men.¹⁰

None of these studies find any negative impacts for white students. In fact, a recent federal study found that white student performance remained similar whether they went to a school that was overwhelmingly white or one that was overwhelmingly Black.¹¹

The positive impacts of school integration extend beyond test scores. Students attending integrated schools become less prejudiced, increase cross-racial trust and friendships, and enhance their capacity for working with others.¹²

Given this body of research, one would expect policymakers to have accelerated school integration in recent years. Yet while racial segregation has remained relatively constant, several studies have observed a marked increase in student segregation by income.¹³

Measures of school segregation

There is no singular measure of school segregation, which is a multi-faceted phenomenon. As such, it is important to use multiple measures of segregation when examining the issue.

- The first, simplest measure of school segregation is looking at the number or share of **isolated schools**. For the purposes of this report, a school is considered racially or economically isolated if more than 75 percent of its students are students of color, or qualify for free or reduced school meals.¹⁴ On average, isolated schools tend to have fewer resources and lower student achievement than non-isolated schools.
- A second, similar measure of school segregation is known as the **exposure index**, which quantifies a student's degree of isolation. In this report, the exposure index measures the likelihood that a student of color interacts with a white student, or the likelihood of a low-income student interacting with a

non-low-income student. The lower the exposure index score, the greater the degree of school segregation.

- The final measure is the dissimilarity index. This tells you how many students would have to move from one school to another in order to equalize racial or economic distribution of students across schools within a district. For example, a racial **dissimilarity index** of 0.45 would indicate that a school district would need to re-assign 45 percent of its students in order to have perfectly racially balanced schools across the district. The dissimilarity index is important because it reveals the extent to which school reassignment policies could be used to ameliorate economic or racial segregation.

For example, a school district with two schools, where free or reduced eligibility is at 90 percent in each school will have a low **exposure index** (indicating a high degree of segregation). But since both schools have the same share of low-income students, the district will have a low **dissimilarity index** (indicating a low degree of segregation). As a result, it is important to look at both measures to best understand how demographic patterns across districts (exposure index) and assignment patterns within districts (dissimilarity index) affect school segregation.

More Schools in North Carolina Are Isolated by Poverty and Race

Over the past 10 years, there has been an increase in the number of schools isolated by race and income in North Carolina's traditional, inclusive school districts. In 2006-07, there were 295 schools where more than 75 percent of the students were persons of color and from low-income families. By 2016-17, there were 476 such schools (see Appendix A). In 2006-07, 13 percent of North Carolina's traditional schools were isolated by both race and income, compared to 19 percent in 2016-17.

The growing share of racially and economically isolated schools should be a warning sign that our school system is becoming more unequal, not less. We know that, on average, racially and economically isolated schools attract and retain fewer high-performing teachers and suffer from greater teacher and principal turnover. Such schools are more

FIGURE 1: North Carolina's Growing Share of Racially & Economically Isolated Schools

	Number of Schools		Share of All Schools	
	2006-07	2016-17	2006-07	2016-17
Racially Isolated	433	579	19%	24%
Economically Isolated	493	915	21%	37%
Racially & Economically Isolated	295	476	13%	19%

likely to be older, dilapidated buildings, where the students generally have less access to advanced course offerings and extra-curricular activities.

It is unclear how much of the increase in racially and economically isolated schools is due to education policy decisions (i.e. school choice, school assignment plans, school district borders, etc.), and how much is attributable to demographics and other policies outside of the control of school leadership.¹⁵ North Carolina's public schools have experienced substantial demographic changes over the past 10 years, with the share of students of color increasing from 44 percent of all traditional public school students to over 51 percent. Over the same period, the number of students qualifying for free or reduced lunch has risen from 48 percent to 60 percent.

Given the demographic changes, one might expect a commensurate increase in the number of racially and economically isolated schools. On the other hand, one might expect policymakers to enact measures to counteract the demographic shift's impact on school segregation. Unfortunately, North Carolina's growing share of racially and economically isolated schools has outpaced the demographic increase in the share of low-income students and students of color. From 2006-07 to 2016-17, North Carolina's share of minority students rose 16 percent, yet the share of racially isolated schools increased 25 percent. Over the same period, North Carolina's share of students qualifying for free or reduced lunch increased 23 percent, while the share of economically isolated schools increased 74 percent.

District exposure index data confirm the growing isolation of low-income students and students of color. Between 2006-07 and 2016-17, students of color became less likely to interact with white students in 106 of 115 districts (see Appendix B). During the same period, students from low-income families became less likely to interact with higher-income students in 108 of 115 districts (see Appendix B).

Racial Distribution Improves As Economic Distribution Regresses

Over the past 10 years, most school districts have seen a slight improvement in their racial dissimilarity indices. Yet schools are becoming more unequal in the distribution of low-income students.

From 2006-07 to 2016-17, 75 districts improved the racial distribution of students across their schools, compared to 40 districts where the racial distribution of students became more uneven (see Appendix C). North Carolina's statewide dissimilarity index was 0.44 in 2006-07, falling slightly to 0.43 in 2016-17, indicating that North Carolina's schools haven't – in total – become more unevenly divided over the past decade.

Yet statewide averages can mask changes within districts. Because the dissimilarity index measures how equally a district distributes students across its schools, it is important to limit our analysis to districts with multiple schools. Of districts with more than 10,000 students, Caldwell, Lincoln, Robeson, and Brunswick Counties most improved the racial distribution of students over the past decade. But that's not to say integration has been achieved in these schools. Despite the progress, Robeson County still has the 6th highest dissimilarity index in the state. Of these four districts, only Brunswick ranks in the bottom half of school districts in terms of dissimilarity index.

Several districts have become increasingly segregated over the last 10 years. Among districts with more than 10,000 students, Pitt, Nash-Rocky Mount, Wake, Guilford, Harnett, and Charlotte-Mecklenburg have all become increasingly segregated. Charlotte-Mecklenburg's dissimilarity index of 0.55 makes it by far the most racially segregated district in the state. Whereas Charlotte-Mecklenburg would need to re-assign 55 percent of its students to achieve racial parity across its schools, the next-most-segregated district, Guilford County, would "only" need to re-assign 45 percent of its students.

The more troubling trend over the past decade has been the increased segregation of North Carolina students by income. From 2006-07 to 2016-17, 62 school districts became increasingly segregated by income, compared to just 53 school districts where students have become more equally distributed by income (see Appendix C).

Overall, most districts have become increasingly divided by income. Ten districts' income-based dissimilarity indices increased by more than 10 percentage points over the decade.

FIGURE 2: Districts with Largest Increase in Income-Based Segregation

	FRL Dissimilarity Index 07	FRL Dissimilarity Index 17	Change in FRL Dissimilarity Index
Cleveland County	0.23	0.49	0.26
New Hanover County	0.34	0.55	0.21
Rowan-Salisbury	0.24	0.40	0.16
Cumberland County	0.32	0.47	0.15
Rockingham County	0.25	0.40	0.15
Guilford County	0.44	0.58	0.14
Gaston County	0.35	0.48	0.14
Nash-Rocky Mount	0.29	0.42	0.13
Mecklenburg County	0.49	0.59	0.11
Wake County	0.30	0.41	0.10

FIGURE 3: Change in Racial Segregation in NC's Largest School Districts

RACIAL DISSIMILARITY INDEX			
School District	FY 06-07	FY 16-17	Ten-Year Change
Wake County	0.27	0.30	0.03
Mecklenburg County	0.53	0.55	0.02
Guilford County	0.43	0.45	0.02
Forsyth County	0.47	0.43	-0.04
Cumberland County	0.35	0.34	-0.01
Union County	0.42	0.39	-0.03
Johnston County	0.28	0.26	-0.02
Durham County	0.43	0.42	-0.01
Cabarrus County	0.21	0.21	-0.00
Gaston County	0.36	0.36	-0.01

FIGURE 4: Change in Income-Based Segregation in NC's Largest School Districts

INCOME DISSIMILARITY INDEX			
School District	FY 06-07	FY 16-17	Ten-Year Change
Wake County	0.30	0.41	0.10
Mecklenburg County	0.49	0.59	0.11
Guilford County	0.44	0.58	0.14
Forsyth County	0.47	0.54	0.07
Cumberland County	0.32	0.47	0.15
Union County	0.43	0.53	0.09
Johnston County	0.34	0.37	0.03
Durham County	0.35	0.37	0.02
Cabarrus County	0.29	0.38	0.09
Gaston County	0.35	0.48	0.14

School Assignment Policies Exacerbate Segregation

North Carolina's largest school districts deserve additional scrutiny. They have the greatest capacity to use school assignment policies to integrate their schools and serve a lot of students; nearly half of all public school students reside in North Carolina's 10 largest school districts. When looking at measures of dissimilarity, North Carolina's largest districts also tend to be among the most segregated.

As measured by racial dissimilarity index, Charlotte-Mecklenburg is the most racially segregated district in the state. Guilford and Forsyth also are among the 10 most segregated districts, as measured by racial dissimilarity.

Charlotte-Mecklenburg and Guilford are the two districts most segregated by income, as measured by the income-based dissimilarity index. Forsyth and Union are also among the 10-most economically segregated districts in the state, as measured by the income-based dissimilarity index.

In terms of trends over the past decade, North Carolina's 10 largest school districts have had a mixed record in terms of racial segregation. Students in the three largest districts

THE EDUCATOR'S PERSPECTIVE:

Kevin Poirier, technology facilitator, West Charlotte High School

In 2018, Instagram filters could create misleading conclusions about the progress of desegregation at many schools in CMS since 1954. Take a walk into the cafeteria at West Charlotte High School on any given day, snap a picture, apply a black and white filter to that photograph, and you might think that the school system never desegregated in the first place. This is the reality for many educators within Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools.

I've spent six years working at West Charlotte High School, a majority-Black school where I've seen firsthand the destructive effects of concentrated poverty on children and the missed opportunity of failing to prioritize socio-economic and racial diversity in schools, something that would benefit all children. At West Charlotte, all of my students receive a free breakfast, a free lunch, and 94 percent of students are classified as being from low-income families. Despite this, outcomes at West Charlotte have improved year over year since 2012.

We have some amazing educators at West Charlotte and despite the challenges of a school with high concentrations of poverty, West Charlotte High School has increased its graduation rate from 56 percent in 2012 to 88% in 2017. Furthermore, proficiency rates have been on the rise and for the first time in many years, in 2017 we were designated as a school that is "exceeding expected growth." Despite a system that doesn't set us up for optimum success, we are still achieving and beating the odds. But this isn't the best solution. Research shows that all students achieve at higher levels when they experience diversity across racial and socio-economic lines of difference.

