

An aerial map of Massachusetts with various colored overlays in blue, yellow, and red, likely representing different school districts or demographic data. The map is partially obscured by a light blue horizontal bar.

School Integration in Massachusetts: Racial Diversity and State Accountability

Summer 2020

An aerial map of Massachusetts with various colored overlays in blue, yellow, and red, likely representing different school districts or demographic data. The map is partially obscured by a light blue horizontal bar.

Jack Schneider, Ph.D

Ashley J. Carey

Beyond Test Scores Project

University of Massachusetts Lowell

Peter Piazza, Ph.D

Center for Education and Civil Rights

Pennsylvania State University

Rachel S. White, Ph.D

Old Dominion University

Table of Contents

I.	Executive Summary	4
II.	School Integration in Massachusetts	
	Background and Introduction	6
	How Many Racially Diverse Schools Are There in Massachusetts?	8
	Why Have Massachusetts Schools Become More Racially Diverse?	11
	Does School Demography Match District Demography?	16
	Racial Diversity and State Accountability	19
	Conclusion and Policy Recommendations	25
III.	References	27
IV.	Appendices	30



BEYOND TEST SCORES PROJECT



Copyright 2020 by the authors. All rights reserved.

Copyright for cover image, 2013, Weldon Cooper Center for Public Service, Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia (Dustin A. Cable, creator).

Suggested citation: Schneider, J., Piazza, P., Carey, A. J., and White, R. S. (2020). *School integration in Massachusetts: Racial diversity and state accountability*. Beyond Test Scores Project and Center for Education and Civil Rights.

Executive Summary

Over the past decade, the student population in Massachusetts has become more racially diverse. While this has led to a decrease in the number of predominantly white¹ schools, it has also coincided with an uptick in the number of intensely segregated schools in the Commonwealth. Perhaps not surprisingly, the vast majority of intensely segregated non-white schools are concentrated in larger urban districts like Boston and Springfield. At the same time, these districts are home to many of the most racially integrated schools in the region. Moreover, of the nine districts with intensely segregated non-white schools, six possess the districtwide demography to produce uniformly diverse schools. Thus, we are disturbed by the state of racial diversity in Massachusetts schools, but we also see a hopeful path forward.

In this report, which is designed for both policy leaders and the interested public, we use publicly available data to track demographic trends across the past decade. In doing so, we examine not only the state of school diversity in Massachusetts, but also the role played by existing accountability structures in exacerbating segregation.

As we find, students of color are disproportionately represented in the lowest-rated quintile of schools, as determined by the Massachusetts accountability system. Similarly, we find that schools in the lowest quintile are also considerably less white than the average school in the Commonwealth. At first blush, this might suggest that racially diverse schools are “low-performing” relative to their predominantly white counterparts. Yet, the existing research literature suggests otherwise (The Century Foundation, 2016; Hallinan, 1998; Mickelson & Nkomo, 2012; National Academy of Education, 2007; Orfield, 2004). An alternative explanation, then, is that the strong relationship between race and measured performance reflects deficiencies in the Commonwealth’s Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) accountability framework, which relies heavily on data from standardized tests. Insofar as standardized test scores often indicate more about demography than school quality, the existing accountability system may be promoting segregation by steering middle- and high-income white families toward predominantly white schools.

In light of the findings of this report, we encourage leaders in the Commonwealth to seize the opportunity to promote racial integration as a top policy priority. Many districts with intensely segregated non-white schools have the demographic capacity to foster integration; and as Massachusetts becomes more racially diverse, more and more districts should be able to foster school diversity across the Commonwealth.

¹ We join other writers who capitalize words like Black and Latinx, but do not capitalize white, as a way of signaling that “white identity and Black identity are not parallels” (Harvey, 2017, p. 7). In particular, while white identity has always shifted, as defined by dominant social groups, Black identity and that of other communities of color has been purposely constructed by oppressed communities as a collective and coherent identity.

Leaders should also look carefully at the existing accountability system, which presently appears to punish racially diverse schools. Courageous leadership on this issue calls for addressing that challenge head-on—not only by amending potentially flawed systems, but by proactively developing ways of recognizing and encouraging racial integration.

With these aims in mind, we encourage the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education to pilot new forms of school accountability. We also encourage the Department to begin tracking figures like district capacity for diversity and within-district segregation. At a minimum, we recommend that leaders in Massachusetts push for explicit policies that will produce, within each school, a racial composition resembling that of the district as a whole. Leaders may also consider regional approaches to integrating students across districts, including expanding on the Commonwealth’s long-standing voluntary inter-district integration program, the Metropolitan Council for Educational Opportunity (METCO). Beyond this example, we suggest that state leaders look outside of Massachusetts for models of voluntary school district integration.

This report deals exclusively with the issue of racial integration. Yet true integration goes beyond race. While in the short-term our hope is to foster racially diverse schools in Massachusetts, we also encourage activists, scholars, educators, and leaders to take aim at other forms of segregation that undermine equal opportunity for young people.

School Integration in Massachusetts

Background and Introduction

Parents strongly support racially integrated schools. In 2020, a nationally representative poll found that over 80 percent of parents favor racially diverse schools (Making Caring Common, 2020). Similarly, a 2017 poll conducted by Phi Delta Kappa International found that seven in 10 parents would prefer to send their children to racially diverse schools. A majority of parents in the Phi Delta Kappa poll also voiced support for the idea that racial diversity improves the academic learning environment for students of all backgrounds (Phi Delta Kappa, 2017). Such sentiments align with research indicating that “widespread public support for the ideal of integration” has remained consistent across the past several decades (Frankenberg & Jacobsen, 2011).

Empirical research also supports the aim of racial integration. Studies show that racially integrated schools have smaller gaps in reading and math scores, as well as lower dropout rates when compared to neighboring, less integrated schools (The Century Foundation (TCF), 2016; Hallinan, 1998; Mickelson & Nkomo, 2012; National Academy of Education, 2007; Orfield, 2004). The academic benefits of racially integrated schools tend to be stronger for students who enter at an early age (Boger & Orfield, 2005), and those benefits extend beyond the end of high school (Civil Rights Project, 2001; Johnson, 2011, 2019; Kurlaender & Yun, 2005, 2007; Page, 2008; Wells, 2009).

Historically marginalized racial groups tend to benefit more directly from racially integrated schools. In one of the most often cited studies, African American/Black adults who attended integrated schools had higher lifetime earnings, lower incarceration rates, and lived longer than those who attended segregated non-white schools (Johnson, 2011, 2019). That said, research indicates that the positive impact of racially integrated schooling extends to white students as well (TCF, 2016; Siegel-Hawley, 2012).

This scholarly consensus on the benefits of school diversity is remarkable in a field often characterized by conflicting findings. Yet the benefits of diversity, at present, are not reflected in school accountability formulas, and previous research has found that test-based school accountability can be a barrier to school diversity (Diem & Frankenberg, 2013; Wells et al., 2004). As is the case nationwide, the Massachusetts school accountability system is heavily weighted towards test-based performance data, which presently account for between 60-80 percent of a school’s rating.²

We know that K-12 accountability systems do not directly address racial diversity. But what are the *indirect* effects of these systems? To explore this relationship, our team looked at more than a decade of

² The remaining 20-40% of a school’s rating is determined by factors such as progress made by students towards attaining English language proficiency (for schools with relevant student populations), chronic absenteeism, graduation and dropout rates (for high schools only), and advanced coursework completion (for high schools only).

school demographic data across the entire Commonwealth of Massachusetts, as well as eight years of test score data from Department of Elementary and Secondary Education’s “Accountability and Assistance” school rating system. Using these data, we documented changes in the numbers of: a) racially diverse schools; b) segregated white schools; and, c) segregated schools serving students of color. After providing an illustration of statewide demographic changes, we focus on changes within the Commonwealth’s three largest cities and within our rapidly diversifying smaller cities. In these analyses, we explore whether individual schools in a district match overall district demographics. We also conduct a demographic exploration of the Accountability and Assistance system. In particular, we document trends that are commonplace, yet nonetheless troubling: schools with higher ratings serve a predominately white student population, while schools with lower ratings service an overwhelmingly non-white student population.

We wanted to know...

- How many racially diverse schools are there in Massachusetts? How many segregated white schools and segregated non-white schools are there in Massachusetts? How have these counts changed over the last decade?
- Does the diversity of individual schools match the overall diversity of the districts where they are located?
- How is racial diversity related to state accountability, especially for the highest- and lowest-rated schools in the state?

This report aims to supply clear and concrete figures to track obvious trends. Thus, although many of these findings may not be particularly surprising to careful observers, we believe they will serve as an important resource for policy makers, educational leaders, parents, and the public. We offer this report in service of a pressing concern that affects our young people, our schools, and the future of our democracy.

How Many Racially Diverse Schools Are There in Massachusetts?

For the first time ever in our nation’s history, students of color account for the majority of the K-12 public school student population (Frankenberg, Ee, Ayscue & Orfield, 2019); Massachusetts, too, is trending in that direction. In the 2008-2009 school year, 69.9 percent of Massachusetts K-12 public school students were white, while 14.3 percent were Latinx, 8.2 percent were African American/Black, 5.1 percent were Asian, 2 percent were multi-race/non-Latinx, and about 0.4 percent were either Native American, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander. Twelve years later, the proportion of white students has declined to 57.9 percent, and the shares of students of color in nearly all subgroups have increased. Today, 21.6 percent identify as Latinx, 9.2 percent as African American/Black, 7.1 percent as Asian, 3.9 percent as multi-race/non-Latinx and 0.3 percent as Native American, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander. Importantly, these trends mirror nationwide racial demographic changes.

We wanted to know if the changes in state demography have led to more school diversity across Massachusetts. To answer this question, we drew on data from the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE). We compiled school-level data on student race from the 2008-2009 school year through the 2019-2020 school year—a 12-year window of time sufficient to capture community and organizational change (Frankenberg, 2010).

Having assembled demographic portraits of all K-12 public schools in Massachusetts, we intended to begin counting. But before we could do so, some definition of diverse schools was necessary. Absent a universal standard, we created a new one by combining two established benchmarks.

What is a “racially diverse” school?

The 70-25 model

According to the 70-25 model, a school is racially diverse when no single racial group accounts for more than 70 percent of the total population and at least 25 percent of students in the school are white.

The 70-25 model expands on a definition produced by The Century Foundation (TCF) (2018), which defines schools as racially diverse when the largest ethnic group in a given school does not account for more than 70 percent of the total school population.³ TCF’s use of a 70 percent threshold is based on previous research, which found that when a single racial group within a school surpasses that threshold, other groups “feel increased isolation and alienation, and cross-racial friendships are less likely to occur” (see also Ma & Kurlaender, 2005; Welner, 2006).

³ For more on TCF’s work on diverse schools, visit: <https://tcf.org/content/report/how-racially-diverse-schools-and-classrooms-can-benefit-all-students/>.

We amended the TCF definition to include a minimum of 25 percent white students. In our estimation, the TCF definition, alone, does not reflect the position of white students as the historic beneficiaries of social, political, and economic privilege. Under the TCF definition, a school that is 70 percent Latinx and 30 percent African American/Black, for instance, would be considered diverse. Even if such a school were a place of tremendous strengths, few observers would refer to it as racially integrated. Moreover, it likely would not have the same access to resources as schools with higher percentages of white students. Finally, the TCF definition does not align with the racial demography of Massachusetts public school enrollment, which is approximately 58 percent white.

In light of this, we included the stipulation that 25 percent of students must be white in order for the school to be classified as racially diverse. In part because of its geographical and demographic similarities to Massachusetts, we borrowed this stipulation from a definition of school diversity used in the state of Connecticut for more than 20 years, which widely has been seen as an effective guideline for school-level racial composition. Under the *Sheff v. O’Neill* (1996) decision, the state of Connecticut was required to implement a voluntary inter-district program in the Hartford region aimed at reducing racial isolation in educational settings. A portion of this definition outlined a minimum percentage of white and Asian students for a school to be considered diverse (*Sheff v. O’Neill*, 2013).⁴ Due to the unique position of large Asian refugee populations in some Massachusetts districts, we chose to only consider white students in our stipulation. Students of refugee families have not shared in the economic prosperity and academic achievement stereotypically applied to all Asian students. Thus, our definition of a racially diverse school is one in which no more than 70 percent of students are from a single racial group and at least 25 percent are white.