One in three CMS schools is isolated by socio-economic status – meaning at least 80 percent of their students live in poverty. Half of our schools are isolated by race – meaning at least 80 percent of their students are of one race. One in five schools is "hypersegregated," with 95 percent of students from one racial group. This

level of economic and racial isolation creates systemic barriers to opportunity, academic excellence, high-quality educators, and ultimately huge disparities between groups of students. One needn't search the Internet for long to find the correlation between high poverty schools and lower academic performance. Across Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools, educators like myself and my colleagues are working day in and day out to combat the multiplying effect of a high-poverty school where, essentially, every student faces similar socio-economic challenges.

I've worked at West Charlotte High School for six years and we have seen a level of turnaround that is to be commended as a result of some incredible students, excellent, hard-working educators, and a community that wants to see students succeed. Imagine the success that would occur if we did prioritize socio-economic and racial diversity in our schools and worked to truly create a more equitable education system for every child, regardless of zip code.

NOTE: The views and opinions expressed by public school educators in this report are their own and do not necessarily reflect the official views of their schools or school districts.

(Wake, Charlotte-Mecklenburg, and Guilford) all became slightly more unequally distributed by race over the past 10 years, as measured by the district racial dissimilarity index. The remaining seven districts (Forsyth, Cumberland, Union, Johnston, Durham, Cabarrus, and Gaston) all slightly improved their racial distribution of students.

The story is much grimmer, however, when looking at income-based segregation. Every one of North Carolina's 10 largest school districts has become more segregated by income over the past decade – substantially so in many cases.

These changes indicate that students from low-income families are becoming increasingly segregated from their higher-income peers within North Carolina's largest school districts. This is particularly dispiriting given these districts' ability to use school assignment policies to create schools that are more equal in terms of students' economic status.

Divided Counties Can Exacerbate Segregation

For most of North Carolina, school district boundaries are contiguous with county boundaries. Eleven of North Carolina's 100 counties, however, have divided their county into two or more school districts. In some instances, the drawing of school district lines exacerbates the problem of school segregation.

Most notably, if Halifax County were one school district, it would be—by far—the most racially segregated school district in the state.

As a county, Halifax has a racial dissimilarity index of 0.68. Fully two-thirds of the county's

FIGURE 5: Segregation across Halifax County's School Districts

	School Districts			County
	Halifax County	Roanoke Rapids City	Weldon City	Halifax County
Students of Color	96%	40%	97%	70%
Low-income students	95%	64%	95%	81%
Racial dissimilarity index	0.4345	0.0999	0.2693	0.6751

FIGURE 6: Segregation across Davidson County's School Districts

	School Districts			County
	Davidson County	Lexington City	Thomasville City	Davidson County
Students of Color	17%	76%	77%	30%
Low-income students	41	95%	95%	53%
Racial dissimilarity index	0.1777	0.0799	0.0301	0.4957

THE EDUCATOR'S PERSPECTIVE:

Rodney D. Pierce, social studies teacher, William R. Davie Middle

Racial segregation is deeply embedded in Halifax County. Growing up, Roanoke Rapids was the “white district” whereas Weldon City and Halifax were the “Black districts.” Little has changed since I was a child.

The Roanoke Rapids Graded School District lines are extraordinary. Consider Hodgestown, a predominantly Black, low income community that used to be called “Colored Town.” Hodgestown is less than a mile from Chaloner Middle School, which is in RRGSD, but its children can’t go to school there. They’re bused all the way up Highway 158 to Halifax’s William R. Davie Middle.

It wasn’t until I got older that I realized that just because you live in the Roanoke Rapids city limits doesn’t mean you automatically go to the Roanoke Rapids school district. You have to live within the school district boundaries. According to an article I read years

ago, the school district lines were drawn in the 1930s. I believe they were drawn specifically to keep certain people out. These lines have contributed to more than eight decades of institutionalized segregation and racism.

If you go back to the 1970s, the city of Scotland Neck tried to create a “White flight” school district until the Justice Department filed suit against them and stopped it. The late Thorne Gregory, a state representative from Scotland Neck, helped get that district set up. It’s funny because the Pearsall Report, the state’s plan to resist school integration, was declared unconstitutional in 1969. What happened locally in 1969? The founding of Hobgood and Halifax academies, two private schools where the staffs and student bodies were pretty much exclusively white.

The only way those lines are potentially redrawn is if the Roanoke Rapids school board changed them, and

they have no plans to do that. That’s what the *Silver v. Halifax County Board of Commissioners* lawsuit is about: the systemic inequality that has existed in education around here for decades. According to that lawsuit, from 2006 to 2014, Roanoke Rapids got almost \$5 million in sales tax revenue, Weldon got \$2.5 million, but Halifax got none. Halifax County just passed its own supplemental tax for the county school system in 2016. We’re at least a decade behind and are unlikely to catch up since years of institutionalized racism have left Halifax residents with lower incomes and fewer places of business. Today, I’m a 6th grade social studies teacher at Davie Middle. Out of an average of about 90 students per year in my grade level, I taught four White students in 2015-16, six in 2016-17 and I have six again in 2017-18. I have two children in elementary school, and I can probably count on one hand the number of White students they have in their respective classes.

NOTE: The views and opinions expressed by public school educators in this report are their own and do not necessarily reflect the official views of their schools or school districts.

students would need to change schools in order for each school to be fully representative of the county's demographics. As a reminder, the most racially segregated school district, Charlotte-Mecklenburg, has a racial dissimilarity index of 0.55.

Similarly, Davidson County's district boundaries appear to be drawn to create racially segregated school districts.

If Davidson County were a unified school district, it would be the third most segregated school district in the state in 2016-17, ranking behind only Charlotte-Mecklenburg and Washington County.

Charter Schools Exacerbate Segregation

Research clearly demonstrates that North Carolina's charter schools have contributed to increasing racial segregation. In an examination of charter school trends from 1999 to 2012, researchers from Duke University found that charter schools transitioned from serving a disproportionate share of students of color to serving an increasingly white population. At the same time, charter schools have become increasingly segregated, with some schools serving primarily students of color, and others serving primarily white students.¹⁶

This report adds to the evidence that charter schools exacerbate racial segregation.¹⁷ The impact of charter enrollment on racial segregation can be observed by comparing the racial dissimilarity index of a county's traditional public schools against the index when also including charter schools. In 72 percent of the counties with at least one charter school, charter schools increase the degree of racial segregation in the district, as measured by the racial dissimilarity index (see Appendix D).¹⁸

For example, both Franklin and Granville Counties contain two charter schools. In all four charter schools, approximately 80 percent of the students are white. However, white students comprise less than 50 percent of each county's student population. At Martin County's lone charter school, Bear Grass, 95 percent of the students are white, compared to just 37 percent of students in the county's traditional, inclusive public schools.

It is important to note that when charter schools were first introduced in North Carolina, the schools were required to "reasonably reflect the racial and ethnic composition" of the population of the district in which the charter school is located. This requirement was watered down in 2013. Under current law, North Carolina charter schools must only "make efforts" to achieve demographic parity with the local school district.¹⁹

Despite the law, most North Carolina charter schools have more white students than

FIGURE 7: School districts where charter schools significantly increase racial segregation

	Franklin County Schools	Crosscreek Charter School	Youngsville Academy
Percent of white students	47%	78%	83%

	Granville County Schools	Falls Lake Academy	Oxford Preparatory High School
Percent of white students	45%	78%	81%

	Martin County Schools	Bear Grass Charter School
Percent of white students	37%	95%

the county in which they are located. Appendix E compares the percentage of white students in each charter school against the percentage of white students across all schools (including the charters) in the county in which the charter is located. Within every county, the percentage of white students at any one school will vary. By comparing a charter school's white enrollment against the standard deviation of white enrollment in a county's schools, one can measure the extent to which the charter school's white population "reasonably reflects the racial and ethnic composition" of the nearby public schools.


FIGURE 8: North Carolina's Growing Share of Racially and Economically Isolated Schools

Figure 8 shows how North Carolina charter schools tend to skew whiter than other schools in the same county. Schools reasonably reflecting the racial composition of

THE EDUCATOR'S PERSPECTIVE:

Michelle Burton, school library media coordinator, Spring Valley Elementary School

When I started working for Durham Public Schools (DPS) in 1994, Durham City and Durham County Schools had just merged two years prior. The racial makeup of the district was approximately 55 percent Black, 45 percent white. At that time, the Hispanic population of Durham was quite small.

In 1997, the first charter school opened in Durham. It was not seen as a threat. Charters were presented as a way to assist students who were struggling in traditional public schools.

I left DPS in 2006 to teach in other counties. When I left DPS, the Hispanic population was slowly growing and the white population was still significant. Though I worked outside of Durham County, I still maintained my residence there. But I did not keep track of how DPS' racial demographics were changing.

The alarm bells went off for me in 2014 about how charters were radically changing DPS' demographics. A good friend of mine got a teaching position at a middle school

in Durham. Knowing where the school was located, I thought there would be a high population of white students who attended the school, but my friend informed me that most of the students who went to this school were African-American and Hispanic. The white students attended a charter school close by. The elementary school that was the feeder for this middle school was so under capacity due to parents putting their kids into charter schools, DPS converted it into a K-8 school.

In 2015, I came back to teach in Durham. The school where I work is in a high-income, mostly-white neighborhood. Yet, our school is only about 15 percent white. The white students in my school's district go to charter or private schools. Not only is our school mostly Black and Hispanic, but it is a Title I school, with 65 percent of our students receiving free and reduced lunch. So, in a predominately-white, affluent neighborhood, sits a Title I school with 75 percent of the student population that is Black and Hispanic because the white families

choose to send their children to charter or private schools.

The biggest hurdle with the re-segregation of DPS schools and the proliferation of charters in Durham County is convincing people in the surrounding community that the school where I work is a wonderful school. The children are well behaved, our suspension rates are extremely low, and we have loving and caring teachers. But because we have a high number of children of color receiving free or reduced price lunch, the perception in the community is that our school is not a good school. This perception is totally wrong and unfair.

My concern is that if charters continue to proliferate, DPS will cease to exist and our community will turn into the next New Orleans or Detroit: communities where there are lots of choices, but none of the choices are great. Policies must be put in place to reign in charters' growth for us to have a strong, inclusive public school system that can meet the needs of all of our community's children.

NOTE: The views and opinions expressed by public school educators in this report are their own and do not necessarily reflect the official views of their schools or school districts.

the surrounding community should be within one standard deviation of other county schools' white enrollment percentage. Yet only 68 of 166 charter schools (41 percent) fell into this range in the 2016-17 school year. 69 charter schools (42 percent) are more than a standard deviation whiter than the surrounding county, while only 29 charter schools (17 percent) skewed more than a standard deviation less white than the surrounding county schools.