Using our definition, the number of racially diverse schools has increased over the past 12 years. According to our analysis of school demographic data from the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, 610 schools (33.1 percent) during the 2019-2020 school year were racially diverse according to the 70-25 model—a nearly 60 percent increase from the 2008-2009 school year when 384 schools (20.8 percent) were diverse (see Table 1).

At the same time, we have seen opposite trends in the number of “intensely segregated” schools, which we define as being more than 90 percent white or, conversely, more than 90 percent non-white. While there has been a sharp decline in the number of intensely segregated white schools, there has also been an increase in the number of intensely segregated schools that predominately serve students of color. Shockingly, in the 2008-2009 school year more than one-third of all Massachusetts public schools served an intensely segregated white population (618 out of 1,850 schools). In the following twelve years, the share of intensely segregated white schools dropped precipitously, though it remains high at 9.4 percent of all schools (173 out of 1,842 schools) in the 2019-2020 school year. Undoubtedly, the decrease in

⁴ A recently updated settlement adjusts this minimum threshold to 30% and includes consideration of socioeconomic status (*Sheff v. O’Neill*, 2020).

intensely segregated white schools is due to the widely-noted diversification of the Commonwealth’s suburban towns (see Boston Indicators, 2019). *Note: Since we are counting three school types—racially diverse, intensely segregated white schools, and intensely-segregated non-white schools—our counts for each category do not represent all schools in Massachusetts. Schools that do not fit into one of our three categories are not displayed in Table 1.*

Table 1

Number of Segregated and Racially Diverse Schools in MA (2008-09 to 2019-20)

School year	Intensely segregated non-white	Intensely segregated white	70-25 diverse	Total schools
08-09	143	619	384	1850
09-10	143	579	390	1832
10-11	148	542	392	1825
11-12	154	490	407	1830
12-13	161	446	430	1851
13-14	165	428	452	1861
14-15	174	371	492	1861
15-16	174	333	503	1855
16-17	173	287	519	1859
17-18	177	235	539	1847
18-19	193	206	578	1846
19-20	192	173	610	1842

N = 22,150

Source: Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

Note: Our data set does not distinguish between elementary, middle and high schools; more information is available upon request.

Meanwhile, the increase in intensely segregated schools serving students of color presents an important contrast with our finding related to the increase of racially diverse schools. Specifically, the number of intensely segregated non-white schools has increased from 143 in the 2008-2009 school year to 192 in 2019-2020. As we detail in Table 5, nearly all of the increase in intensely segregated non-white schools has occurred outside of the Commonwealth’s most populous cities (i.e., Boston, Springfield, and Worcester). Although some may find hope in the increase of racially diverse schools, we believe that even an ostensibly positive trend deserves critical public attention; moreover, we are concerned about the increase in intensely segregated non-white schools.

Why Have Massachusetts Schools Become More Racially Diverse?

It would be encouraging to believe that more schools are racially diverse because policy makers and families are taking decisive integratory action. That, however, appears not to be the primary driver of this shift. Instead, the rising number of diverse schools seems to reflect a broader change in the demography of the Commonwealth. Thus, all three findings noted in the previous section—the increase in racially diverse schools, the increase in intensely segregated non-white schools, and the decrease in intensely segregated white schools—are products of the same underlying change—a change in state demographics that, at present, is not being steered intentionally.

The increase in racially diverse schools, the increase in intensely segregated non-white schools, and the decrease in intensely segregated white schools are products of the same underlying change.

Racial Segregation in the Three Largest Districts

Given the larger populations of color in cities, one might expect to see higher numbers of diverse schools in urban districts. However, this is not the case. Boston, Springfield, and Worcester—the three largest cities in Massachusetts, which together are home to 223 K-12 public schools—collectively had just 47 racially diverse schools in the 2019-2020 school year (out of 610 racially diverse schools across the Commonwealth).⁵

Put differently, although Boston, Springfield, and Worcester account for 12.1 percent of all schools in Massachusetts, they are home to only 7.7 percent of the Commonwealth’s racially diverse schools.

It is particularly troubling that, of 61 schools in Springfield, only one passed the threshold for our definition of racial diversity, while 29 were intensely segregated non-white schools (for a full list of districts with segregated schools, see Table 5). Due to the racial diversity of these three cities, there was not a single intensely segregated white school in any of the three largest districts across all years of our collected data.

⁵ During the 2019-2020 school year, the student population in Boston was, on average, 30% African-American/ Black, 9% Asian, 42.4% Latinx, 14.9% white, 0.3% Native American, 0.2% Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander, and 3.3% Multi-racial (non-Latinx). During the same year, Springfield’s student population was, on average, 18.9% African-American/ Black, 2.1% Asian, 67.1% Latinx, 9.7% white, 0.2% Native American, and 2% Multi-racial (non-Latinx). In Worcester, the student population during 2019-2020 was, on average, 16.9% African-American/ Black, 6.4% Asian, 43.1% Latinx, 29.1% white, 0.2% Native American, and 4.2% multi-racial (non-Latinx).

Table 2

Number of Racially Diverse Schools in MA’s Three Largest Districts (2019-20)

	70-25 diverse	Intensely segregated non-white	Intensely segregated white	Total schools
Boston	24	65	0	117
Springfield	1	29	0	61
Worcester	22	4	0	45
Boston, Springfield, Worcester (combined)	47	98	0	223
State Total	610	192	173	1842

N = 1842, total public schools in Massachusetts during the 2019-2020 school year

Source: Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

As Massachusetts is becoming more diverse, students of color are becoming more racially isolated in urban schools. The total number of diverse schools in the three largest districts has fallen from 58 during the 2008-2009 school year to 47 during the 2019-2020 school year. It is important to recognize that the total number of schools in the three largest districts also decreased during that time frame. More importantly, then, we found that the *proportion* of diverse schools decreased from 25.7 to 21.1 percent between 2008-2009 and 2019-2020.

Meanwhile, the state’s three largest districts are also home to a disproportionate share of intensely segregated non-white schools, with 98 total across Boston, Springfield, and Worcester in the 2019-2020 school year (see Table 3). Though these districts account for only 12.1 percent of Massachusetts schools, they account for more than half (51 percent) of the Commonwealth’s intensely segregated non-white schools. Within the three largest districts, 43.9 percent of schools were intensely segregated non-white schools.

Another way to consider the magnitude of school segregation is by looking at student enrollment data. We found the proportion of students attending intensely segregated non-white schools closely mirrors the proportion of schools that were intensely segregated non-white. In the three largest districts, 43,762 students (43.4 percent) attended intensely segregated non-white schools during the 2019-2020 school year. Our research aligns with similar studies, including a recent Boston Indicators (2020) report finding that two of three students of color in Boston attend intensely segregated schools.

Table 3

Percentage of Intensely Segregated Non-White Schools (2008-09 & 2019-20)

	2008-09			2019-20		
	Intensely segregated non-white count	Total school count	Intensely segregated non-white percentage	Intensely segregated non-white count	Total school count	Intensely segregated non-white percentage
Boston	76	137	55.5%	65	117	55.6%
Springfield	12	45	26.7%	29	61	49.2%
Worcester	0	44	0%	4	45	8.9%
Boston, Springfield, Worcester (combined)	88	226	38.9%	98	223	44.4%
State	146	1850	7.9%	192	1842	10.4%

N = 1850 total schools in 2008-2009; 1842 total schools in 2019-2020

Source: Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

We also found that the percentage of white students within individual schools in the same districts varies widely, as Table 4 reveals. Within the district boundaries of Boston, Springfield, and Worcester, extremely low percentages of white students existed in some schools (as low as zero), while substantially higher percentages of white students existed in other schools. These large ranges illustrate the untapped potential for racial integration even in districts that serve an overwhelming majority of students of color. Simply evening out the distribution of white students within these districts would increase integration without requiring major changes in state law or policy.

Table 4

School-Level White Student Population Ranges (2019-20)

District	White student population range
Boston	0.0-59.7%
Springfield	2-73.3%
Worcester	6.2-72.2%

N = 1842, total public schools in Massachusetts during the 2019-2020 school year

Source: Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

Our large districts can and should do more to respond to re-segregation trends within their borders; however, many of the causal factors are beyond their control. Analysis focused within district boundaries not only overlooks important trends in segregation across districts, but also overlooks the

fact that school policies are largely responsible for the racial sorting that created overwhelmingly white suburban rings around majority non-white cities. Many sources, for example, document the massive “white flight” from Boston that followed school desegregation efforts in the city (Formisano, 2004).

Notably, the Supreme Court’s decision in *Milliken v. Bradley* (1974) dramatically curtailed cross-district remedies for school segregation. Following the *Milliken* decision, municipal boundaries essentially function as walls against inter-district integration for families that left the city (Eaton & Orfield, 1997; Sedler, 1987). This is especially true in Northeastern states, where school district boundaries align with municipal boundaries, as opposed to the countywide school districts that are more common in other parts of the country. In addition, as demonstrated in the 2020 Boston Indicators report, school enrollment trends are shaped by shifting demographic trends (e.g., lack of affordable housing, increased income inequality, declining birth rates) that are clearly outside the boundaries of school policy.

Segregation Beyond the Three Largest Districts

Looking across the Commonwealth, one might expect to see a decrease in intensely segregated schools of both varieties, given the increase in diverse schools over the last decade. Indeed, this is true for intensely segregated white schools: since the Commonwealth’s major cities are not home to any schools of this kind, all of the decrease has occurred outside the three largest urban districts.

However, even outside of the major cities, the number of intensely segregated non-white schools has increased. As seen in Table 3, the number of intensely segregated non-white schools across the Commonwealth rose by 51—from 143 in the 2008-2009 school year to 194 in the 2019-2020 school year. During the same period, the number of intensely segregated non-white schools in Boston, Springfield, and Worcester increased by 12 schools. The remainder of the increase in intensely segregated schools serving students of color occurred outside of the three largest cities.

Nine of the Commonwealth’s districts housed intensely segregated non-white schools in the 2019-2020 school year, including the three largest cities. We observed increases in intensely segregated non-white schools in districts like Brockton, Chelsea, and Lynn⁶. Consistent with the statewide demographic trends described earlier, these districts experienced major demographic changes over the past decade. For example, Brockton’s percentage of white students decreased from 30.6 percent in the 2007-2008 school year to 16.5 percent in 2019-2020. Similarly, the percentage of white students in Lynn decreased from 28.6 percent to 17.2 percent during this time period.

Even more troubling, in some of these districts, nearly all schools served intensely segregated non-white student bodies. In Lawrence, 24 of the district’s 25 schools were intensely segregated during the 2019-2020 school year. Similarly, nine of the ten schools in Chelsea were intensely segregated in 2019-2020.

⁶ For historical information on Lynn’s desegregation efforts, visit: <https://www.civilrightsproject.ucla.edu/legal-developments/court-decisions/voluntary-desegregation-plan-using-race-as-a-factor-1>

Chelsea and Lawrence do not possess the overall district-level enrollment numbers to avoid producing intensely segregated non-white schools. In 2019-2020 school year, the student population in Lawrence was 93.7 percent Latinx; in Chelsea it was 87.6 percent.

Due to their small size and the legal restrictions on cross-district integration, there is not much that these districts can do to diversify their school-level enrollment. Lawrence, for instance, borders North Andover—a community whose schools were 73.8 percent white in the 2019-2020 school year—but limitations on cross-district integration tie the hands of even modest efforts to integrate enrollment across these districts. Instead, major change, especially outside the Commonwealth’s largest cities, will only come through bold state support and continued public advocacy.

Table 5
Districts with Intensely Segregated Non-White Schools (2008-09 & 2019-20)

	2008-2009			2019-2020		
District	Intensely Segregated Non-white schools	Total Schools in District	Percentage of Intensely Segregated Non-white	Intensely Segregated Non-white schools	Total Schools in District	Percentage of Intensely Segregated Non-white
Non-district public charters	18	61	29.5%	35	78	44.9%
Boston	76	137	55.5%	65	117	55.6%
Brockton	0	24	0.0%	6	23	26.1%
Chelsea	8	9	88.9%	9	10	90.0%
Holyoke	5	11	45.5%	5	12	41.7%
Lawrence	24	28	85.7%	24	25	96.0%
Lynn	3	24	12.5%	9	25	36.0%
Randolph	0	6	0.0%	1	6	16.7%
Springfield	12	45	26.7%	29	61	47.5%
Worcester	0	44	0.0%	4	45	8.9%

N = 1850 total schools in 2008-2009; N = 1842 total schools in 2019-2020

Source: Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

In addition, 35 of the 78 Commonwealth charter schools in Massachusetts (44.9 percent) were intensely segregated non-white schools, while only one was an intensely segregated white school during the 2019-2020 school year. Massachusetts classifies Commonwealth charter schools as their own autonomous districts in school and district data reporting; however, many charters are geographically located within districts that are home to intensely segregated non-white schools.

Does School Demography Match District Demography?

As an alternative to an absolute measure of school diversity, researchers have considered relative measures, like whether a school matches the overall diversity of its district. As noted earlier, relative measures are limited in what they can tell us about large-scale segregation. They may, for instance, obscure the fact that district boundaries are often used as walls against integration.

We find that the number of schools that meet the district match criterion has fallen slightly over the last decade

Still, relative measures can be helpful in identifying actions that are more immediately feasible within the current legal context, such as attendance zone boundary changes. Indeed, districts that possess the demographic capacity to foster racially diverse schools should consider policies that will distribute their student population more evenly and equitably.

To investigate this matter further, we established a “district match” model that compares school-level demography against district-level demography. In our model, a school is considered to be a “match” if the percentage of white students is

comparable (+/- 5 percent) to the percentage of white students district-wide. For example, if a district’s population is 50 percent white, a school within that district will be considered a “match” if the percentage of white students in the school were no lower than 45 and no higher than 55.

Table 6

Schools Meeting District Match Criteria (2008-09 & 2019-20)

School year	Count of district match schools	Total number of schools	Percentage of schools that match district
2008-2009	1292	1850	69.8%
2019-2020	1246	1842	67.6%

N = 1850 total schools in 2008-2009; N = 1842 total schools in 2019-2020

Source: Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

Our methodology draws on models common in “controlled choice” plans, such as those used by some Massachusetts districts (e.g., Lynn and Cambridge). District match ranges are typically greater in models where the goal is avoiding extreme forms of racial or economic isolation. In Cambridge, for instance, the range used by the district is 20 percentage points. We use a smaller range in order to more accurately capture the extent to which districts are distributing their students evenly across schools. Overall, we find that the number of schools that meet the district match criterion has fallen slightly over the last

decade. During the 2008-2009 school year, 1,292 schools (69.8 percent) met the criterion; however, the number declined to 1,246 schools (67.6 percent) in the 2019-2020 school year, as seen above in Table 6.

Next, we wanted to know how the number of district match schools changed in the Commonwealth’s three largest districts between 2008-2009 and 2019-2020. As we see in Table 7, the numbers in Boston decreased from 38 schools (27.7 percent) meeting the district match definition to 21 (16.1 percent). Meanwhile, Springfield’s number of district match schools rose considerably, from 17 schools (37.8 percent) in 2008-2009 to 46 (75.4 percent) in the 2019-2020 school year. Worcester increased slightly from six schools (13.6 percent) meeting the district match criterion in 2008-2009 to nine schools (20.0 percent) meeting the criterion in 2019-2020.

Table 7

District Match Schools in MA’s Three Largest Districts (2008-09 & 2019-20)

District	2008-2009 school year			2019-2020 school year		
	School count	Total schools	Percentage of schools	School count	Total schools	Percentage of schools
Boston	38	137	27.7%	21	117	16.1%
Springfield	17	45	37.8%	46	61	75.4%
Worcester	6	44	13.6%	9	45	20%

N = 1,850 total schools in 2008-2009; *N* = 1,842 total schools in 2019-2020

Source: Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

Importantly, relative measures of diversity should always be interpreted within their particular district or municipal context. It is easier for demographically homogeneous districts to have high percentages of district match schools. Indeed, this is the case in Springfield, where district match schools appear to be the result of overall demographic homogeneity in the district. As a reminder, Springfield only had one school that met our 70-25 model for school diversity in 2019-2020, compared to 29 intensely segregated schools. In the period covered by our study, Springfield saw an overall decrease in its white student population, from 16.8 percent in 2007-2008 to 9.7 percent in 2019-2020. Its increase in district match schools, then, appears not to be the result of deliberate efforts at integration, but instead a natural consequence in a district that has become more racially homogenous (and less white) over time.

We know that the benefits of diverse schools are not distributed equally across racial subgroups of students. To get a sense of how this plays out in Massachusetts, we wanted to know more about the demography of students who attend schools that meet the district match criterion. We therefore looked specifically at the district match schools, grouping them together and then disaggregating the overall district match enrollment according to student racial sub-groups. Consistent with previous research on school integration, we present the combined percentages of African American/Black and Latinx student populations, given our country’s history of extreme discrimination and exclusion of these two racial subgroups (e.g., Government Accountability Office, 2016).

Schools that meet the criterion for district match across all years (2008-2009 through 2019-2020) are 73.7 percent white on average. Meanwhile, schools that *do not meet* the district match criterion are only 47.9 percent white on average across the ten-year span. Comparing these figures with the overall percentage of white students in Massachusetts during this time period (64.5 percent) we see that white students tend to be overrepresented in schools that meet the district match criterion and underrepresented in schools that do not meet it. This suggests that district match diversity is more common in Massachusetts localities where white families are the majority.

Table 8

Average Percentage of Students in District Match Schools (2008-09 & 2019-20)

	2008-2009 school year		2019-2020 school year	
	District match	State average	District match	State average
White	77.9%	69.3%	65.9%	59%
African American/ Black & Latinx	16.1%	23.3%	24.6%	30.1%
Asian	3.6%	4.8%	5.2%	6.5%
Non-white*	22.1%	30.7%	34.1%	41%

N = 1,850 total schools in 2008-2009; N = 1,842 total schools in 2019-2020

*Non-white refers to students in the following racial groups: African American/Black, Latinx, Asian, Multi-racial (non-Latinx), Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, and Native American.

Source: Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

As shown in Table 8, the percentage of white students in district match schools has declined from roughly 78 percent in the 2008-2009 school year to about 66 percent in the 2019-2020 school year. This decrease coincides with a dramatic drop in the share of intensely segregated white schools across the Commonwealth during the same time period. Meanwhile, when students of color are the majority—as they are in the largest cities—white students are concentrated in a small number of schools.

As noted earlier in this report, the number of intensely segregated white schools has declined dramatically in recent years. While this finding seems positive, it must also be interpreted in light of less encouraging findings related to our district match analysis. Over time, white students have become less segregated in intensely non-white schools, yet our district match analysis illustrates that they are still overwhelmingly represented in majority white schools. These data align with national studies of school demography demonstrating that white students are consistently the most segregated racial sub-group in American public education (Frankenberg, Ee, Ayscue, & Orfield, 2019).

Racial Diversity and State Accountability

How is racial diversity or segregation related to state accountability? To answer that question, we looked at the relationship between the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education's (DESE) "Accountability Percentiles," which it began calculating in the 2011-2012 school year, and the racial composition of schools. Due to school closures during the COVID-19 pandemic, DESE did not collect MCAS testing data in the 2019-2020 school year.⁷ As a result, the most recent accountability data come from the 2018-2019 school year. To better understand student demographic patterns, we switch our unit of analysis from the racial composition of individual schools to the composition of particular groups of schools (e.g., those rated as "underperforming").

Until recently, DESE divided schools into five groups for accountability purposes. Schools in the bottom quintile were identified as Levels 3, 4, and 5, with the top 80 percent identified as Levels 1 and 2. The department then identified a sub-set of schools in the bottom quintile as "underperforming" (Level 4) or "chronically underperforming" (Level 5). Those schools were then subject to more intensive forms of intervention and, potentially, takeover. Looking at schools in the lowest quintile, we find that white students were significantly underrepresented; students of color, meanwhile, were significantly overrepresented. In Table 9, we present averages across our entire ten-year span; however, it is important to note that these averages mostly remained stable from year to year.

Who Attends Low and High Rated Schools?

As our research indicates (Table 9), students of color are disproportionately represented in schools rated as low performing according to the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education's accountability system. Racial disparities, alone, are troubling, but because race is correlated with income and, to a lesser extent, language status, race also functions as a proxy for other kinds of educational needs. To check related demographic profiles more directly, we also looked at how the Massachusetts school accountability system intersects with student language status and family income.

⁷ The Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System is the Commonwealth's statewide set of standards-based tests, given in grades 3-8, as well as grade 10.

Table 9
 Racial Composition of the Highest and Lowest Accountability Quintiles
 (2011-12 to 2018-19)

Student race/ethnicity	Average representation in the highest quintile	Average representation in lowest quintile	Average representation in all schools
White	76.9%	31.3%	63.6%
Non-white (African American/Black, Latinx, and Asian)	23.1%	68.7%	36.4%
African American/Black	3.5%	18.4%	8.7%
Asian	10.5%	4.4%	5.8%
Latinx	5.3%	42.4%	18.3%
African American/Black & Latinx combined	8.9%	60.3%	26.9%

N = 14,801

Source: Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

As we find, the schools rated most highly by DESE’s accountability system, on average, are overwhelmingly white. The schools rated lowest by DESE’s accountability system, on average, have student demographics that are inversely proportional.

Consistent with findings related to race, we also find that the same disparities are evident with regard to other markers of advantage and disadvantage. Schools serving high populations of English language learners and Economically Disadvantaged students are disproportionately represented in the lowest accountability quintile. By contrast, we also analyzed trends related to students with disabilities—a high-needs sub-group whose members are less consistently predicted by race—and found that their representation in lower-rated schools is comparable to the overall enrollment across the Commonwealth. This suggests that the present accountability system may be more biased against racial and cultural student sub-groups than it is against students with disabilities.

Table 10
Other Demographic Indicators, Highest and Lowest Accountability Quintiles
(2011-12 to 2018-19)

Student subgroup	Average representation in the highest quintile	Average representation in lowest quintile	Overall share of school-age population
English Language Learners	3%	20.4%	8.6%
Economically Disadvantaged	10.1%	67.5%	34.1%
Students with Disabilities	14.4%	20.4%	18.3%

N = 14,801

Source: Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

In sum, one can generally predict whether a school will be designated as lower performing (Levels 3, 4, and 5 under DESE’s previous system) by looking at the demography of its student population. Schools in the bottom quintile serve roughly twice the number of high-need groups (English language learners and Economically Disadvantaged students) and historically marginalized racial groups. The schools most likely to be sanctioned are the schools serving the largest shares of the least advantaged. We believe that such figures are a call to action—to ensure that the educational accountability system is identifying schools according to quality, not demographics.

Does This Mean That Racially Diverse Schools Are Worse?

Looking at the average demography of schools rated in the bottom 20 percent of schools, it may seem that racially diverse schools are weaker than predominantly white schools. After all, the lowest-rated schools, according to the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, are much more racially diverse than the average Massachusetts public school.

The strong relationship between race and bottom quintile performance may indicate deficiencies in the accountability framework.

It is important to note that the strong relationship between race and bottom quintile rating may indicate deficiencies in the accountability framework, rather than differences in school quality. Heavy reliance on standardized achievement scores systematically disadvantages schools with higher percentages of low-income students and students from historically marginalized racial groups (Koretz, 2017; Schneider, 2017; Shealey, 2006). As a result, the existing system appears to reflect demography more than it does school quality.