Policies Can Reverse School Segregation in North Carolina

School segregation is not an intractable problem. Policymakers at every level of government can turn to several low-cost and no-cost interventions to ensure students can attend schools that better reflect each community's demographics. Educators, parents, and community leaders also play an important role in making sure these policies lead to schools that are fully integrated.

What about residential segregation?

School segregation is inevitably intertwined with residential segregation. In most cases, segregated neighborhoods create segregated schools which, in turn, entrench residential segregation by dissuading higher-income or white

parents from moving into school enrollment zones for those serving predominately students of color or students from low-income families.

As persuasively documented in Richard Rothstein's book *The Color of Law*, residential segregation did not occur by accident or strictly through individual preference. In all parts of the country, federal, state, and local policies were designed specifically to create patterns of residential segregation.

Policymakers wishing to focus on creating an inclusive, integrated school system cannot ignore the legacy of racist housing policies that have yet to be remedied. A more concerted effort to integrate schools by integrating neighborhoods is needed at the state, local, and federal level. Policy changes need to dismantle the barriers that have been created to keep affordable housing out of communities where good schools exist. This requires a commitment to more investment in affordable housing; zoning laws that

result in affordable housing development throughout communities; more housing vouchers and policies that help families move to higher opportunity neighborhoods; and more funding for increased enforcement of fair housing laws.

Policymakers also need to do a better job fostering collaboration between the education and housing sectors to create policies that will work together to address the related legacies of educational and residential segregation.²¹



FEDERAL EDUCATION LEADERS

North Carolina's congressional delegation could facilitate school integration by removing federal funding barriers, enforcing desegregation orders, and implementing inclusive housing policies.

Currently, **federal law prohibits schools from using federal funds to cover the transportation costs of school desegregation.** Recent attempts to remove this restriction were thwarted by Republican members of the House of Representatives.²⁰ Given the substantial benefits of school integration, federal policymakers should remove this barrier.

Additionally, federal policymakers should **reject proposals for unfettered school choice.** Without appropriate guardrails, school choice can exacerbate school segregation.²² President Trump's budget plan called for substantial increases in federal funding for school choice and charter school expansion.²³

Federal leaders can also **strengthen civil rights enforcement**, particularly within the Department of Education. The Department of Education's Office of Civil Rights (OCR) enforces federal civil rights laws in our schools, including enforcement of school desegregation orders. Under Secretary Betsy DeVos, the OCR is reportedly taking a more narrow view of civil rights complaints, ignoring systemic issues.²⁴ The administration's budget proposal calls for eliminating 46 OCR positions, a reduction of approximately 8 percent.²⁵

Finally, the federal government should **reverse course on allowing the use of 529 plan funds on private schools serving students in grades K-12.** 529 plans are tax-advantaged savings accounts that—until recently—could only be used for qualified higher education expenses. The recently passed federal tax bill now allows up to \$10,000 annually in 529 plans to be used for expenses at private K-12 schools. This change will likely exacerbate school segregation by subsidizing wealthier families considering private school.²⁶

STATE EDUCATION LEADERS

Members of the North Carolina General Assembly and the State Board of Education can also play a role in creating schools that are more racially and economically integrated.

General Assembly leaders can **mandate the merging of city and county school districts** in cases where district boundaries are creating segregated school systems. If leaders are uncomfortable with forcing such a change, they may create financial incentives to encourage local mergers.

Lawmakers can also create incentives to encourage districts to more evenly distribute

their students across schools. These incentives could include **transportation grants** for districts implementing income-based student attendance policies or controlled choice assignment plans. The General Assembly could also provide **awards to districts that improve their racial or income-based dissimilarity indices**.

Alternatively, the General Assembly could create disincentives by **using school report cards to highlight the degree to which districts are (or are not) segregating their students**. It's often said that "that which gets measured gets done," and simply measuring and publishing school segregation measures might spur movement towards more integrated schools.

Relatedly, our state leaders should also consider how current measures of school performance contribute to school segregation. North Carolina assigns each school a school performance grade, based almost entirely upon the share of students passing standardized tests. Unfortunately, standardized test passage rates are highly correlated with socioeconomic status of the students. As a result, school performance grades stigmatize schools with high concentrations of students from low-income families. If the General Assembly instead created **school performance grades based entirely on student growth**, families would have a better understanding of which schools are doing a great job teaching their students, and be less likely to make school enrollment decisions on the basis of the socioeconomic status of the student body.

State leaders can make several **changes to charter school laws**:

- **Require that charter schools provide transportation and school lunch.** Under current law, charter schools are not required to offer transportation or child nutrition programs. Students from low-income families are often excluded from attending schools that fail to offer transportation or school meals.
- **Clarify requirements that charter school demographics reflect those of the school district.** Under current law, charter schools must "make efforts" to "reasonably reflect" the racial demographics of the school district in which the charter school is located. Unfortunately, the state has failed to define what these terms mean. State leaders need to clearly define the extent to which charter demographics must reflect the demographics of the larger community, and what additional efforts schools must make to meet those goals.
- **Close charter schools that fail to meet integration goals.** Currently, there is no penalty for charter schools that flout school demographic requirements. State leaders should revoke the charters of schools with demographics that significantly differ from those of the larger school district. Exceptions may be made on a limited basis for schools serving special populations.

Finally, state policymakers should **reject initiatives that will further segregate our school system**. During the 2017 session, the General Assembly considered and rejected bills to allow mostly-white communities and corporations form their own, exclusive charter schools, and they must continue to reject such measures. Additionally, lawmakers must closely monitor the newly-created Joint Legislative Study Committee on the Division of Local School Administrative Units to ensure that this committee does not recommend re-dividing large urban districts on the basis of income or race.

SCHOOL DISTRICT LEADERS

Local school board members and superintendents have tremendous opportunity to improve the racial and economic integration of North Carolina's schools, particularly in large school districts.

The main tool that school district leaders can employ is **income-based student attendance policies**. Wake County notably implemented income-based student assignment from 2000 to 2010. Many districts across the country followed Wake County's lead after the Supreme Court declared race-based attendance policies unconstitutional in 2007.

Wake County's income-based student attendance policy ensured no school would consist of more than 40 percent students receiving free or reduced lunch, nor more than 25 percent of students performing below grade level. Over this period, Wake County experienced:

- Less racial segregation than other large North Carolina districts
- A narrowing of the Black-white achievement gap
- Small increases in math and reading achievement²⁷

Other school districts, such as Jefferson County Public Schools (Louisville, Kentucky) and Cambridge School District (Massachusetts) have employed a strategy known as controlled choice. Under a controlled choice assignment plan, parents rank their preferred schools in the district. The district then uses a computer algorithm to balance parental preferences against district goals for student diversity. According to research from the Century Foundation, controlled choice policies allow districts to maintain a relatively even distribution of students across schools, even as community demographics shift, all while providing the majority of families their first choice school.²⁸

Finally, school district leaders can **merge city and county school districts**, as permitted by state law. Historically, this authority has been used to maintain integrated schools

and avoid “white flight” from cities to suburbs. Consequently, the number of school districts in North Carolina has fallen from 174 districts in 1957 to just 115 districts today. County and district leaders should consolidate districts when district boundaries are creating segregated school systems.

CHARTER SCHOOL LEADERS

There are a number of steps that charter school operators can take to avoid contributing to the state’s school segregation problem. State law allows charter schools to use **weighted lotteries** to ensure the demographic makeup of their school reflects the makeup of the larger community. As of March 2017, only four of the state’s 168 charter schools utilized weighted lotteries to achieve student diversity goals.²⁹ Additionally, charter schools can offer transportation and school lunch programs to minimize exclusion of students from low-income families. Finally, charter school leaders can utilize marketing efforts to attract a more diverse student population.

SCHOOL LEADERSHIP AND EDUCATORS

Principals, teachers, and other educators also play a role in ensuring our schools are fully integrated.

Educators need to work to **ensure enrollment in advanced courses and gifted programs reflect the demographics of the school population**. According to an investigation by *The News & Observer* and *The Charlotte Observer*, bright children from low-income families are much more likely to be excluded from the state’s gifted programs.³⁰ Similar discrepancies can be found in the most rigorous high school courses. In 2016-17, Black students accounted for just 11 percent of enrollments in Advanced Placement courses, despite comprising 26 percent of all students.³¹

Additionally, **discriminatory student discipline practices** disproportionately isolate Black students and create unnecessary barriers for success.³² Schools with racially disproportionate student discipline patterns should pursue implicit bias training for educators, and implement positive behavior interventions and support, social and emotional learning strategies, and restorative justice practices.³³

PARENTS AND COMMUNITY LEADERS

Parents and community leaders can play a vital role in fighting for the integration of our public schools by **advocating for the policy options presented in this report** and paying attention to how school enrollment decisions for their own children impact other children in their community.

There is some evidence that their **local school board vote** can play a significant role. A recent study of North Carolina school board elections data shows that electing at least one Democrat leads to student reassignment that is 18 percent closer to achieving racial parity for each school.³⁴

Conclusion

The benefits of integrated schools are numerous. Integrated schools lift the performance Black and Lantinx students, as well as students from low-income families. Higher-income and white students attending integrated schools become less prejudiced and enhance their capacity for working with others. In short, all students, and society at large, benefit from an integrated school system that improves all students' opportunities for success.

The data in this report clearly demonstrate that leaders at all levels of society can do more to create an inclusive, integrated system of public schools. The state's public schools are becoming increasingly segregated by income, and while the trends in racial school segregation in North Carolina are mixed, the overall level of racial segregation remains far too high.