How do diverse schools perform on DESE’s accountability framework? As we find, racially diverse schools tend to be overrepresented in the bottom quintile. According to our analysis, 30.5 percent of diverse schools appeared in the lowest quintile over the past seven years, despite the fact that diverse schools made up only 25.8 percent of all schools during this period (see table 11). Interestingly, racially diverse schools represented a proportional share of the top quintile schools—approximately 25 percent.

Table 11
Percentage of School Types Rated in Lowest and Highest Accountability Quintiles
(2011-12 through 2018-19)

School type	Count of School Type Lowest Quintile	% of School Type in the Lowest Quintile	Count of School Type in the Highest Quintile	% of School Type in the Highest Quintile	% of All Schools
Diverse	630	16.07%	583	14.87%	26.5%
District match	1045	10.43%	1589	15.86%	67.7%
Predominantly Non-white*	1547	36.75%	146	3.47%	28.5%
Intensely Segregated Non-white**	662	47.49%	27	1.94%	9.4%
Intensely Segregated White**	62	2.22%	480	17.17%	18.9%

N = 14,801

*A predominantly non-white school is a school with more than 50% non-white students
 **An intensely segregated school is a school with more than 90% white or non-white students

Source: Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

Though diverse schools perform inconsistently on the Accountability and Assistance system, DESE does seem to consistently over-identify predominantly non-white schools as low-performing. Since the creation of accountability percentiles in the 2011-2012 school year, 36.6 percent of predominantly non-

white schools (i.e., schools serving 50-100 percent students of color) have appeared in the bottom quintile, while accounting for 27.9 percent of all schools. Over that same period, 47.1 percent of intensely segregated non-white schools have appeared in the bottom quintile, while accounting for only nine percent of all schools.

Unlike the schools rated in the bottom quintile, the top quintile of schools is whiter on average than the typical school. Statewide, roughly nine percent of students are African American/Black, and roughly 18 percent are Latinx. Yet the typical top quintile school has dramatically smaller proportions of students from these racial groups. Only three percent of schools with predominantly non-white student bodies (50-100 percent) appeared in the top quintile. Across this same time span (beginning in the 2011-2012 school year), only 1.9 percent of intensely segregated schools (90-100 percent non-white) appeared in the top quintile, despite accounting for more than nine percent of all schools. So-called high-risk subgroups—English language learners, Economically Disadvantaged students, and students with disabilities—are also underrepresented in the highest accountability quintile.

How Does Diversity Relate to State Accountability?

Exploring the demographic profiles of high- and low-rated schools allows a broad look at trends in the relationship between diversity and accountability. We now look more closely at these trends, using DESE’s accountability percentiles to see how diverse and non-diverse schools performed according to the Accountability and Assistance framework. As we show in Table 12, schools that meet the 70-25 criterion for racial diversity performed just below average, at an accountability percentile of 46.4 percent (with 50.0 serving as the exact midpoint for performance). Strikingly, schools that were majority African American/Black and Latinx fared far worse, with an average accountability percentile of 21.1.

Table 12

Average Accountability Percentiles by School Type (2011-12 to 2018-19)

Diversity & segregation classification	Average accountability percentile
70-25 diverse model	46.4
Majority white	59.3
Majority African American/Black & Latinx	21.1
Intensely Segregated (90-100% non-white)	19.4

N = 14,801

Source: Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

Looking at the average percentiles for different school types, we see the same trend identified in our analysis of schools in the lowest and highest quintiles: majority white schools are rated more favorably than majority African American/Black and Latinx schools. Racially diverse schools, meanwhile, fall in between. This, once more, illustrates the importance of asking whether the existing accountability system is measuring school quality or school demography and whether relevant changes need to be

made to the system. Of course, such changes will not happen without sustained public conversation and advocacy from school and district leaders.

As we know from educational research, present accountability measures correlate strongly with student background variables (Koretz, 2017). Especially because school ratings factor heavily in housing decisions, as well as within-district choice decisions, the existing accountability framework may be unintentionally exacerbating segregation by steering white families away from racially diverse schools and predominantly non-white schools (Schneider, 2017). Given these potentially steep costs, as well as the absence of evidence that the present accountability system has improved student learning, it may be time to reevaluate how schools are measured and valued.

Conclusion and Policy Recommendations

Over the past decade, racial diversity has increased inside Massachusetts public schools. Yet so has the isolation of students of color in intensely segregated schools. Thus, as the Commonwealth increases its capacity to promote integration, the opposite is often happening in our schools. Presently, the most racially diverse districts are home to the largest number of intensely segregated non-white schools.

Why is this happening? Though over a dozen districts have racial integration plans on the books, there is little evidence of implementation. Additionally, the present accountability system not only ignores racial diversity, but appears to actively *discourage* it. Existing accountability mechanisms currently produce sanctions mostly for schools with majority populations of color; at the same time, they single out predominantly white schools for praise, drawing the attention of families with the privilege to choose where they live send their children to school. In light of the numerous positive outcomes of racial integration for students, we believe this merits commitment of both time and resources.

We encourage leaders in Massachusetts to seize the opportunity to promote racial diversity in our schools. Demography in the Commonwealth will continue to change over the next decade, echoing many of the trends from the previous decade. As it does, the public schools can become more racially integrated. We fear, however, that we will instead see a rise in the number of intensely segregated schools if demographic changes are not steered intentionally towards school diversity.

To promote the aim of racial integration, we encourage the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, in partnership with other organizations, to consider the following policy recommendations:

- 1. Pilot new and more democratic forms of accountability**
It is imperative that measures of school quality do not merely reflect racial demography. As long as they do, these systems will guide families away from racially diverse schools as well as undermine the potential for racially diverse schools.
- 2. Track district capacity for integration within and across school districts**
The Department of Elementary and Secondary Education should help the public understand which localities presently have the capacity for districtwide integration, and identify those in which schools are racially imbalanced. Of course, it might also do far more than simply provide information, including formally recognizing racially integrated schools and districts as well as providing incentives and technical assistance for districts that pursue voluntary integration.
- 3. Expand METCO**
Massachusetts is home to one of the longest-standing cross-district integration programs in the nation: the Metropolitan Council of Educational Opportunity (METCO). Our data suggest that, given increasing segregation within district boundaries, there is much to be gained in expanding METCO to include a two-way integration program—one that also places students from majority white districts into schools with higher percentages of students of color.

We also encourage leaders in the Commonwealth to push for explicit policies that will produce, within each school, a racial composition resembling that of the district as a whole. We believe this can be done in two specific ways:

1. Encourage district-level integration policies

Presently, voluntary integration policies exist in cities like Cambridge, where the district aims to cultivate in each school a student body as socioeconomically diverse as the city. Such policies, though imperfect, can do a great deal to prevent intra-district segregation. As cities and towns become more diverse, voluntary integration policies will be important tools for harnessing demographic change to ensure diverse schools within each district.

2. Develop more sophisticated measures of social advantage and disadvantage

Massachusetts may have much to learn from localities outside the Commonwealth that have lawfully considered race as part of their voluntary integration plans. In Berkeley, California, for instance, the district considers the racial makeup of each neighborhood as one factor in its plan.⁸ Because the district does not consider race at the individual student level, it has withstood legal challenges.

Ultimately, this report makes a case for action in racially integrating schools in Massachusetts. Such work is urgent, as changing demography in the Commonwealth presents both an opportunity and a threat. With careful stewardship, the public schools in Massachusetts might become truly integrated for the first time in history. Or, they might become even more segregated. Doing nothing, it seems, will lead to the latter.

Racial integration is an unfulfilled moral commitment—in our society and our schools. Yet so are other forms of segregation. Systematic separation, whether by race or other markers, undermines the aims of equity and opportunity. Thus, while we urge leaders to move boldly in the direction of racial integration, we also hope that they attend to other ways our young people can come together across all manner of differences. Together, we have much to learn.

⁸ See the Berkeley Public Schools website for more information on the district’s student assignment policy: <https://www.berkeleyschools.net/information-on-berkeley-unifieds-student-assignment-plan/>.

References

- Boger, J. C. & Orfield, G. (2005). *School segregation: Must the South turn back?* Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.
- Boston Indicators. (2019). *Changing faces of greater Boston*. Retrieved from: <https://www.bostonindicators.org/reports/report-website-pages/changing-faces-of-greater-boston>
- Boston Indicators. (2020). *Kids today*. Retrieved from: <https://www.bostonindicators.org/reports/report-website-pages/kids-today>
- The Century Foundation (TCF). (2016). *How racially diverse schools and classrooms can benefit all students*. Retrieved from: https://tcf.org/assets/downloads/HowRaciallyDiverse_AmyStuartWells.pdf
- The Century Foundation (TCF). (2018). *Diverse-by-design charter schools*. Retrieved from: <https://tcf.org/content/report/diverse-design-charter-schools/>
- Civil Rights Project. (2001). *Schools more separate: Consequences of a decade of resegregation*. Retrieved from: <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED459217>
- Diem, S., & Frankenberg, E. (2013). The politics of diversity: Integration in an era of political and legal uncertainty. *Teachers College Record*, 115(11).
- Eaton, S., & Orfield, G. (1997). *Dismantling Desegregation: The quiet reversal of Brown V. Board of Education*. New York: The New Press.
- Formisano, R. P. (2004). *Boston against busing: Race, class, and ethnicity in the 1960s and 1970s*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.
- Frankenberg, E. (2010). Exploring the difference in diverse schools' destinies: A research note. *Teachers College Record*. Retrieved from: <http://www.tcrecord.org/Content.asp?ContentID=15929>
- Frankenberg, E., Ee, J., Ayscue, J., & Orfield, G. (2019, May 10). Harming Our Common Future: America's Segregated Schools 65 Years After *Brown*. *UCLA Civil Rights Project-Proyecto Derechos Civiles*. Retrieved from <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/23j1b9nv>
- Frankenberg, E. & Jacobsen, R. (2011). Trends school integration polls. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 75(4), 788-811.
- Government Accountability Office. (2016, May 17). Better Use of Information Could Help Agencies Identify Disparities and Address Racial Discrimination. Washington, D.C.: Government Accountability Office.
- Hallinan, M. T. (1998). Diversity effects on student outcomes: Social science evidence. *Ohio State Law Journal*, 59, 733-754.

- Harvey, J. (2017). *Raising white kids: Bringing up children in a racially unjust America*. Nashville: Abingdon Press.
- Johnson, R. C. (2011). *Long-run impacts of school desegregation & school quality on adult attainments* (No. w16664). National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Johnson, R. C. (2019). *Children of the dream: Why school integration works*. London: Hachette UK.
- Koretz, D. (2017). *The testing charade: Pretending to make schools better*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Kurlaender, M. & Yun, J. T. (2005). Fifty years after brown: New evidence of the impact of school racial composition on student outcomes. *International Journal of Educational Policy, Research, and Practice*, 6(1), 51-78.
- Kurlaender, M. & Yun, J. T. (2007). Measuring school racial composition and student outcomes in a multiracial society. *American Journal of Education*, 113(2), 213-242.
- Ma, Y. S., & Kurlaender, M. (2005). The future of race-conscious policies in K-12 public schools: Support from recent legal opinions and social science research, in *School Resegregation: Must the South Turn Back?* J. C. Boger & G. Orfield (Eds.). Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.
- Making Caring Common. (2020). Do parents really want school integration? Cambridge, MA: Harvard University. Retrieved from: <https://mcc.gse.harvard.edu/reports/do-parents-really-want-school-integration>
- Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) (2020). Statewide Reports. School and District Profiles. Retrieved from: http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/state_report/
- Mickelson, R. A. & Nkomo, M. (2012). Integrated schooling, life course outcomes, and social cohesion in multiethnic democratic societies. *Review of Research in Education*, 36(1), 197-238.
- National Academy of Education. (2007). *Race conscious policies for assigning students to schools*. Retrieved from: <https://nepc.colorado.edu/sites/default/files/Brief-NAE.pdf>
- Orfield, G. (2004). *"Brown" at 50: King's dream or "Plessy's" nightmare?* Cambridge, MA: Civil Rights Project at Harvard University.
- Page, S. E. (2008). *The difference: How the power of diversity creates better groups, firms, schools, and societies*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Phi Delta Kappa. (2017). *The 49th Annual PDK poll of the public's attitudes toward the public schools: Academic achievement isn't the only mission*. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0031721717728274>
- Schneider, J. (2017). *Beyond test scores: A better way to measure school quality*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Sedler, R. A. (1987). The profound impact of *Milliken v. Bradley*. *Wayne State University Law Review*, 33(1693). Retrieved from: <https://digitalcommons.wayne.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1076&context=lawfrp>

- Shealey, M. W. (2006). The promises and perils of “scientifically based” research for urban schools. *Urban Education, 41*(1), 5-19.
- Sheff v. O’Neill Stipulation and Proposed Order. (2020, January 10). Judicial District of Hartford, Docket No. HHD-X07-CV89-4026240-S. Retrieved from: https://portal.ct.gov/-/media/AG/Press_Releases/2019/State-Revision-Phase-IV-Stipulation-1-9-20.pdf?la=en&hash=5DA1D94768F6F1B461BD1AAE3E4B4F87
- Sheff v. O’Neill*. (1996). 238 Conn. 1, 678 A.2d 126.
- Sheff v. O’Neill* Stipulation and Proposed Order. (2013, December 13). Judicial District of Hartford, Docket No. HHD-X07-CV89-4026240-S. Retrieved from: <http://ctschoolfinance.org/assets/uploads/files/2013-December-13-Sheff-Stipulation.pdf>
- Siegel-Hawley, G. (2012). *How non-minority students also benefit from racially diverse schools*. National Coalition on School Diversity. Retrieved from: <https://www.school-diversity.org/pdf/DiversityResearchBriefNo8.pdf>
- Wells, A. S. (2009). *Both sides now*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Wells, A. S., Holme, J. J., Revilla, A. T., & Atanda, A. K. (2004). How society failed school desegregation policy: Looking past the schools to understand them. *Review of Research in Education, 28*(1), 47-99.
- Welner, K. G. (2006). K–12 race-conscious student assignment policies: Law, social science, and diversity. *Review of Educational Research, 76*(3), 349–382.

Appendix A

Diverse Schools (70-25 Definition) for the 2019-2020 School Year

Year	District	School	School Code	Diverse (70-25)
19-20	Acton-Boxborough	Acton-Boxborough Regional High	06000505	diverse
19-20	Acton-Boxborough	Blanchard Memorial School	06000005	diverse
19-20	Acton-Boxborough	C.T. Douglas Elementary School	06000020	diverse
19-20	Acton-Boxborough	Carol Huebner Early Childhood Program	06000001	diverse
19-20	Acton-Boxborough	Luther Conant School	06000030	diverse
19-20	Acton-Boxborough	McCarthy-Towne School	06000015	diverse
19-20	Acton-Boxborough	Merriam School	06000010	diverse
19-20	Acton-Boxborough	Paul P Gates Elementary School	06000025	diverse
19-20	Acton-Boxborough	Raymond J Grey Junior High	06000405	diverse
19-20	Advanced Math and Science Academy Charter (District)	Advanced Math and Science Academy Charter School	04300305	diverse
19-20	Amherst	Crocker Farm Elementary	00080009	diverse
19-20	Amherst	Fort River Elementary	00080020	diverse
19-20	Amherst	Wildwood Elementary	00080050	diverse
19-20	Amherst-Pelham	Amherst Regional High	06050505	diverse
19-20	Amherst-Pelham	Amherst Regional Middle School	06050405	diverse
19-20	Andover	Andover West Middle	00090310	diverse
19-20	Andover	Henry C Sanborn Elementary	00090010	diverse
19-20	Andover	High Plain Elementary	00090004	diverse
19-20	Andover	Shawsheen School	00090005	diverse
19-20	Andover	Wood Hill Middle School	00090350	diverse
19-20	Argosy Collegiate Charter School (District)	Argosy Collegiate Charter School	35090305	diverse

19-20	Arlington	Hardy	00100030	diverse
19-20	Arlington	John A Bishop	00100005	diverse
19-20	Arlington	M Norcross Stratton	00100055	diverse
19-20	Arlington	Menotomy Preschool	00100038	diverse
19-20	Arlington	Peirce	00100045	diverse
19-20	Arlington	Thompson	00100050	diverse
19-20	Ashland	Ashland High	00140505	diverse
19-20	Ashland	Ashland Middle	00140405	diverse
19-20	Ashland	David Mindess	00140015	diverse
19-20	Ashland	Henry E Warren Elementary	00140010	diverse
19-20	Ashland	William Pittaway Elementary	00140005	diverse
19-20	Attleboro	Attleboro Community Academy	00160515	diverse
19-20	Attleboro	Attleboro High	00160505	diverse
19-20	Attleboro	Cyril K. Brennan Middle School	00160315	diverse
19-20	Attleboro	Hill-Roberts Elementary School	00160045	diverse
19-20	Attleboro	Hyman Fine Elementary School	00160040	diverse
19-20	Attleboro	Peter Thacher Elementary School	00160050	diverse
19-20	Attleboro	Thomas Willett Elementary School	00160035	diverse
19-20	Attleboro	Wamsutta Middle School	00160320	diverse
19-20	Avon	Avon Middle High School	00180510	diverse
19-20	Avon	Ralph D Butler	00180010	diverse
19-20	Barnstable	Barnstable Community Innovation School	00200012	diverse
19-20	Barnstable	Barnstable High	00200505	diverse
19-20	Barnstable	Barnstable Intermediate School	00200315	diverse
19-20	Barnstable	Barnstable United Elementary School	00200050	diverse
19-20	Barnstable	Centerville Elementary	00200010	diverse
19-20	Barnstable	Enoch Cobb Early Learning Center	00200001	diverse
19-20	Barnstable	Hyannis West Elementary	00200025	diverse
19-20	Bedford	Bedford High	00230505	diverse
19-20	Bedford	John Glenn Middle	00230305	diverse
19-20	Bedford	Lt Elezer Davis	00230010	diverse
19-20	Bedford	Lt Job Lane School	00230012	diverse
19-20	Belmont	Belmont High	00260505	diverse
19-20	Belmont	Daniel Butler	00260015	diverse
19-20	Belmont	Mary Lee Burbank	00260010	diverse
19-20	Belmont	Winn Brook	00260005	diverse
19-20	Belmont	Winthrop L Chenery Middle	00260305	diverse
19-20	Benjamin Franklin Classical Charter Public (District)	Benjamin Franklin Classical Charter Public School	04470205	diverse

	Berkshire Arts and Technology Charter Public (District)	Berkshire Arts and Technology Charter Public School	04140305	diverse
19-20	Billerica	Hajjar Elementary	00310026	diverse
19-20	Billerica	Parker	00310015	diverse
	Blue Hills Regional Vocational Technical			
19-20	Technical	Blue Hills Regional Vocational Technical	08060605	diverse
19-20	Boston	Baldwin Early Learning Center	00350003	diverse
19-20	Boston	Beethoven	00350021	diverse
19-20	Boston	Boston Latin	00350560	diverse
19-20	Boston	Boston Latin Academy	00350545	diverse
19-20	Boston	Boston Teachers Union School	00350012	diverse
19-20	Boston	Curley K-8 School	00350020	diverse
19-20	Boston	Dante Alighieri Montessori School	00350066	diverse
19-20	Boston	Dennis C Haley	00350077	diverse
19-20	Boston	Dr. William Henderson Lower	00350266	diverse
19-20	Boston	East Boston Early Childhood Center	00350009	diverse
19-20	Boston	Eliot Elementary	00350096	diverse
19-20	Boston	Ellis Mendell	00350100	diverse
19-20	Boston	Joseph P Manning	00350184	diverse
19-20	Boston	Joyce Kilmer	00350190	diverse
19-20	Boston	Lyndon	00350262	diverse
19-20	Boston	Lyon K-8	00350004	diverse
19-20	Boston	Lyon Upper 9-12	00350655	diverse
19-20	Boston	Manassah E Bradley	00350215	diverse
19-20	Boston	Mission Hill School	00350382	diverse
19-20	Boston	Mozart	00350237	diverse
19-20	Boston	Oliver Hazard Perry	00350255	diverse
19-20	Boston	Phineas Bates	00350278	diverse
19-20	Boston	Warren-Prescott	00350346	diverse
19-20	Boston	Winship Elementary	00350374	diverse
	Boston Collegiate Charter (District)			
19-20	Charter (District)	Boston Collegiate Charter School	04490305	diverse
19-20	Braintree	Archie T Morrison	00400033	diverse
19-20	Braintree	Braintree High	00400505	diverse
19-20	Braintree	Donald Ross	00400050	diverse
19-20	Braintree	East Middle School	00400305	diverse
19-20	Braintree	Hollis	00400005	diverse

19-20	Braintree	Liberty	00400025	diverse
19-20	Braintree	Mary E Flaherty School	00400020	diverse
19-20	Braintree	Monatiquot Kindergarten Center	00400009	diverse
19-20	Brockton	Ashfield Middle School	00440421	diverse
19-20	Brockton	Brockton Champion High School	00440515	diverse
19-20	Brockton	Hancock	00440045	diverse
19-20	Brockton	Huntington Therapeutic Day School	00440400	diverse
19-20	Brockton	Mary E. Baker School	00440002	diverse
19-20	Brookline	Brookline Early Education Program at Beacon	00460001	diverse
19-20	Brookline	Brookline Early Education Program at Clark Road	00460003	diverse
19-20	Brookline	Brookline Early Education Program at Putterham	00460002	diverse
19-20	Brookline	Brookline High	00460505	diverse
19-20	Brookline	Coolidge Corner School	00460015	diverse
19-20	Brookline	Edith C Baker	00460005	diverse
19-20	Brookline	Heath	00460025	diverse
19-20	Brookline	John D Runkle	00460045	diverse
19-20	Brookline	Lawrence	00460030	diverse
19-20	Brookline	Michael Driscoll	00460020	diverse
19-20	Brookline	Pierce	00460040	diverse
19-20	Brookline	The Lynch Center	00460060	diverse
19-20	Brookline	William H Lincoln	00460035	diverse
19-20	Burlington	Burlington High	00480505	diverse
19-20	Burlington	Fox Hill	00480007	diverse
19-20	Burlington	Francis Wyman Elementary	00480035	diverse
19-20	Burlington	Marshall Simonds Middle	00480303	diverse
19-20	Burlington	Memorial	00480015	diverse
19-20	Burlington	Pine Glen Elementary	00480020	diverse
19-20	Cambridge	Amigos School	00490006	diverse
19-20	Cambridge	Cambridge Rindge and Latin	00490506	diverse
19-20	Cambridge	Cambridge Street Upper School	00490305	diverse
19-20	Cambridge	Cambridgeport	00490007	diverse
19-20	Cambridge	Graham and Parks	00490080	diverse
19-20	Cambridge	Haggerty	00490020	diverse
19-20	Cambridge	John M Tobin	00490065	diverse
19-20	Cambridge	Kennedy-Longfellow	00490040	diverse
19-20	Cambridge	King Open	00490035	diverse
19-20	Cambridge	Maria L. Baldwin	00490005	diverse
19-20	Cambridge	Martin Luther King Jr.	00490030	diverse