The good news is that integrating our schools is an incredibly low-cost proposition. North Carolina could create a much fairer, inclusive, and integrated system of schools by spending just slightly more on student transportation and demonstrating a modicum of political will. In the end, failure to integrate schools is the much more expensive proposition—financially and morally. ■

APPENDIX A: High-minority and High-poverty Schools by District: 2006-07 to 2016-17

RACIALLY-ISOLATED SCHOOLS					ECONOMICALLY-ISOLATED SCHOOLS			RACIALLY- & ECONOMICALLY-ISOLATED SCHOOLS		
LEA#	School District	2007	2017	Change	2007	2017	Change	2007	2017	Change
10	Alamance-Burlington	6	12	6	8	12	4	5	10	5
20	Alexander County	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0
30	Alleghany County	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0
40	Anson County	4	4	0	6	11	5	4	4	0
50	Ashe County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
60	Avery County	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0
70	Beaufort County	1	2	1	5	7	2	1	2	1
80	Bertie County	8	7	-1	7	8	1	7	7	0
90	Bladen County	3	3	0	9	13	4	3	3	0
100	Brunswick County	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0
110	Buncombe County	0	0	0	3	4	1	0	0	0
111	Asheville City	1	0	-1	2	0	-2	1	0	-1
120	Burke County	0	1	1	6	4	-2	0	1	1
130	Cabarrus County	1	0	-1	2	3	1	0	0	0
132	Kannapolis City	0	0	0	2	8	6	0	0	0
140	Caldwell County	0	0	0	4	7	3	0	0	0
150	Camden County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
160	Carteret County	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
170	Caswell County	0	0	0	0	4	4	0	0	0
180	Catawba County	1	0	-1	1	3	2	1	0	-1
181	Hickory City	1	1	0	3	3	0	1	1	0
182	Newton-Conover	0	0	0	1	3	2	0	0	0
190	Chatham County	2	4	2	2	4	2	2	3	1
200	Cherokee County	0	0	0	2	10	8	0	0	0
210	Edenton/Chowan	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
220	Clay County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
230	Cleveland County	1	2	1	4	17	13	1	2	1
240	Columbus County	3	3	0	7	18	11	2	3	1
241	Whiteville City	1	1	0	0	5	5	0	1	1
250	Craven County	2	2	0	4	4	0	2	2	0
260	Cumberland County	31	47	16	28	43	15	19	37	18
270	Currituck County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
280	Dare County	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0
290	Davidson County	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0
291	Lexington City	3	4	1	5	7	2	2	4	2
292	Thomasville City	0	4	4	0	4	4	0	4	4
300	Davie County	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0
310	Duplin County	4	5	1	7	16	9	3	5	2
320	Durham County	29	37	8	11	19	8	11	19	8
330	Edgecombe County	5	7	2	9	13	4	5	7	2
340	Forsyth County	30	31	1	25	35	10	24	28	4
350	Franklin County	0	1	1	2	8	6	0	1	1
360	Gaston County	3	6	3	10	20	10	3	6	3
370	Gates County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
380	Graham County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
390	Granville County	0	2	2	1	3	2	0	2	2
400	Greene County	0	1	1	2	6	4	0	1	1
410	Guilford County	41	64	23	30	62	32	26	54	28
420	Halifax County	16	10	-6	13	10	-3	13	10	-3
421	Roanoke Rapids City	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0
422	Weldon City	3	4	1	2	4	2	2	4	2
430	Harnett County	0	2	2	2	6	4	0	2	2
440	Haywood County	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0
450	Henderson County	0	0	0	2	3	1	0	0	0
460	Hertford County	5	6	1	2	7	5	2	6	4
470	Hoke County	6	8	2	6	8	2	6	6	0

APPENDIX A: High-minority and high-poverty schools by district: 2006-07 to 2016-17 (continued)

RACIALLY-ISOLATED SCHOOLS					ECONOMICALLY-ISOLATED SCHOOLS			RACIALLY- & ECONOMICALLY-ISOLATED SCHOOLS		
480	Hyde County	0	0	0	2	3	1	0	0	0
490	Iredell-Statesville	1	2	1	2	5	3	0	2	2
491	Mooreville City	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
500	Jackson County	0	0	0	0	4	4	0	0	0
510	Johnston County	3	5	2	5	8	3	3	5	2
520	Jones County	0	0	0	3	6	3	0	0	0
530	Lee County	0	0	0	3	6	3	0	0	0
540	Lenoir County	6	6	0	6	17	11	5	6	1
550	Lincoln County	0	0	0	1	5	4	0	0	0
560	Macon County	0	0	0	4	2	-2	0	0	0
570	Madison County	0	0	0	1	0	-1	0	0	0
580	Martin County	4	3	-1	3	10	7	3	3	0
590	McDowell County	0	0	0	3	9	6	0	0	0
600	Mecklenburg County	85	104	19	45	76	31	45	75	30
610	Mitchell County	0	0	0	1	0	-1	0	0	0
620	Montgomery County	1	1	0	4	6	2	1	1	0
630	Moore County	0	1	1	2	5	3	0	1	1
640	Nash-Rocky Mount	10	12	2	7	15	8	7	10	3
650	New Hanover County	0	6	6	8	19	11	0	6	6
660	Northampton County	8	7	-1	8	7	-1	6	7	1
670	Onslow County	0	0	0	1	0	-1	0	0	0
680	Orange County	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0
681	Chapel Hill-Carrboro	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1
690	Pamlico County	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0
700	Pasquotank County	0	2	2	3	5	2	0	2	2
710	Pender County	1	0	-1	5	6	1	1	0	-1
720	Perquimans County	0	0	0	1	0	-1	0	0	0
730	Person County	2	2	0	2	7	5	2	2	0
740	Pitt County	7	11	4	8	15	7	6	11	5
750	Polk County	0	0	0	1	3	2	0	0	0
760	Randolph County	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
761	Asheboro City	0	3	3	2	3	1	0	3	3
770	Richmond County	2	1	-1	9	16	7	2	1	-1
780	Robeson County	29	35	6	32	40	8	25	34	9
790	Rockingham County	1	1	0	3	9	6	1	1	0
800	Rowan-Salisbury	2	4	2	2	12	10	0	4	4
810	Rutherford County	0	0	0	3	18	15	0	0	0
820	Sampson County	0	4	4	5	17	12	0	4	4
821	Clinton City	0	1	1	0	5	5	0	1	1
830	Scotland County	6	7	1	8	12	4	6	7	1
840	Stanly County	0	0	0	4	3	-1	0	0	0
850	Stokes County	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0
860	Surry County	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	0
861	Elkin City	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
862	Mount Airy City	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
870	Swain County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
880	Transylvania County	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0
890	Tyrrell County	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
900	Union County	6	7	1	5	7	2	4	7	3
910	Vance County	8	12	4	13	17	4	8	12	4
920	Wake County	15	33	18	4	16	12	3	14	11
930	Warren County	5	5	0	3	8	5	3	5	2
940	Washington County	3	3	0	3	5	2	2	3	1
950	Watauga County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
960	Wayne County	10	9	-1	12	14	2	10	8	-2
970	Wilkes County	0	0	0	3	13	10	0	0	0
980	Wilson County	7	10	3	6	7	1	6	5	-1
990	Yadkin County	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0
995	Yancey County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

APPENDIX B: Change in Exposure Index by School District: 2006-07 To 2016-07

EXPOSURE INDEX (Students of Color Exposure to White Students)					EXPOSURE INDEX (Low-Income Students Exposure to Higher-Income Students)		
LEA#	School District	2007	2017	Change	2007	2017	Change
10	Alamance-Burlington	0.416	0.346	-0.070	0.434	0.323	-0.112
20	Alexander County	0.793	0.767	-0.026	0.565	0.436	-0.129
30	Alleghany County	0.852	0.724	-0.127	0.351	0.320	-0.030
40	Anson County	0.294	0.304	0.010	0.252	0.050	-0.202
50	Ashe County	0.922	0.861	-0.062	0.455	0.431	-0.024
60	Avery County	0.887	0.825	-0.062	0.329	0.319	-0.010
70	Beaufort County	0.475	0.418	-0.057	0.282	0.230	-0.052
80	Bertie County	0.118	0.136	0.018	0.064	0.047	-0.016
90	Bladen County	0.377	0.353	-0.024	0.193	0.050	-0.143
100	Brunswick County	0.652	0.631	-0.021	0.362	0.401	0.039
110	Buncombe County	0.752	0.651	-0.101	0.532	0.451	-0.081
111	Asheville City	0.475	0.600	0.126	0.457	0.609	0.152
120	Burke County	0.710	0.597	-0.113	0.411	0.377	-0.033
130	Cabarrus County	0.636	0.511	-0.125	0.586	0.510	-0.076
132	Kannapolis City	0.482	0.346	-0.136	0.337	0.121	-0.216
140	Caldwell County	0.745	0.721	-0.024	0.507	0.383	-0.124
150	Camden County	0.819	0.794	-0.025	0.741	0.731	-0.010
160	Carteret County	0.800	0.738	-0.062	0.582	0.549	-0.034
170	Caswell County	0.524	0.492	-0.032	0.424	0.213	-0.212
180	Catawba County	0.688	0.619	-0.069	0.560	0.464	-0.096
181	Hickory City	0.487	0.414	-0.073	0.374	0.326	-0.048
182	Newton-Conover	0.539	0.461	-0.078	0.437	0.354	-0.084
190	Chatham County	0.436	0.392	-0.045	0.429	0.373	-0.055
200	Cherokee County	0.907	0.860	-0.047	0.400	0.164	-0.236
210	Edenton/Chowan	0.503	0.437	-0.065	0.415	0.344	-0.071
220	Clay County	0.968	0.881	-0.088	0.559	0.436	-0.123
230	Cleveland County	0.599	0.551	-0.049	0.456	0.248	-0.209
240	Columbus County	0.414	0.433	0.019	0.282	0.050	-0.231
241	Whiteville City	0.474	0.384	-0.089	0.347	0.049	-0.298
250	Craven County	0.530	0.476	-0.054	0.434	0.423	-0.011
260	Cumberland County	0.320	0.261	-0.059	0.374	0.253	-0.121
270	Currituck County	0.861	0.801	-0.060	0.732	0.649	-0.083
280	Dare County	0.809	0.730	-0.078	0.702	0.550	-0.152
290	Davidson County	0.897	0.808	-0.089	0.614	0.544	-0.070
291	Lexington City	0.250	0.235	-0.015	0.119	0.050	-0.069
292	Thomasville City	0.273	0.231	-0.042	0.331	0.050	-0.281
300	Davie County	0.762	0.710	-0.052	0.561	0.496	-0.066
310	Duplin County	0.343	0.293	-0.050	0.266	0.076	-0.190
320	Durham County	0.199	0.157	-0.042	0.403	0.317	-0.086
330	Edgecombe County	0.317	0.261	-0.056	0.219	0.056	-0.163
340	Forsyth County	0.333	0.297	-0.036	0.362	0.274	-0.089
350	Franklin County	0.505	0.455	-0.050	0.448	0.232	-0.216
360	Gaston County	0.584	0.495	-0.088	0.406	0.274	-0.132
370	Gates County	0.581	0.594	0.013	0.518	0.485	-0.033
380	Graham County	0.869	0.785	-0.084	0.464	0.331	-0.133
390	Granville County	0.484	0.395	-0.089	0.474	0.367	-0.107
400	Greene County	0.337	0.298	-0.039	0.238	0.050	-0.187
410	Guilford County	0.306	0.249	-0.057	0.363	0.235	-0.128
420	Halifax County	0.046	0.036	-0.010	0.160	0.049	-0.110
421	Roanoke Rapids City	0.729	0.594	-0.136	0.488	0.311	-0.178
422	Weldon City	0.031	0.031	0.000	0.107	0.051	-0.055
430	Harnett County	0.535	0.458	-0.077	0.455	0.403	-0.052
440	Haywood County	0.914	0.857	-0.057	0.557	0.441	-0.116
450	Henderson County	0.708	0.609	-0.099	0.502	0.425	-0.077
460	Hertford County	0.156	0.141	-0.015	0.260	0.050	-0.210
470	Hoke County	0.273	0.248	-0.025	0.288	0.239	-0.049