19-20	Cambridge	Morse	00490045	diverse
19-20	Cambridge	Peabody	00490050	diverse
19-20	Cambridge	Putnam Avenue Upper School	00490310	diverse
19-20	Cambridge	Rindge Avenue Upper School	00490315	diverse
19-20	Cambridge	Vassal Lane Upper School	00490320	diverse
19-20	Canton	Canton High	00500505	diverse
19-20	Canton	Dean S Luce	00500020	diverse
19-20	Canton	Lt Peter M Hansen	00500012	diverse
19-20	Canton	Rodman Early Childhood Center	00500010	diverse
19-20	Canton	Wm H Galvin Middle	00500305	diverse
19-20	Chelmsford	Center Elementary School	00560005	diverse
19-20	Chelmsford	Charles D Harrington	00560025	diverse
19-20	Chelmsford	Community Education Center	00560001	diverse
19-20	Chicopee	Barry	00610003	diverse
19-20	Chicopee	Belcher	00610010	diverse
19-20	Chicopee	Bellamy Middle	00610305	diverse
19-20	Chicopee	Bowe	00610015	diverse
19-20	Chicopee	Bowie	00610020	diverse
19-20	Chicopee	Chicopee Comprehensive High School	00610510	diverse
19-20	Chicopee	Chicopee High	00610505	diverse
19-20	Chicopee	Dupont Middle	00610310	diverse
19-20	Chicopee	Fairview Elementary	00610050	diverse
19-20	Chicopee	Gen John J Stefanik	00610090	diverse
19-20	Chicopee	Lambert-Lavoie	00610040	diverse
19-20	Chicopee	Litwin	00610022	diverse
19-20	Chicopee	Streiber Memorial School	00610065	diverse
19-20	Chicopee	Szetela Early Childhood Center	00610001	diverse
	Christa McAuliffe Charter Public (District)	Christa McAuliffe Charter Public School	04180305	diverse
	City on a Hill Charter Public School New	City on a Hill Charter Public School New		
19-20	Bedford (District)	Bedford	35070505	diverse
19-20	Clinton	Clinton Elementary	00640050	diverse
19-20	Clinton	Clinton Middle School	00640305	diverse
19-20	Clinton	Clinton Senior High	00640505	diverse
19-20	Concord	Alcott	00670005	diverse
19-20	Dedham	Avery	00730010	diverse
19-20	Dedham	Riverdale	00730045	diverse
19-20	Dennis-Yarmouth	Dennis-Yarmouth Regional High	06450505	diverse

19-20	Dennis-Yarmouth	Ezra H Baker Innovation School	06450005	diverse
19-20	Dennis-Yarmouth	Marguerite E Small Elementary	06450015	diverse
19-20	Dennis-Yarmouth	Mattacheese Middle School	06450305	diverse
19-20	Dennis-Yarmouth	N H Wixon Innovation School	06450050	diverse
19-20	Dracut	Brookside Elementary	00790035	diverse
19-20	Dracut	George H. Englesby Elementary School	00790045	diverse
19-20	Edgartown	Edgartown Elementary	00890005	diverse
19-20	Everett	Devens School	00930030	diverse
19-20	Everett	Madeline English School	00930018	diverse
19-20	Everett	Webster School	00930015	diverse
19-20	Fall River	B M C Durfee High	00950505	diverse
19-20	Fall River	Carlton M. Viveiros Elementary School	00950009	diverse
19-20	Fall River	Henry Lord Community School	00950017	diverse
19-20	Fall River	John J Doran	00950045	diverse
19-20	Fall River	Letourneau Elementary School	00950013	diverse
19-20	Fall River	Mary Fonseca Elementary School	00950011	diverse
19-20	Fall River	Matthew J Kuss Middle	00950320	diverse
19-20	Fall River	Morton Middle	00950315	diverse
19-20	Fall River	North End Elementary	00950005	diverse
19-20	Fall River	Resiliency Preparatory Academy	00950525	diverse
19-20	Fall River	Samuel Watson	00950145	diverse
19-20	Fall River	Spencer Borden	00950130	diverse
19-20	Fall River	Stone PK-12 School	00950340	diverse
19-20	Fall River	Talbot Innovation School	00950305	diverse
19-20	Fall River	William S Greene	00950065	diverse
19-20	Falmouth	Teaticket	00960015	diverse
19-20	Fitchburg	Crocker Elementary	00970016	diverse
19-20	Fitchburg	Fitchburg High	00970505	diverse
19-20	Fitchburg	Goodrich Academy	00970510	diverse
19-20	Fitchburg	McKay Arts Academy	00970340	diverse
19-20	Fitchburg	Memorial Middle School	00970048	diverse
19-20	Fitchburg	Reingold Elementary	00970043	diverse
	Foxborough Regional Charter (District)			
19-20	Foxborough Regional Charter (District)	Foxborough Regional Charter School	04460550	diverse
19-20	Framingham	Brophy	01000006	diverse
19-20	Framingham	Cameron Middle School	01000302	diverse
19-20	Framingham	Charlotte A Dunning	01000007	diverse
19-20	Framingham	Framingham High School	01000515	diverse
19-20	Framingham	Fuller Middle	01000305	diverse

19-20	Framingham	Hemenway	01000015	diverse
19-20	Framingham	Juniper Hill School	01000001	diverse
19-20	Framingham	King Elementary School	01000005	diverse
19-20	Framingham	Mary E Stapleton Elementary	01000045	diverse
19-20	Framingham	Miriam F McCarthy School	01000050	diverse
19-20	Framingham	Potter Road	01000039	diverse
19-20	Framingham	Walsh Middle	01000310	diverse
19-20	Framingham	Woodrow Wilson	01000055	diverse
19-20	Gardner	Elm Street School	01030001	diverse
19-20	Gardner	Gardner High	01030505	diverse
19-20	Gardner	Gardner Middle School	01030405	diverse
19-20	Gardner	Waterford Street	01030020	diverse
	Global Learning Charter Public (District)	Global Learning Charter Public School	04960305	diverse
19-20	Gloucester Greater Lowell Regional Vocational Technical	Veterans Memorial	01070045	diverse
19-20	Greater New Bedford Regional Vocational Technical	Gr Lowell Regional Vocational Technical	08280605	diverse
19-20	Technical	Gr New Bedford Vocational Technical	08250605	diverse
19-20	Greenfield	Federal Street School	01140010	diverse
19-20	Greenfield	Greenfield High	01140505	diverse
19-20	Greenfield	Newton School	01140035	diverse
	Greenfield Commonwealth Virtual District	Greenfield Commonwealth Virtual School	39010900	diverse
	Hampden Charter School of Science East (District)	Hampden Charter School of Science East	04990305	diverse
	Hampden Charter School of Science West (District)	Hampden Charter School of Science West	35160305	diverse
19-20	Haverhill	Bradford Elementary	01280008	diverse
19-20	Haverhill	Caleb Dustin Hunking School	01280030	diverse
19-20	Haverhill	Consentino Middle School	01280100	diverse
19-20	Haverhill	Dr Paul Nettle	01280050	diverse
19-20	Haverhill	Golden Hill	01280026	diverse
19-20	Haverhill	Greenleaf Academy	01280033	diverse

19-20	Haverhill	Haverhill High	01280505	diverse
19-20	Haverhill	John G Whittier	01280085	diverse
19-20	Haverhill	Moody	01280045	diverse
19-20	Haverhill	Pentucket Lake Elementary	01280054	diverse
19-20	Haverhill	Silver Hill Elementary School	01280067	diverse
19-20	Haverhill	TEACH	01280073	diverse
19-20	Haverhill	Tilton	01280075	diverse
19-20	Haverhill	Tilton Upper Middle School	01280105	diverse
19-20	Haverhill	Walnut Square	01280080	diverse
	Hill View Montessori Charter Public (District)	Hill View Montessori Charter Public School	04550050	diverse
19-20	Holbrook	Holbrook Middle High School	01330505	diverse
19-20	Holbrook	John F Kennedy	01330018	diverse
19-20	Holyoke	Joseph Metcalf School	01370003	diverse
19-20	Holyoke	Lt Elmer J McMahon Elementary	01370015	diverse
19-20	Hopkinton	Elmwood	01390010	diverse
19-20	Hopkinton	Hopkins Elementary School	01390015	diverse
19-20	Hopkinton	Hopkinton Pre-School	01390003	diverse
19-20	Hopkinton	Marathon Elementary School	01390005	diverse
	Innovation Academy Charter (District)	Innovation Academy Charter School	04350305	diverse
19-20	Leominster	Bennett Center For Technical Education	01530003	diverse
19-20	Leominster	Innovation	01530605	diverse
19-20	Leominster	Fall Brook	01530007	diverse
19-20	Leominster	Frances Drake School	01530010	diverse
19-20	Leominster	Johnny Appleseed	01530025	diverse
19-20	Leominster	Leominster Center for Excellence	01530515	diverse
19-20	Leominster	Leominster High School	01530505	diverse
19-20	Leominster	Lincoln School	01530005	diverse
19-20	Leominster	Northwest	01530030	diverse
19-20	Leominster	Priest Street	01530040	diverse
19-20	Leominster	Samoset School	01530045	diverse
19-20	Leominster	Sky View Middle School	01530320	diverse
19-20	Lexington	Bowman	01550008	diverse
19-20	Lexington	Bridge	01550006	diverse
19-20	Lexington	Fiske	01550015	diverse
19-20	Lexington	Harrington	01550030	diverse

19-20	Lexington	Jonas Clarke Middle	01550305	diverse
19-20	Lexington	Joseph Estabrook	01550010	diverse
19-20	Lexington	Lexington Children's Place	01550001	diverse
19-20	Lexington	Lexington High	01550505	diverse
19-20	Lexington	Maria Hastings	01550035	diverse
19-20	Lexington	Wm Diamond Middle	01550310	diverse
19-20	Lincoln	Hanscom Middle	01570305	diverse
19-20	Lincoln	Hanscom Primary	01570006	diverse
19-20	Lincoln	Lincoln School	01570025	diverse
19-20	Lowell	Cardinal O'Connell Early Learning Center	01600001	diverse
19-20	Lowell	Dr An Wang School	01600345	diverse
19-20	Lowell	Dr Gertrude Bailey	01600002	diverse
19-20	Lowell	Dr. Janice Adie Day School	01600605	diverse
19-20	Lowell	Greenhalge	01600015	diverse
19-20	Lowell	James S Daley Middle School	01600315	diverse
19-20	Lowell	James Sullivan Middle School	01600340	diverse
19-20	Lowell	Laura Lee Therapeutic Day School	01600085	diverse
19-20	Lowell	Leblanc Therapeutic Day School	01600320	diverse
19-20	Lowell	Lowell High	01600505	diverse
19-20	Lowell	Moody Elementary	01600027	diverse
19-20	Lowell	Pawtucketville Memorial	01600036	diverse
19-20	Lowell	Peter W Reilly	01600040	diverse
19-20	Lowell	Pyne Arts	01600018	diverse
19-20	Lowell	S Christa McAuliffe Elementary	01600075	diverse
	Lowell Middlesex Academy Charter (District)	Lowell Middlesex Academy Charter School		
19-20			04580505	diverse
19-20	Lynn	Aborn	01630011	diverse
19-20	Lynn	Capt William G Shoemaker	01630090	diverse
19-20	Lynn	Edward A Sisson	01630095	diverse
19-20	Lynn	Fecteau-Leary Junior/Senior High School	01630525	diverse
19-20	Lynn	Lynn Woods	01630075	diverse
19-20	Lynn	Pickering Middle	01630420	diverse
	Ma Academy for Math and Science	Ma Academy for Math and Science School		
19-20			04680505	diverse
19-20	Malden	Beebe	01650003	diverse
19-20	Malden	Forestdale	01650027	diverse
19-20	Malden	Linden	01650047	diverse
19-20	Malden	Malden Early Learning Center	01650049	diverse

	Map Academy Charter School			
19-20	(District)	Map Academy Charter School	35170505	diverse
19-20	Marlborough	1 LT Charles W. Whitcomb School	01700045	diverse
19-20	Marlborough	Charles Jaworek School	01700030	diverse
19-20	Marlborough	Early Childhood Center	01700006	diverse
19-20	Marlborough	Francis J Kane	01700008	diverse
19-20	Marlborough	Marlborough High	01700505	diverse
19-20	Marlborough	Richer	01700025	diverse
	Martha's Vineyard			
19-20	Vineyard	Martha's Vineyard Regional High	07000505	diverse
19-20	Medford	Christopher Columbus	01760140	diverse
19-20	Medford	Curtis-Tufts	01760510	diverse
19-20	Medford	John J McGlynn Elementary School	01760068	diverse
19-20	Medford	John J. McGlynn Middle School	01760320	diverse
19-20	Medford	Madeleine Dugger Andrews	01760315	diverse
19-20	Medford	Medford High	01760505	diverse
19-20	Medford	Milton Fuller Roberts	01760150	diverse
19-20	Melrose	Lincoln	01780020	diverse
19-20	Methuen	Comprehensive Grammar School	01810050	diverse
19-20	Methuen	Donald P Timony Grammar	01810060	diverse
19-20	Methuen	Marsh Grammar School	01810030	diverse
19-20	Methuen	Methuen High	01810505	diverse
19-20	Methuen	Tenney Grammar School	01810055	diverse
19-20	Milford	Brookside	01850065	diverse
19-20	Milford	Memorial	01850010	diverse
19-20	Milford	Milford High	01850505	diverse
19-20	Milford	Shining Star Early Childhood Center	01850075	diverse
19-20	Milford	Stacy Middle	01850305	diverse
19-20	Milford	Woodland	01850090	diverse
19-20	Milton	Milton High	01890505	diverse
19-20	Milton	Tucker	01890020	diverse
	Mystic Valley Regional Charter			
19-20	(District)	Mystic Valley Regional Charter School	04700105	diverse
19-20	Nantucket	Cyrus Peirce	01970010	diverse
19-20	Nantucket	Nantucket Elementary	01970005	diverse
19-20	Nantucket	Nantucket High	01970505	diverse
19-20	Nantucket	Nantucket Intermediate School	01970020	diverse
19-20	Natick	Brown	01980010	diverse
19-20	Natick	Lilja Elementary	01980035	diverse

19-20	Needham	John Eliot	01990020	diverse
19-20	New Bedford	Abraham Lincoln	02010095	diverse
19-20	New Bedford	Betsey B Winslow	02010140	diverse
19-20	New Bedford	Carlos Pacheco	02010105	diverse
19-20	New Bedford	Charles S Ashley	02010010	diverse
19-20	New Bedford	Elizabeth Carter Brooks	02010015	diverse
19-20	New Bedford	Ellen R Hathaway	02010075	diverse
19-20	New Bedford	Elwyn G Campbell	02010020	diverse
19-20	New Bedford	Irwin M. Jacobs Elementary School	02010070	diverse
19-20	New Bedford	James B Congdon	02010040	diverse
19-20	New Bedford	Jireh Swift	02010130	diverse
19-20	New Bedford	John Avery Parker	02010115	diverse
19-20	New Bedford	John B Devalles	02010050	diverse
19-20	New Bedford	Keith Middle School	02010405	diverse
19-20	New Bedford	New Bedford High	02010505	diverse
19-20	New Bedford	Normandin Middle School	02010410	diverse
19-20	New Bedford	Roosevelt Middle School	02010415	diverse
19-20	New Bedford	Sgt Wm H Carney Academy	02010045	diverse
19-20	New Bedford	Thomas R Rodman	02010125	diverse
19-20	New Bedford	Trinity Day Academy	02010510	diverse
19-20	New Bedford	Whaling City Junior/Senior High School	02010515	diverse
19-20	New Bedford	William H Taylor	02010135	diverse
19-20	Newton	A E Angier	02070005	diverse
19-20	Newton	Bigelow Middle	02070305	diverse
19-20	Newton	Bowen	02070015	diverse
19-20	Newton	C Burr	02070020	diverse
19-20	Newton	Cabot	02070025	diverse
19-20	Newton	Charles E Brown Middle	02070310	diverse
19-20	Newton	Countryside	02070040	diverse
19-20	Newton	F A Day Middle	02070315	diverse
19-20	Newton	Horace Mann	02070075	diverse
19-20	Newton	Lincoln-Eliot	02070070	diverse
19-20	Newton	Mason-Rice	02070080	diverse
19-20	Newton	Memorial Spaulding	02070105	diverse
19-20	Newton	Newton Early Childhood Center	02070108	diverse
19-20	Newton	Newton North High	02070505	diverse
19-20	Newton	Newton South High	02070510	diverse
19-20	Newton	Oak Hill Middle	02070320	diverse
19-20	Newton	Peirce	02070100	diverse
19-20	Newton	Underwood	02070115	diverse

19-20	Newton	Williams	02070125	diverse
19-20	Newton	Zervas	02070130	diverse
19-20	North Andover North	Atkinson	02110001	diverse
19-20	Attleborough	Community	02120030	diverse
19-20	Northampton	Bridge Street	02100005	diverse
19-20	Northampton	Jackson Street	02100020	diverse
19-20	Northampton	John F Kennedy Middle School	02100410	diverse
19-20	Northborough	Fannie E Proctor	02130015	diverse
19-20	Northborough Northeast Metropolitan Regional Vocational	Marguerite E Peaslee	02130014	diverse
19-20	Technical	Northeast Metro Regional Vocational	08530605	diverse
19-20	Norwood	Balch	02200005	diverse
19-20	Norwood	Charles J Prescott	02200025	diverse
19-20	Norwood	Cornelius M Callahan	02200010	diverse
19-20	Norwood	Dr. Philip O. Coakley Middle School	02200305	diverse
19-20	Norwood	George F. Willett	02200075	diverse
19-20	Norwood	John P Oldham	02200020	diverse
19-20	Norwood	Norwood High	02200505	diverse
19-20	Oak Bluffs	Oak Bluffs Elementary	02210005	diverse
19-20	Peabody	Center	02290015	diverse
19-20	Peabody Pioneer Charter School of Science (District)	William A Welch Sr	02290027	diverse
19-20	Pioneer Charter School of Science II (PCSS-II) (District)	Pioneer Charter School of Science	04940205	diverse
19-20	Pioneer Valley Chinese Immersion Charter (District)	Pioneer Charter School of Science II (PCSS-II)	35060505	diverse
19-20	Pioneer Valley Performing Arts Charter Public (District)	Pioneer Valley Chinese Immersion Charter School	04970205	diverse
19-20	Pittsfield	Pioneer Valley Performing Arts Charter Public School	04790505	diverse
19-20	Pittsfield	Allendale	02360010	diverse
19-20	Pittsfield	Crosby	02360065	diverse

19-20	Pittsfield	Egremont	02360035	diverse
19-20	Pittsfield	John T Reid Middle	02360305	diverse
19-20	Pittsfield	Morningside Community School	02360055	diverse
19-20	Pittsfield	Pittsfield High	02360505	diverse
19-20	Pittsfield	Silvio O Conte Community	02360105	diverse
19-20	Pittsfield	Taconic High	02360510	diverse
19-20	Pittsfield	Theodore Herberg Middle	02360310	diverse
19-20	Plymouth	Hedge	02390010	diverse
19-20	Provincetown	Provincetown Schools	02420020	diverse
		Amelio Della Chiesa Early Childhood		
19-20	Quincy	Center	02430005	diverse
19-20	Quincy	Atlantic Middle	02430305	diverse
19-20	Quincy	Beechwood Knoll Elementary	02430020	diverse
19-20	Quincy	Broad Meadows Middle	02430310	diverse
19-20	Quincy	Central Middle	02430315	diverse
19-20	Quincy	Charles A Bernazzani Elementary	02430025	diverse
19-20	Quincy	Clifford H Marshall Elementary	02430055	diverse
19-20	Quincy	Lincoln-Hancock Community School	02430035	diverse
19-20	Quincy	Merrymount	02430060	diverse
19-20	Quincy	North Quincy High	02430510	diverse
19-20	Quincy	Point Webster Middle	02430325	diverse
19-20	Quincy	Quincy High	02430505	diverse
19-20	Quincy	Snug Harbor Community School	02430090	diverse
19-20	Quincy	South West Middle School	02430320	diverse
19-20	Quincy	Squantum	02430095	diverse
19-20	Quincy	Wollaston School	02430110	diverse
19-20	Revere	A. C. Whelan Elementary School	02480003	diverse
19-20	Revere	Abraham Lincoln	02480025	diverse
19-20	Revere	Beachmont Veterans Memorial School	02480013	diverse
19-20	Revere	Garfield Middle School	02480057	diverse
19-20	Revere	Paul Revere	02480050	diverse
19-20	Revere	Revere High	02480505	diverse
19-20	Revere	Rumney Marsh Academy	02480014	diverse
19-20	Revere	Seacoast School	02480520	diverse
19-20	Revere	Susan B. Anthony Middle School	02480305	diverse
19-20	Rockland	Memorial Park	02510020	diverse
19-20	Salem	Bates	02580003	diverse
19-20	Salem	Carlton	02580015	diverse
19-20	Salem	Collins Middle	02580305	diverse
19-20	Salem	Horace Mann Laboratory	02580030	diverse

19-20	Salem	New Liberty Innovation School	02580510	diverse
19-20	Salem	Salem Early Childhood	02580001	diverse
19-20	Salem	Salem High	02580505	diverse
19-20	Salem	Salem Prep High School	02580515	diverse
19-20	Salem	Saltonstall School	02580050	diverse
19-20	Salem	Witchcraft Heights	02580070	diverse
	Salem Academy			
19-20	Charter (District)	Salem Academy Charter School	04850485	diverse
19-20	Saugus	Belmonte Saugus Middle	02620305	diverse
19-20	Saugus	Douglas Waybright	02620067	diverse
19-20	Saugus	Lynnhurst	02620040	diverse
19-20	Saugus	Oaklandvale	02620050	diverse
19-20	Saugus	Saugus High	02620505	diverse
19-20	Sharon	Cottage Street	02660005	diverse
19-20	Sharon	East Elementary	02660010	diverse
19-20	Sharon	Heights Elementary	02660015	diverse
19-20	Sharon	Sharon Early Childhood Center	02660001	diverse
19-20	Sharon	Sharon High	02660505	diverse
19-20	Sharon	Sharon Middle	02660305	diverse
19-20	Shrewsbury	Beal School	02710005	diverse
19-20	Shrewsbury	Calvin Coolidge	02710015	diverse
19-20	Shrewsbury	Floral Street School	02710020	diverse
19-20	Shrewsbury	Oak Middle School	02710030	diverse
19-20	Shrewsbury	Parker Road Preschool	02710040	diverse
19-20	Shrewsbury	Sherwood Middle School	02710305	diverse
19-20	Shrewsbury	Shrewsbury Sr High	02710505	diverse
19-20	Shrewsbury	Spring Street	02710035	diverse
19-20	Shrewsbury	Walter J Paton	02710025	diverse
	Sizer School: A			
	North Central			
19-20	Charter Essential (District)	Sizer School: A North Central Charter Essential School	04740505	diverse
	Albert F. Argenziano School at Lincoln Park			
19-20	Somerville	Arthur D Healey	02740087	diverse
19-20	Somerville	Benjamin G Brown	02740075	diverse
19-20	Somerville	Benjamin G Brown	02740015	diverse
19-20	Somerville	Capuano Early Childhood Center	02740005	diverse
19-20	Somerville	Full Circle High School	02740510	diverse
19-20	Somerville	John F Kennedy	02740083	diverse
19-20	Somerville	Somerville High	02740505	diverse
19-20	Somerville	West Somerville Neighborhood	02740115	diverse