APPENDIX B: Change in Exposure Index by School District: 2006-07 To 2016-07 (continued)

EXPOSURE INDEX (Students of Color Exposure to White Students)					EXPOSURE INDEX (Low-Income Students Exposure to Higher-Income Students)		
480	Hyde County	0.453	0.565	0.113	0.221	0.035	-0.186
490	Iredell-Statesville	0.593	0.548	-0.045	0.495	0.444	-0.051
491	Mooreville City	0.762	0.649	-0.112	0.675	0.620	-0.055
500	Jackson County	0.721	0.684	-0.036	0.461	0.384	-0.077
510	Johnston County	0.565	0.503	-0.062	0.518	0.463	-0.055
520	Jones County	0.395	0.456	0.061	0.228	0.049	-0.180
530	Lee County	0.466	0.382	-0.084	0.402	0.334	-0.068
540	Lenoir County	0.308	0.278	-0.030	0.339	0.050	-0.289
550	Lincoln County	0.679	0.678	0.000	0.532	0.451	-0.082
560	Macon County	0.876	0.753	-0.123	0.293	0.349	0.056
570	Madison County	0.958	0.935	-0.023	0.463	0.495	0.032
580	Martin County	0.334	0.327	-0.006	0.318	0.055	-0.264
590	McDowell County	0.829	0.763	-0.065	0.391	0.192	-0.199
600	Mecklenburg County	0.246	0.196	-0.050	0.360	0.250	-0.109
610	Mitchell County	0.916	0.848	-0.067	0.446	0.454	0.008
620	Montgomery County	0.427	0.371	-0.056	0.272	0.225	-0.047
630	Moore County	0.605	0.573	-0.032	0.503	0.482	-0.021
640	Nash-Rocky Mount	0.318	0.274	-0.044	0.370	0.241	-0.128
650	New Hanover County	0.541	0.506	-0.035	0.458	0.309	-0.149
660	Northampton County	0.156	0.126	-0.029	0.153	0.050	-0.102
670	Onslow County	0.553	0.514	-0.039	0.543	0.520	-0.024
680	Orange County	0.668	0.549	-0.119	0.603	0.471	-0.132
681	Chapel Hill-Carrboro	0.577	0.507	-0.070	0.756	0.726	-0.030
690	Pamlico County	0.664	0.635	-0.029	0.434	0.250	-0.184
700	Pasquotank County	0.450	0.397	-0.054	0.397	0.286	-0.111
710	Pender County	0.571	0.554	-0.017	0.370	0.326	-0.044
720	Perquimans County	0.629	0.664	0.035	0.299	0.386	0.087
730	Person County	0.501	0.461	-0.040	0.445	0.290	-0.155
740	Pitt County	0.371	0.310	-0.060	0.391	0.315	-0.077
750	Polk County	0.795	0.749	-0.046	0.441	0.288	-0.153
760	Randolph County	0.751	0.677	-0.074	0.526	0.441	-0.085
761	Asheboro City	0.467	0.316	-0.151	0.376	0.265	-0.111
770	Richmond County	0.466	0.435	-0.031	0.309	0.050	-0.258
780	Robeson County	0.152	0.118	-0.034	0.173	0.052	-0.121
790	Rockingham County	0.578	0.542	-0.036	0.462	0.328	-0.134
800	Rowan-Salisbury	0.514	0.454	-0.060	0.478	0.286	-0.192
810	Rutherford County	0.709	0.676	-0.032	0.396	0.179	-0.217
820	Sampson County	0.428	0.365	-0.063	0.286	0.067	-0.219
821	Clinton City	0.358	0.266	-0.092	0.348	0.050	-0.298
830	Scotland County	0.331	0.275	-0.055	0.258	0.050	-0.209
840	Stanly County	0.634	0.588	-0.046	0.482	0.412	-0.070
850	Stokes County	0.876	0.871	-0.006	0.590	0.482	-0.108
860	Surry County	0.767	0.680	-0.087	0.432	0.373	-0.059
861	Elkin City	0.773	0.713	-0.059	0.658	0.608	-0.049
862	Mount Airy City	0.706	0.662	-0.044	0.448	0.425	-0.023
870	Swain County	0.679	0.607	-0.072	0.409	0.367	-0.042
880	Transylvania County	0.826	0.779	-0.047	0.538	0.452	-0.086
890	Tyrrell County	0.452	0.371	-0.081	0.299	0.284	-0.015
900	Union County	0.524	0.481	-0.042	0.497	0.436	-0.061
910	Vance County	0.231	0.179	-0.052	0.205	0.050	-0.155
920	Wake County	0.479	0.404	-0.074	0.576	0.549	-0.027
930	Warren County	0.172	0.159	-0.013	0.259	0.050	-0.209
940	Washington County	0.219	0.133	-0.085	0.182	0.050	-0.132
950	Watauga County	0.889	0.812	-0.077	0.636	0.588	-0.048
960	Wayne County	0.359	0.312	-0.047	0.330	0.241	-0.088
970	Wilkes County	0.733	0.700	-0.033	0.403	0.202	-0.200
980	Wilson County	0.324	0.271	-0.052	0.318	0.283	-0.034
990	Yadkin County	0.751	0.664	-0.086	0.509	0.386	-0.123
995	Yancey County	0.861	0.788	-0.073	0.455	0.459	0.004

APPENDIX C: Change in Dissimilarity Index by School District: 2006-07 to 2016-07

DISSIMILARITY INDEX (Students of Color vs. White Students)					DISSIMILARITY INDEX (FRL-eligible Students vs. Non-FRL-eligible Students)		
LEA#	School District	2007	2017	Change	2007	2017	Change
10	Alamance-Burlington	0.451	0.445	-0.007	0.385	0.462	0.076
20	Alexander County	0.221	0.218	-0.003	0.179	0.285	0.106
30	Alleghany County	0.101	0.172	0.071	0.240	0.244	0.004
40	Anson County	0.260	0.289	0.029	0.203	0.008	-0.195
50	Ashe County	0.194	0.169	-0.025	0.202	0.185	-0.018
60	Avery County	0.285	0.247	-0.038	0.318	0.263	-0.055
70	Beaufort County	0.229	0.242	0.013	0.282	0.435	0.153
80	Bertie County	0.125	0.231	0.106	0.341	0.065	-0.276
90	Bladen County	0.307	0.220	-0.088	0.324	0.007	-0.317
100	Brunswick County	0.234	0.183	-0.050	0.258	0.213	-0.045
110	Buncombe County	0.277	0.255	-0.022	0.306	0.256	-0.050
111	Asheville City	0.196	0.057	-0.139	0.257	0.166	-0.091
120	Burke County	0.255	0.263	0.009	0.237	0.265	0.028
130	Cabarrus County	0.211	0.210	-0.002	0.289	0.382	0.093
132	Kannapolis City	0.031	0.046	0.015	0.140	0.273	0.133
140	Caldwell County	0.388	0.302	-0.085	0.230	0.254	0.024
150	Camden County	0.048	0.031	-0.018	0.031	0.111	0.081
160	Carteret County	0.263	0.201	-0.062	0.228	0.259	0.031
170	Caswell County	0.086	0.136	0.050	0.162	0.512	0.350
180	Catawba County	0.248	0.237	-0.011	0.236	0.249	0.013
181	Hickory City	0.167	0.137	-0.030	0.343	0.361	0.018
182	Newton-Conover	0.097	0.096	-0.001	0.165	0.246	0.081
190	Chatham County	0.407	0.422	0.015	0.390	0.458	0.069
200	Cherokee County	0.233	0.138	-0.094	0.221	0.555	0.335
210	Edenton/Chowan	0.042	0.056	0.014	0.238	0.169	-0.069
220	Clay County	0.061	0.109	0.047	0.145	0.208	0.063
230	Cleveland County	0.257	0.268	0.012	0.231	0.494	0.262
240	Columbus County	0.373	0.333	-0.040	0.343	0.007	-0.336
241	Whiteville City	0.031	0.161	0.130	0.114	0.012	-0.102
250	Craven County	0.190	0.182	-0.007	0.273	0.292	0.018
260	Cumberland County	0.348	0.343	-0.006	0.320	0.474	0.155
270	Currituck County	0.054	0.089	0.035	0.165	0.258	0.092
280	Dare County	0.324	0.257	-0.067	0.287	0.262	-0.025
290	Davidson County	0.167	0.178	0.011	0.267	0.244	-0.023
291	Lexington City	0.094	0.080	-0.014	0.426	0.008	-0.418
292	Thomasville City	0.030	0.030	0.000	0.117	0.002	-0.115
300	Davie County	0.264	0.190	-0.074	0.303	0.344	0.041
310	Duplin County	0.361	0.310	-0.051	0.320	0.261	-0.059
320	Durham County	0.426	0.415	-0.011	0.351	0.370	0.019
330	Edgecombe County	0.291	0.351	0.060	0.334	0.259	-0.075
340	Forsyth County	0.469	0.433	-0.036	0.467	0.542	0.075
350	Franklin County	0.181	0.115	-0.066	0.215	0.527	0.312
360	Gaston County	0.363	0.357	-0.006	0.345	0.484	0.138
370	Gates County	0.025	0.038	0.013	0.138	0.128	-0.010
380	Graham County	0.016	0.049	0.033	0.209	0.150	-0.059
390	Granville County	0.260	0.304	0.044	0.233	0.317	0.084
400	Greene County	0.084	0.058	-0.026	0.340	0.003	-0.337
410	Guilford County	0.425	0.447	0.022	0.440	0.581	0.141
420	Halifax County	0.465	0.435	-0.031	0.382	0.009	-0.373
421	Roanoke Rapids City	0.054	0.100	0.046	0.295	0.312	0.017
422	Weldon City	0.099	0.269	0.171	0.473	0.006	-0.467
430	Harnett County	0.123	0.144	0.021	0.188	0.221	0.033
440	Haywood County	0.167	0.125	-0.042	0.172	0.225	0.053
450	Henderson County	0.252	0.239	-0.013	0.289	0.302	0.013
460	Hertford County	0.167	0.167	0.000	0.259	0.006	-0.253
470	Hoke County	0.248	0.219	-0.029	0.342	0.427	0.085

APPENDIX C: Change in Dissimilarity Index by School District: 2006-07 to 2016-07 (continued)

DISSIMILARITY INDEX (Students of Color vs. White Students)					DISSIMILARITY INDEX (FRL-eligible Students vs. Non-FRL-eligible Students)		
480	Hyde County	0.181	0.086	-0.095	0.473	0.309	-0.164
490	Iredell-Statesville	0.395	0.355	-0.040	0.393	0.466	0.073
491	Mooreville City	0.017	0.132	0.116	0.091	0.227	0.136
500	Jackson County	0.306	0.197	-0.109	0.245	0.252	0.007
510	Johnston County	0.285	0.261	-0.024	0.336	0.369	0.033
520	Jones County	0.183	0.123	-0.060	0.163	0.011	-0.152
530	Lee County	0.145	0.122	-0.023	0.274	0.218	-0.057
540	Lenoir County	0.457	0.419	-0.038	0.305	0.005	-0.301
550	Lincoln County	0.420	0.345	-0.075	0.313	0.394	0.081
560	Macon County	0.187	0.146	-0.040	0.299	0.245	-0.054
570	Madison County	0.142	0.071	-0.071	0.162	0.146	-0.016
580	Martin County	0.409	0.279	-0.130	0.339	0.098	-0.242
590	McDowell County	0.190	0.139	-0.051	0.213	0.551	0.338
600	Mecklenburg County	0.532	0.547	0.015	0.487	0.594	0.107
610	Mitchell County	0.331	0.256	-0.075	0.154	0.145	-0.009
620	Montgomery County	0.263	0.300	0.037	0.364	0.313	-0.051
630	Moore County	0.275	0.265	-0.010	0.315	0.376	0.061
640	Nash-Rocky Mount	0.303	0.341	0.038	0.286	0.421	0.135
650	New Hanover County	0.342	0.342	0.000	0.343	0.554	0.211
660	Northampton County	0.393	0.152	-0.242	0.357	0.012	-0.345
670	Onslow County	0.278	0.266	-0.012	0.198	0.190	-0.009
680	Orange County	0.138	0.190	0.052	0.254	0.351	0.097
681	Chapel Hill-Carrboro	0.121	0.103	-0.018	0.172	0.183	0.011
690	Pamlico County	0.032	0.056	0.023	0.250	0.465	0.215
700	Pasquotank County	0.152	0.189	0.036	0.192	0.367	0.174
710	Pender County	0.356	0.427	0.072	0.383	0.546	0.162
720	Perquimans County	0.082	0.016	-0.067	0.165	0.077	-0.087
730	Person County	0.210	0.224	0.013	0.252	0.347	0.096
740	Pitt County	0.209	0.296	0.087	0.316	0.394	0.078
750	Polk County	0.156	0.141	-0.014	0.286	0.443	0.157
760	Randolph County	0.288	0.253	-0.034	0.241	0.219	-0.022
761	Asheboro City	0.202	0.189	-0.013	0.318	0.269	-0.048
770	Richmond County	0.121	0.088	-0.034	0.294	0.006	-0.288
780	Robeson County	0.494	0.434	-0.061	0.328	0.057	-0.270
790	Rockingham County	0.286	0.280	-0.006	0.252	0.397	0.145
800	Rowan-Salisbury	0.452	0.423	-0.029	0.239	0.399	0.160
810	Rutherford County	0.252	0.211	-0.041	0.227	0.150	-0.077
820	Sampson County	0.238	0.237	-0.001	0.271	0.260	-0.012
821	Clinton City	0.051	0.094	0.043	0.125	0.004	-0.122
830	Scotland County	0.206	0.217	0.011	0.289	0.005	-0.285
840	Stanly County	0.354	0.358	0.004	0.268	0.313	0.045
850	Stokes County	0.238	0.160	-0.078	0.196	0.203	0.007
860	Surry County	0.243	0.225	-0.019	0.228	0.206	-0.021
861	Elkin City	0.072	0.038	-0.034	0.151	0.090	-0.061
862	Mount Airy City	0.150	0.066	-0.084	0.263	0.235	-0.028
870	Swain County	0.225	0.211	-0.015	0.214	0.174	-0.041
880	Transylvania County	0.280	0.236	-0.044	0.176	0.167	-0.009
890	Tyrrell County	0.089	0.030	-0.058	0.198	0.183	-0.015
900	Union County	0.419	0.391	-0.028	0.435	0.526	0.091
910	Vance County	0.233	0.227	-0.006	0.320	0.008	-0.312
920	Wake County	0.272	0.301	0.030	0.305	0.409	0.104
930	Warren County	0.123	0.286	0.163	0.191	0.012	-0.179
940	Washington County	0.167	0.497	0.330	0.288	0.006	-0.282
950	Watauga County	0.306	0.237	-0.069	0.232	0.246	0.014
960	Wayne County	0.369	0.368	-0.001	0.354	0.439	0.086
970	Wilkes County	0.401	0.306	-0.095	0.230	0.432	0.202
980	Wilson County	0.326	0.311	-0.015	0.323	0.311	-0.013
990	Yadkin County	0.228	0.190	-0.038	0.211	0.300	0.088
995	Yancey County	0.310	0.270	-0.040	0.151	0.174	0.023

APPENDIX D: Impact of Charter School Enrollment on County Dissimilarity Index, 2016-07

FY 16-17 DISSIMILARITY INDEX
(Students of Color vs. White Students)

County	Traditional Schools Only	Traditional and Charter Schools	Change
Alamance	0.445	0.452	0.007
Avery	0.247	0.243	-0.004
Beaufort	0.242	0.278	0.035
Bertie	0.231	0.209	-0.022
Bladen	0.220	0.228	0.008
Brunswick	0.183	0.187	0.004
Buncombe	0.246	0.259	0.013
Burke	0.263	0.263	-0.001
Cabarrus	0.230	0.228	-0.001
Carteret	0.201	0.203	0.002
Chatham	0.422	0.417	-0.005
Cherokee	0.138	0.140	0.001
Cleveland	0.268	0.266	-0.002
Columbus	0.291	0.304	0.013
Cumberland	0.343	0.343	0.000
Currituck	0.089	0.090	0.001
Durham	0.415	0.452	0.037
Edgecombe	0.351	0.334	-0.017
Forsyth	0.433	0.450	0.017
Franklin	0.115	0.133	0.018
Gaston	0.357	0.337	-0.020
Granville	0.304	0.341	0.037
Guilford	0.447	0.459	0.012
Halifax	0.675	0.681	0.006
Harnett	0.144	0.146	0.001
Haywood	0.125	0.132	0.007
Henderson	0.239	0.249	0.009
Iredell	0.304	0.301	-0.003
Jackson	0.197	0.201	0.004
Johnston	0.261	0.260	-0.001
Lenoir	0.419	0.432	0.014
Lincoln	0.345	0.312	-0.034
Martin	0.279	0.391	0.112

FY 16-17 DISSIMILARITY INDEX
(Students of Color vs. White Students)
continued

County	Traditional Schools Only	Traditional and Charter Schools	Change
Mecklenburg	0.547	0.558	0.010
Moore	0.265	0.261	-0.004
Nash	0.341	0.359	0.019
New Hanover	0.342	0.359	0.017
Northampton	0.152	0.089	-0.063
Onslow	0.266	0.269	0.003
Orange	0.139	0.153	0.014
Pamlico	0.056	0.123	0.067
Pasquotank	0.189	0.207	0.018
Person	0.224	0.306	0.082
Pitt	0.296	0.291	-0.005
Randolph	0.363	0.369	0.005
Robeson	0.434	0.443	0.009
Rockingham	0.280	0.283	0.003
Rutherford	0.211	0.209	-0.002
Stanly	0.358	0.360	0.001
Surry	0.185	0.206	0.020
Swain	0.211	0.210	-0.001
Transylvania	0.236	0.255	0.019
Union	0.391	0.380	-0.011
Vance	0.227	0.381	0.154
Wake	0.301	0.313	0.012
Warren	0.286	0.302	0.016
Washington	0.497	0.579	0.082
Watauga	0.237	0.242	0.006
Wayne	0.368	0.386	0.017
Wilkes	0.306	0.306	0.000
Wilson	0.311	0.353	0.042

APPENDIX E: Charter School Demographics

Charter School Number	Charter School Name	School Percent White	County	County Percent White	Difference
01C	Clover Garden	88.28%	Alamance	48.30%	39.98%
01B	River Mill Academy	73.98%	Alamance	48.30%	25.69%
01D	The Hawbridge School	85.89%	Alamance	48.30%	37.60%
06A	Grandfather Academy	56.25%	Avery	85.22%	-28.97%
06B	Williams Academy (fka Crossnore)	82.57%	Avery	85.22%	-2.65%
07A	Washington Montessori	85.46%	Beaufort	48.72%	36.74%
08A	Heritage Collegiate Leadership Academy	15.59%	Bertie	14.38%	1.22%
09A	Paul R Brown Leadership Academy	16.11%	Bladen	37.17%	-21.06%
10A	Charter Day School	73.91%	Brunswick	66.98%	6.93%
10B	South Brunswick Charter School	85.20%	Brunswick	66.98%	18.22%
11B	ArtSpace Charter	85.25%	Buncombe	70.17%	15.08%
11A	Evergreen Community Charter	88.51%	Buncombe	70.17%	18.34%
11K	Francine Delany New School	54.02%	Buncombe	70.17%	-16.15%
11C	Invest Collegiate - Imagine	84.72%	Buncombe	70.17%	14.55%
11D	The Franklin School of Innovation	83.86%	Buncombe	70.17%	13.69%
12A	The New Dimensions School	78.48%	Burke	69.17%	9.31%
13C	A.C.E. Academy	10.54%	Cabarrus	51.15%	-40.61%
13B	Cabarrus Charter Academy	46.79%	Cabarrus	51.15%	-4.37%
13A	Carolina International School	43.44%	Cabarrus	51.15%	-7.71%
13D	Kannapolis Charter Academy	37.47%	Cabarrus	51.15%	-13.68%
16B	Tiller School	84.65%	Carteret	77.20%	7.45%
19A	Chatham Charter	81.31%	Chatham	55.08%	26.23%
19C	Willow Oak Montessori	80.00%	Chatham	55.08%	24.92%
19B	Woods Charter School	82.00%	Chatham	55.08%	26.92%
20A	The Learning Center	90.59%	Cherokee	87.62%	2.97%
23A	Pinnacle Classical Academy	75.56%	Cleveland	62.02%	13.54%
24N	Columbus Charter School	69.43%	Columbus	49.82%	19.61%
24B	Flemington Academy	45.36%	Columbus	49.82%	-4.46%
26B	Alpha Academy	16.22%	Cumberland	29.73%	-13.51%
26C	The Capitol Encore Academy	38.75%	Cumberland	29.73%	9.03%
27A	Water's Edge Village School	87.50%	Currituck	80.90%	6.60%
32C	Carter Community Charter	0.78%	Durham	20.34%	-19.57%
32K	Central Park School For Children	56.25%	Durham	20.34%	35.91%
32R	Excelsior Classical Academy	54.82%	Durham	20.34%	34.48%
32M	Global Scholars Academy	0.00%	Durham	20.34%	-20.34%
32B	Healthy Start Academy	3.61%	Durham	20.34%	-16.74%
32S	KIPP Durham College Preparatory	0.54%	Durham	20.34%	-19.80%
32D	Kestrel Heights School	24.54%	Durham	20.34%	4.20%
32A	Maureen Joy Charter	0.16%	Durham	20.34%	-20.19%
32Q	Reaching All Minds Academy	0.44%	Durham	20.34%	-19.90%
32H	Research Triangle Charter	3.27%	Durham	20.34%	-17.07%
32N	Research Triangle High School	55.03%	Durham	20.34%	34.69%
32P	The Institute for the Development of You	1.59%	Durham	20.34%	-18.76%
32L	Voyager Academy	63.50%	Durham	20.34%	43.16%
33A	North East Carolina Preparatory School	46.98%	Edgecombe	32.49%	14.49%
34G	Arts Based School	66.92%	Forsyth	38.99%	27.94%
34D	Carter G Woodson School	0.00%	Forsyth	38.99%	-38.99%
34F	Forsyth Academy	10.79%	Forsyth	38.99%	-28.20%
34B	Quality Education Academy	0.39%	Forsyth	38.99%	-38.60%
34H	The North Carolina Leadership Academy	84.47%	Forsyth	38.99%	45.48%