19-20	Somerville South Middlesex Regional Vocational	Winter Hill Community	02740120	diverse
19-20	Technical South Shore Charter Public (District)	Joseph P Keefe Technical High School	08290605	diverse
19-20		South Shore Charter Public School	04880550	diverse
19-20	Southborough	Albert S. Woodward Memorial School	02760050	diverse
19-20	Southborough	Margaret A Neary	02760020	diverse
19-20	Southborough	Mary E Finn School	02760008	diverse
19-20	Southborough	P Brent Trottier	02760305	diverse
19-20	Southbridge	Charlton Street	02770005	diverse
19-20	Southbridge	Eastford Road	02770010	diverse
19-20	Southbridge	Southbridge Academy	02770525	diverse
19-20	Southbridge	Southbridge High School	02770515	diverse
19-20	Southbridge	Southbridge Middle School	02770315	diverse
19-20	Southbridge Southeastern Regional Vocational	West Street	02770020	diverse
19-20	Technical	Southeastern Regional Vocational Technical Gateway to College at Springfield	08720605	diverse
19-20	Springfield	Technical Community College	02810580	diverse
19-20	Stoughton	Edwin A Jones Early Childhood Center	02850012	diverse
19-20	Stoughton	Helen Hansen Elementary	02850010	diverse
19-20	Stoughton	Joseph H Gibbons	02850025	diverse
19-20	Stoughton	Joseph R Dawe Jr Elementary	02850014	diverse
19-20	Stoughton	O'Donnell Middle School	02850405	diverse
19-20	Stoughton	Richard L. Wilkins Elementary School	02850020	diverse
19-20	Stoughton	South Elementary	02850015	diverse
19-20	Stoughton	Stoughton High	02850505	diverse
19-20	Sunderland	Sunderland Elementary	02890005	diverse
19-20	Taunton	East Taunton Elementary	02930010	diverse
19-20	Taunton	Edward F. Leddy Preschool	02930005	diverse
19-20	Taunton	Elizabeth Pole	02930027	diverse
19-20	Taunton	H Galligan	02930057	diverse
19-20	Taunton	Hopewell	02930035	diverse
19-20	Taunton	John F Parker Middle	02930305	diverse
19-20	Taunton	Joseph H Martin	02930042	diverse
19-20	Taunton	Mulcahey Elementary School	02930015	diverse

19-20	Taunton	Taunton Alternative High School	02930525	diverse
19-20	Taunton	Taunton High	02930505	diverse
	TEC Connections Academy Commonwealth Virtual School	TEC Connections Academy		
19-20	District	Commonwealth Virtual School	39020900	diverse
19-20	Tisbury	Tisbury Elementary	02960005	diverse
19-20	Waltham	Douglas MacArthur Elementary School	03080032	diverse
19-20	Waltham	James Fitzgerald Elementary School	03080060	diverse
19-20	Waltham	John F Kennedy Middle	03080404	diverse
19-20	Waltham	John W. McDevitt Middle School	03080415	diverse
19-20	Waltham	Northeast Elementary School	03080040	diverse
19-20	Waltham	Thomas R Plympton Elementary School	03080050	diverse
19-20	Waltham	Waltham Sr High	03080505	diverse
19-20	Waltham	William F. Stanley Elementary School	03080005	diverse
19-20	Wareham	Minot Forest	03100017	diverse
19-20	Wareham	Wareham Cooperative Alternative School	03100315	diverse
19-20	Wareham	Wareham Senior High	03100505	diverse
19-20	Watertown	Cunniff	03140015	diverse
19-20	Watertown	Hosmer	03140020	diverse
19-20	Watertown	James Russell Lowell	03140025	diverse
19-20	Watertown	Watertown High	03140505	diverse
19-20	Watertown	Watertown Middle	03140305	diverse
19-20	Wayland	Loker School	03150020	diverse
19-20	Wayland	Wayland High School	03150505	diverse
19-20	Wayland	Wayland Middle School	03150305	diverse
19-20	Webster	Bartlett High School	03160505	diverse
19-20	Webster	Park Avenue Elementary	03160015	diverse
19-20	Webster	Webster Middle School	03160315	diverse
19-20	Wellesley	John D Hardy	03170020	diverse
19-20	Wellesley	Joseph E Fiske	03170015	diverse
19-20	Wellesley	Preschool at Wellesley Schools	03170001	diverse
19-20	Wellesley	Schofield	03170045	diverse
19-20	Wellesley	Sprague Elementary School	03170048	diverse
19-20	Wellesley	Wellesley Middle	03170305	diverse
19-20	West Springfield	Cowing Early Childhood	03320001	diverse
19-20	West Springfield	John Ashley	03320005	diverse
19-20	West Springfield	Memorial	03320025	diverse
19-20	West Springfield	Mittineague	03320030	diverse

19-20	West Springfield	Philip G Coburn	03320007	diverse
19-20	West Springfield	West Springfield High	03320505	diverse
19-20	West Springfield	West Springfield Middle	03320305	diverse
19-20	Westborough	Annie E Fales	03210010	diverse
19-20	Westborough	Elsie A Hastings Elementary	03210025	diverse
19-20	Westborough	J Harding Armstrong	03210005	diverse
19-20	Westborough	Mill Pond School	03210045	diverse
19-20	Westborough	Sarah W Gibbons Middle	03210305	diverse
19-20	Westborough	Westborough High	03210505	diverse
19-20	Westfield	Abner Gibbs	03250020	diverse
19-20	Westfield	Franklin Ave	03250015	diverse
19-20	Westfield	Paper Mill	03250036	diverse
19-20	Westford	Blanchard Middle	03260310	diverse
19-20	Westford	Col John Robinson	03260025	diverse
19-20	Westford	Day Elementary	03260007	diverse
19-20	Westford	John A. Crisafulli Elementary School	03260045	diverse
19-20	Westford	Millennium Elementary	03260013	diverse
19-20	Westford	Rita E. Miller Elementary School	03260055	diverse
19-20	Westford	Stony Brook School	03260330	diverse
19-20	Westford	Westford Academy	03260505	diverse
19-20	Weston	Country	03300010	diverse
19-20	Weston	Field Elementary School	03300012	diverse
19-20	Weston	Weston High	03300505	diverse
19-20	Weston	Weston Middle	03300305	diverse
19-20	Weston	Woodland	03300015	diverse
19-20	Weymouth	Abigail Adams Middle School	03360310	diverse
19-20	Weymouth	Academy Avenue	03360005	diverse
19-20	Weymouth	Johnson Early Childhood Center	03360003	diverse
19-20	Weymouth	Thomas W. Hamilton Primary School	03360105	diverse
19-20	Weymouth	William Seach	03360080	diverse
	Whittier Regional Vocational			
19-20	Technical	Whittier Regional Vocational	08850605	diverse
19-20	Winchester	Lynch Elementary	03440020	diverse
19-20	Winchester	Muraco Elementary	03440040	diverse
19-20	Winchester	Vinson-Owen Elementary	03440025	diverse
19-20	Woburn	Goodyear Elementary School	03470005	diverse
19-20	Woburn	Linscott-Rumford	03470025	diverse
19-20	Woburn	Malcolm White	03470055	diverse
19-20	Woburn	Mary D Altavesta	03470065	diverse

19-20	Woburn	Shamrock	03470043	diverse
19-20	Worcester	Burncoat Middle School	03480405	diverse
19-20	Worcester	Burncoat Senior High	03480503	diverse
19-20	Worcester	Doherty Memorial High	03480512	diverse
19-20	Worcester	Forest Grove Middle	03480415	diverse
19-20	Worcester	Francis J McGrath Elementary	03480177	diverse
19-20	Worcester	Gates Lane	03480110	diverse
19-20	Worcester	Head Start	03480002	diverse
19-20	Worcester	Heard Street	03480136	diverse
19-20	Worcester	Lake View	03480145	diverse
19-20	Worcester	May Street	03480175	diverse
19-20	Worcester	Midland Street	03480185	diverse
19-20	Worcester	Nelson Place	03480200	diverse
19-20	Worcester	Norrback Avenue	03480202	diverse
19-20	Worcester	Quinsigamond	03480210	diverse
19-20	Worcester	Roosevelt	03480220	diverse
19-20	Worcester	Sullivan Middle	03480423	diverse
19-20	Worcester	Tatnuck	03480230	diverse
19-20	Worcester	Thorndyke Road	03480235	diverse
19-20	Worcester	Wawecus Road School	03480026	diverse
19-20	Worcester	West Tatnuck	03480260	diverse
19-20	Worcester	Worcester Arts Magnet School	03480225	diverse
19-20	Worcester	Worcester Technical High	03480605	diverse

Appendix B

Diverse Districts (70-25 Definition) for the 2019-2020 School Year

Year	District	Diverse (70-25)
19-20	Acton-Boxborough	diverse
19-20	Advanced Math and Science Academy Charter (District)	diverse
19-20	Amherst	diverse
19-20	Amherst-Pelham	diverse
19-20	Andover	diverse
19-20	Argosy Collegiate Charter School (District)	diverse
19-20	Ashland	diverse
19-20	Attleboro	diverse
19-20	Avon	diverse
19-20	Barnstable	diverse
19-20	Bedford	diverse
19-20	Belmont	diverse
19-20	Benjamin Franklin Classical Charter Public (District)	diverse
19-20	Berkshire Arts and Technology Charter Public (District)	diverse
19-20	Blue Hills Regional Vocational Technical	diverse
19-20	Boston Collegiate Charter (District)	diverse
19-20	Braintree	diverse
19-20	Brookline	diverse
19-20	Burlington	diverse
19-20	Cambridge	diverse
19-20	Canton	diverse
19-20	Chicopee	diverse
19-20	Christa McAuliffe Charter Public (District)	diverse
19-20	City on a Hill Charter Public School New Bedford (District)	diverse
19-20	Clinton	diverse
19-20	Dedham	diverse
19-20	Dennis-Yarmouth	diverse
19-20	Edgartown	diverse
19-20	Fall River	diverse
19-20	Fitchburg	diverse
19-20	Foxborough Regional Charter (District)	diverse
19-20	Framingham	diverse

19-20	Gardner	diverse
19-20	Global Learning Charter Public (District)	diverse
19-20	Greater Lowell Regional Vocational Technical	diverse
19-20	Greater New Bedford Regional Vocational Technical	diverse
19-20	Greenfield Commonwealth Virtual District	diverse
19-20	Hampden Charter School of Science East (District)	diverse
19-20	Hampden Charter School of Science West (District)	diverse
19-20	Haverhill	diverse
19-20	Hill View Montessori Charter Public (District)	diverse
19-20	Holbrook	diverse
19-20	Innovation Academy Charter (District)	diverse
19-20	Leominster	diverse
19-20	Lexington	diverse
19-20	Lincoln	diverse
19-20	Lowell	diverse
19-20	Lowell Middlesex Academy Charter (District)	diverse
19-20	Ma Academy for Math and Science	diverse
19-20	Malden	diverse
19-20	Map Academy Charter School (District)	diverse
19-20	Marlborough	diverse
19-20	Martha's Vineyard	diverse
19-20	Medford	diverse
19-20	Methuen	diverse
19-20	Milford	diverse
19-20	Milton	diverse
19-20	Mystic Valley Regional Charter (District)	diverse
19-20	Nantucket	diverse
19-20	New Bedford	diverse
19-20	Newton	diverse
19-20	Northeast Metropolitan Regional Vocational Technical	diverse
19-20	Norwood	diverse
19-20	Oak Bluffs	diverse
19-20	Pioneer Charter School of Science (District)	diverse
19-20	Pioneer Charter School of Science II (PCSS-II) (District)	diverse
19-20	Pioneer Valley Chinese Immersion Charter (District)	diverse
19-20	Pioneer Valley Performing Arts Charter Public (District)	diverse
19-20	Pittsfield	diverse
19-20	Provincetown	diverse
19-20	Quincy	diverse
19-20	Revere	diverse

19-20	Salem	diverse
19-20	Salem Academy Charter (District)	diverse
19-20	Saugus	diverse
19-20	Sharon	diverse
19-20	Shrewsbury	diverse
19-20	Sizer School: A North Central Charter Essential (District)	diverse
19-20	Somerville	diverse
19-20	South Middlesex Regional Vocational Technical	diverse
19-20	South Shore Charter Public (District)	diverse
19-20	Southborough	diverse
19-20	Southbridge	diverse
19-20	Southeastern Regional Vocational Technical	diverse
19-20	Stoughton	diverse
19-20	Sunderland	diverse
19-20	Taunton	diverse
19-20	TEC Connections Academy Commonwealth Virtual School District	diverse
19-20	Tisbury	diverse
19-20	Waltham	diverse
19-20	Wareham	diverse
19-20	Watertown	diverse
19-20	Wayland	diverse
19-20	Webster	diverse
19-20	Wellesley	diverse
19-20	West Springfield	diverse
19-20	Westborough	diverse
19-20	Westford	diverse
19-20	Weston	diverse
19-20	Whittier Regional Vocational Technical	diverse
19-20	Woburn	diverse
19-20	Worcester	diverse