APPENDIX E: Charter School Demographics (continued)

Charter School Number	Charter School Name	School Percent White	County	County Percent White	Difference
35A	Crosscreek Charter School	77.67%	Franklin	48.20%	29.47%
35B	Youngsville Academy	82.93%	Franklin	48.20%	34.73%
36C	Mountain Island Charter	63.69%	Gaston	59.99%	3.70%
36B	Piedmont Community Charter	66.51%	Gaston	59.99%	6.53%
39A	Falls Lake Academy	78.43%	Granville	48.98%	29.44%
39B	Oxford Preparatory High School	81.48%	Granville	48.98%	32.50%
41G	Cornerstone Charter Academy	74.50%	Guilford	34.23%	40.27%
41L	Gate City Charter Academy	10.32%	Guilford	34.23%	-23.91%
41B	Greensboro Academy	73.90%	Guilford	34.23%	39.67%
41C	Guilford Preparatory Academy	1.08%	Guilford	34.23%	-33.15%
41D	Phoenix Academy Inc	51.43%	Guilford	34.23%	17.20%
41K	Piedmont Classical High School	53.30%	Guilford	34.23%	19.08%
41J	Summerfield Charter Academy	69.97%	Guilford	34.23%	35.74%
41H	The College Preparatory and Leadership A	0.76%	Guilford	34.23%	-33.47%
41F	Triad Math and Science Academy	16.01%	Guilford	34.23%	-18.22%
42A	KIPP Halifax College Preparatory	5.26%	Halifax	28.61%	-23.35%
43C	Anderson Creek Club Charter School	61.34%	Harnett	47.59%	13.75%
44A	Shining Rock Classical Academy: CFA	91.78%	Haywood	86.94%	4.84%
45B	FernLeaf Community Charter School	89.71%	Henderson	66.69%	23.02%
45A	The Mountain Community Sch	86.93%	Henderson	66.69%	20.24%
49B	American Renaissance School	76.57%	Iredell	68.07%	8.50%
49G	Iredell Charter Academy	75.28%	Iredell	68.07%	7.21%
49F	Langtree Charter Academy	71.41%	Iredell	68.07%	3.34%
49E	Pine Lake Preparatory	87.03%	Iredell	68.07%	18.97%
49D	Success Charter School	3.19%	Iredell	68.07%	-64.88%
50A	Summit Charter	84.32%	Jackson	73.10%	11.22%
51A	Neuse Charter School	70.18%	Johnston	57.13%	13.05%
54A	Children's Village Academy	0.00%	Lenoir	34.87%	-34.87%
55A	Lincoln Charter School	82.88%	Lincoln	78.73%	4.15%
58B	Bear Grass Charter School	94.74%	Martin	43.55%	51.19%
60N	Aristotle Preparatory Academy	1.85%	Mecklenburg	30.09%	-28.24%
60S	Bradford Preparatory School	64.69%	Mecklenburg	30.09%	34.60%
60P	Charlotte Choice Charter	1.04%	Mecklenburg	30.09%	-29.05%
60V	Charlotte Learning Academy	0.77%	Mecklenburg	30.09%	-29.32%
60K	Charlotte Secondary School	31.47%	Mecklenburg	30.09%	1.38%
60U	Commonwealth High School	1.84%	Mecklenburg	30.09%	-28.25%
60A	Community Charter School	12.20%	Mecklenburg	30.09%	-17.90%
60I	Community School of Davidson	86.07%	Mecklenburg	30.09%	55.98%
60M	Corvian Community School	75.36%	Mecklenburg	30.09%	45.27%
60Q	Invest Collegiate	5.50%	Mecklenburg	30.09%	-24.59%
60L	KIPP: Charlotte	0.36%	Mecklenburg	30.09%	-29.73%
60D	Lake Norman Charter	72.46%	Mecklenburg	30.09%	42.37%
60F	Metrolina Regional Scholars Academy	36.80%	Mecklenburg	30.09%	6.71%
60Y	Pioneer Springs Community School	80.31%	Mecklenburg	30.09%	50.22%
60G	Queens Grant Community School	63.96%	Mecklenburg	30.09%	33.87%
60J	Socrates Academy	71.11%	Mecklenburg	30.09%	41.02%
60B	Sugar Creek Charter	0.13%	Mecklenburg	30.09%	-29.96%
60M	Charlotte Lab School	66.83%	Mecklenburg	30.09%	36.74%
60Q	Mallard Creek STEM Academy	28.07%	Mecklenburg	30.09%	-2.02%
60R	Matthews-Mint Hill Charter Academy	57.95%	Mecklenburg	30.09%	27.86%

APPENDIX E: Charter School Demographics (continued)

Charter School Number	Charter School Name	School Percent White	County	County Percent White	Difference
60N	Queen City STEM School	10.79%	Mecklenburg	30.09%	-19.30%
60L	Stewart Creek High School	4.70%	Mecklenburg	30.09%	-25.39%
60J	Thunderbird Preparatory School	64.33%	Mecklenburg	30.09%	34.24%
60K	United Community School	32.80%	Mecklenburg	30.09%	2.70%
60P	VERITAS Community School	33.33%	Mecklenburg	30.09%	3.24%
63B	Sandhills Theatre Arts Renaiss	73.01%	Moore	64.79%	8.22%
63A	The Academy of Moore County	74.06%	Moore	64.79%	9.28%
64A	Rocky Mount Preparatory	13.47%	Nash	30.28%	-16.81%
65A	Cape Fear Center for Inquiry	88.70%	New Hanover	60.94%	27.75%
65C	Douglass Academy	4.26%	New Hanover	60.94%	-56.69%
65G	Girls Leadership Academy of Wilmington	26.00%	New Hanover	60.94%	-34.94%
65D	Island Montessori Charter	87.38%	New Hanover	60.94%	26.44%
65B	Wilmington Preparatory Academy	27.40%	New Hanover	60.94%	-33.55%
66A	Gaston College Preparatory	12.82%	Northampton	12.83%	-0.01%
67B	Z.E.C.A. School of Arts and Technology	9.32%	Onslow	56.50%	-47.18%
68A	Orange Charter	84.54%	Orange	54.84%	29.69%
68C	The Expedition School	84.66%	Orange	54.84%	29.82%
69A	Arapahoe Charter School	76.83%	Pamlico	67.50%	9.33%
70A	Northeast Academy of Aerospace & AdvTech	73.00%	Pasquotank	43.30%	29.71%
73A	Bethel Hill Charter	74.25%	Person	56.06%	18.19%
73B	Roxboro Community School	82.46%	Person	56.06%	26.39%
74B	Ignite Innovation Academy - Pitt	23.78%	Pitt	35.73%	-11.94%
74C	Winterville Charter Academy	39.21%	Pitt	35.73%	3.48%
76A	Uwharrie Charter Academy	86.89%	Randolph	65.39%	21.50%
78A	CIS Academy	1.74%	Robeson	13.71%	-11.97%
78B	Southeastern Academy	72.38%	Robeson	13.71%	58.67%
79A	Bethany Community Middle	80.44%	Rockingham	61.58%	18.86%
81B	Lake Lure Classical Academy	88.31%	Rutherford	74.81%	13.50%
81A	Thomas Jefferson Classical Academy	79.89%	Rutherford	74.81%	5.08%
84B	Gray Stone Day School	88.36%	Stanly	70.67%	17.69%
86T	Millennium Charter Academy	88.24%	Surry	72.07%	16.16%
87A	Mountain Discovery Charter School	82.80%	Swain	66.76%	16.04%
88A	Brevard Academy	89.85%	Transylvania	82.09%	7.76%
90A	Union Academy Charter School	75.77%	Union	63.68%	12.08%
90B	Union Day School	74.22%	Union	63.68%	10.53%
90C	Union Preparatory Academy at Indian Trai	57.35%	Union	63.68%	-6.34%
91B	Henderson Collegiate	6.10%	Vance	22.87%	-16.77%
91A	Vance Charter School	82.64%	Vance	22.87%	59.77%
92W	Cardinal Charter	49.21%	Wake	47.90%	1.31%
92R	Casa Esperanza Montessori	41.72%	Wake	47.90%	-6.18%
92G	East Wake Academy	81.53%	Wake	47.90%	33.63%
92S	Endeavor Charter	84.60%	Wake	47.90%	36.70%
92Y	Envision Science Academy	67.28%	Wake	47.90%	19.38%
92F	Franklin Academy	83.88%	Wake	47.90%	35.98%
92Q	Hope Charter Leadership Academy	0.00%	Wake	47.90%	-47.90%
92U	Longleaf School of the Arts	62.95%	Wake	47.90%	15.05%
92D	Magellan Charter	83.50%	Wake	47.90%	35.60%
92M	PreEminent Charter School	2.93%	Wake	47.90%	-44.97%
92N	Quest Academy	79.86%	Wake	47.90%	31.96%
92K	Raleigh Charter High School	62.81%	Wake	47.90%	14.91%

APPENDIX E: Charter School Demographics (continued)

Charter School Number	Charter School Name	School Percent White	County	County Percent White	Difference
92P	Southern Wake Academy	86.97%	Wake	47.90%	39.08%
92E	Sterling Montessori Academy	49.59%	Wake	47.90%	1.69%
92B	The Exploris School	81.56%	Wake	47.90%	33.66%
92L	Torchlight Academy	0.00%	Wake	47.90%	-47.90%
92T	Triangle Math and Science Academy	33.17%	Wake	47.90%	-14.73%
92V	Wake Forest Charter Academy	73.64%	Wake	47.90%	25.74%
93L	Central Wake Charter High School	9.23%	Warren	15.22%	-5.99%
93A	Haliwa-Saponi Tribal School	5.33%	Warren	15.22%	-9.89%
93J	PAVE Southeast Raleigh Charter School	7.93%	Warren	15.22%	-7.29%
94Z	Northeast Regional School - Biotech//Agri	65.02%	Washington	23.52%	41.50%
95A	Two Rivers Community School	94.22%	Watauga	85.41%	8.81%
96C	Dillard Academy	1.33%	Wayne	38.32%	-36.99%
96F	Wayne Preparatory	70.87%	Wayne	38.32%	32.55%
97D	Bridges Academy	87.70%	Wilkes	77.68%	10.02%
98A	Sallie B Howard School	1.67%	Wilson	29.97%	-28.30%
98B	Wilson Preparatory Academy	50.99%	Wilson	29.97%	21.02%

*County Percent White includes the percentage of white students in all public schools located in the county, both traditional and charter.

END NOTES

1. Yemi Adewuyi, "Why 1956 Matters," *AJ Fletcher Foundation*, July 26, 2017, as found at: <http://ajf.org/why-1956-matters/>
2. Adrienne Dunne, "The Pearsall Plan," *NorthCarolinahistory.org: An Online Encyclopedia*, North Carolina History Project, as found at: <http://northcarolinahistory.org/encyclopedia/pearsall-plan/>
3. Rev. William J. Barber II, "The Case Against Resegregation," speech to Committee of National Board of Directors, as found at: <http://www.protectcivilrights.org/pdf/edconf/education-symposium-doc-final.pdf>
4. Kris Nordstrom, "Flurry of House charter school bills would facilitate segregation of North Carolina's schools," *The Progressive Pulse*, April 26, 2017, as found at: <http://pulse.ncpolicywatch.org/2017/04/26/flurry-house-charter-school-bills-facilitate-segregation-north-carolinas-schools/#sthash.qzqygwLd.dpbs>
5. Stephen B. Billings, David J. Deming, and Jonah Rockoff, "School Segregation, Educational Attainment, and Crime: Evidence from the End of Busing in Charlotte-Mecklenburg," *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* (2014), 435-476, as found at: https://scholar.harvard.edu/files/ddeming/files/the_quarterly_journal_of_economics-2014-billings-435-76-1.pdf
6. Sean F. Reardon, "School Segregation and Racial Academic Achievement Gaps," *RSF: The Russell Sage Foundation Journal of the Social Sciences*, 2(5), 34-57 (2016), as found at: <http://www.rsffournal.org/doi/full/10.7758/RSF.2016.2.5.03>
7. David D. Liebowitz, "Ending to What End? The Impact of the Termination of Court-Desegregation Orders on Residential Segregation and School Dropout Rates," *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, August 25, 2017, as found at: <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.3102/0162373717725804>
8. Heather Schwartz, "Housing Policy Is School Policy: Economically Integrative Housing Promotes Academic Success in Montgomery County, Maryland," *The Century Foundation*, 2010, as found at: <https://tcf.org/assets/downloads/tcf-Schwartz.pdf>
9. Guryan, Jonathan. 2004. "Desegregation and Black Dropout Rates." *American Economic Review*, 94(4): 919-943, as found at: <https://www.aeaweb.org/articles?id=10.1257/0002828042002679>
10. Rucker C. Johnson, "Long-run Impacts of School Desegregation & School Quality on Adult Attainments," *NBER Working Paper No. 16664*, Issued in January 2011, Revised in September 2015, as found at: <http://www.nber.org/papers/w16664>
11. Bohrntstedt, G., Kitmitto, S., Ogut, B., Sherman, D., and Chan, D. "School Composition and the Black-White Achievement Gap," (NCES 2015-018), U.S. Department of Education, Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics. As found at: <http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch>
12. Roslyn Arlin Mickelson, "School Integration and K-12 Educational Outcomes: A Quick Synthesis of Social Science Evidence," *The National Coalition on School Diversity*, March 2015, as found at: http://www.gpmilaw.com/portalresource/School_Integration_and_K-12_Educational_Outcomes.pdf
13. Sean F. Reardon and Ann Owens, "60 Years After Brown: Trends and Consequences of School Segregation," *Annual Review of Sociology*, November 8, 2013, as found at: <https://cepa.stanford.edu/sites/default/files/reardon%20owens%20ARS%20final%20version.pdf>; and Ann Owens, Sean F. Reardon, Christopher Jencks, "Income Segregation Between Schools and School Districts," *American Education Research Journal*, August 1, 2016, as found at: <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.3102/0002831216652722>
14. Students qualify for the federal free or reduced lunch program if they come from families with income levels less than 185 percent of the federal poverty threshold.
15. Of course, there could be several other contributing policy factors such as economic policy, housing policy, etc.
16. Helen F. Ladd, Charles T. Clotfelter, and John B. Holbein, "The Growing Segmentation of the Charter School Sector in North Carolina," *Education Finance and Policy*, Vol 12, Issue 4, Fall 2017, as found at: http://www.mitpressjournals.org/doi/pdf/10.1162/EDFP_a_00226
17. Due to the lack of data on charter students' family income, this report is only able to examine the impact of charter school enrollment on racial segregation.
18. This analysis also includes the Northeast Regional School of Biotechnology and Agriscience located in Washington County.
19. Section 1 of S.L. 2013-359, Charter School Enrollment & Charter Revisions
20. Alyson Klein, "Congressmen Target 'Relic of Ugly History' in Education Spending Bill," *Education Week*, September 8, 2017, as found at: <http://blogs.edweek.org/edweek/campaign-k-12/2017/09/scott-segregation-budget-transportation.html>
21. For additional information on the relationship between housing and education policy, see Philip Tegeler and Michael Hilton, "Disrupting the Reciprocal Relationship Between Housing and School Segregation," as found at: http://www.jchs.harvard.edu/sites/jchs.harvard.edu/files/a_shared_future_disrupting_reciprocal_relationship.pdf
22. William J. Mathis and Kevin G. Welner, "Do Choice Policies Segregate Schools?" *National Education Policy Center*, March 2016, as found at: <http://nepc.colorado.edu/files/publications/Mathis%20RBOPM-3%20Choice%20Segregation.pdf>
23. Office of Management and Budget, "America First: A Budget Blueprint to Make America Great Again," as found at: https://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/whitehouse.gov/files/omb/budget/fy2018/2018_blueprint.pdf
24. Benjamin Wermund, "DeVos closes civil rights complaints at faster clip than predecessor," *Politico*, August 10, 2017, as found at: <https://www.politico.com/story/2017/08/10/devos-closes-civil-rights-complaints-at-faster-clip-than-predecessors-241483>
25. Department of Education, Office for Civil Rights, "Fiscal Year 2018 Budget Request," as found at: <https://www2.ed.gov/about/overview/budget/budget18/justifications/z-ocr.pdf>
26. United States Government Accountability Office, "Higher Education: A Small Percentage of Families Save in 529 Plans," December 2012, as found at: <http://www.gao.gov/assets/660/650759.pdf>
27. M. Monique McMillian, Sarah Fuller, Zoelene Hill, Kate Duch, William A. Darity, Jr., "Can Class-Based Substitute for Race-Based Student Assignment Plans? Evidence From Wake County, North Carolina," *Urban Education*, November 27, 2015, as found at: <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0042085915613554>
28. Kimberly Quick, "How to Achieve Socioeconomic Integration in Schools," *The Century Foundation*, April 15, 2016, updated October 14, 2016, as found at: <https://tcf.org/content/facts/achieve-socioeconomic-integration-schools/>
29. Ann Doss Helms, "Two popular area charter schools want to increase student diversity. Here's their strategy," *Charlotte Observer*, March 12, 2017, as found at: <http://www.charlotteobserver.com/news/local/education/article137666508.html>
30. Joseph Neff, Ann Doss Helms, and David Raynor, "Why have thousands of smart, low-income NC students been excluded from advanced classes?" *The News & Observer*, May 19, 2017, as found at: <http://www.newsobserver.com/news/local/education/article149942987.html>
31. North Carolina State Board of Education, "Broaden Successful Participation in Advanced Courses," December 15, 2016, as found at: [https://www.ncleg.net/documentsites/committees/JLEOC/Reports%20Received/2016%20Reports%20Received/Broaden%20Successful%20Participation-Adanvcned%20Courses%2012%202%2016%20\(4\).pdf](https://www.ncleg.net/documentsites/committees/JLEOC/Reports%20Received/2016%20Reports%20Received/Broaden%20Successful%20Participation-Adanvcned%20Courses%2012%202%2016%20(4).pdf)
32. Billy Ball, "Black students significantly more likely to face suspension in North Carolina," *NC Policy Watch*, March 10, 2016, as found at: <http://www.ncpolicywatch.com/2016/03/10/black-students-significantly-more-likely-to-face-suspension-in-north-carolina/>
33. James E. Ford, "The Root of Discipline Disparities," *Disrupting Inequity*, November 2016, as found at: <http://www.ascd.org/publications/educational-leadership/nov16/vol74/num03/The-Root-of-Discipline-Disparities.aspx>
34. Hugh Macartney and John D. Singleton, "School Boards and Student Segregation" *NBER Working Paper No. 23619*, July 2017, as found at: <http://www.nber.org/papers/w23619>



www.ncjustice.org

contact@ncjustice.org

Phone: (919) 856-2570

Fax: (919) 856-2175

Physical Address: 224 S. Dawson Street
Raleigh, NC 27601

Mailing Address: PO Box 28068
Raleigh, NC 27611

© COPYRIGHT 2018

NO PORTION OF THIS DOCUMENT
MAY BE REPRODUCED WITHOUT PERMISSION.

STYMIED by Segregation

MEDIA CONTACT:

KRIS NORDSTROM

919/856-3195

kris@ncjustice.org