

Supplemental Material for “A Closer Look at Charter Schools and Segregation,” *Education Next*, Vol 10, No. 3 (2010), by Gary Ritter, Nathan Jensen, Brian Kisida, and Joshua McGee
Article available at <http://educationnext.org/a-closer-look-at-charter-schools-and-segregation>

In January 2010, the UCLA-based Civil Rights Project (CRP) released the study “Choice without Equity: Charter School Segregation and the Need for Civil Rights Standards.” The study intended to report on, among other things, levels of racial segregation in charter schools across the United States. The authors use 2007–08 data from the U.S. Department of Education’s Common Core of Data (CCD) to compare the racial composition of charter schools to that of traditional public schools at three different levels of aggregation: nationwide; within 40 states and the District of Columbia; and within 39 metropolitan areas with large enrollments of charter school students. Based on these comparisons, the authors conclude, incorrectly in our view, that charter schools experience severe levels of racial segregation compared to traditional public schools (TPS).

In the *Education Next* article titled “A Closer Look at Charter Schools and Segregation” we show that, when examined more appropriately, the data actually reveal small differences in the level of overall segregation between the charter school sector and the traditional public-school sector. The charts and figure presented below comprise the supplemental materials for that Education Next article.

Appendix Table 1 compares the hypersegregation in traditional public schools within the central city to hypersegregation across each CBSA as a whole. This table extends Table 1 (p. 71) from the Education Next article to include all 39 CBSAs considered by the CRP report. Focusing our analysis on traditional public schools located within the central city of each metropolitan area reveals much higher levels of hypersegregation than those reported by the Civil Rights Project researchers.¹

Appendix Table 2 is a reproduction of Table 10 (p. 40) from the CRP report. The focal measures in this table are the percentage of charter school students (from the entire metropolitan area) in schools with greater than 90 percent minority students (column 2) alongside the similar figure for traditional public schools (column 3). The problematic figure in this table is the percentage of traditional public school students in hypersegregated minority schools (column 3) used as the point of comparison. The problem arises because charters are disproportionately located in low-SES (socioeconomic status) urban areas, while traditional public schools are dispersed throughout the entire CBSA. For the 39 CBSAs examined by the CRP authors, only 22 percent of the traditional public schools were located in central cities, compared to 51 percent of the charter schools. Appendix Table 1, presented here, illustrates this problem for the 39 metropolitan areas included in the CRP report.

Appendix Table 3 contrasts the two methods of comparison, the CBSA strategy employed in the CRP report versus the central city strategy employed in our analysis. Columns 2-4 (CRP method) compare the proportion of students attending hypersegregated minority charters (column 2) within each CBSA to the percentage of students in hypersegregated minority traditional public schools (column 3) within the same CBSA. Columns 5-7 (our method) make the same comparison, but limit the comparison to the central city of each CBSA. Within the central cities of the 39 metropolitan areas examined by the CRP, the share of charter school students attending hypersegregated minority schools is only modestly greater than the share of traditional public school students attending such schools. For students in both traditional and charter schools, that share is much higher in central cities than in metropolitan areas taken as a whole.

Appendix Figure 1 presents the data from Appendix Table 3 graphically. The grey bars represent the difference in segregation between charters and traditional public schools in the central cities, and the black bars represent this difference across the CBSA as a whole. Bars extending out to the right indicate that the charter schools in that particular metropolitan area are more segregated; bars extending to the left indicate that the traditional public school sector is more segregated. Importantly, this figure demonstrates that while it appears that charter students are, on average, more likely to attend hypersegregated minority schools, the difference between the charter and traditional public sector is far less stark than the CRP authors suggest. This is illustrated by the fact that the black bars generally extend further to the right than do the grey bars.

¹ For this report, a school was characterized as located in the “central city” if the school address matched the primary city in the CBSA. For example, all schools with a city address of “Washington D.C.” were classified as being in the center city of the Washington D.C. CBSA, with all other schools in the Washington D.C. CBSA (such as Arlington, VA) considered outside of the center city.

Supplemental Material for “A Closer Look at Charter Schools and Segregation,” *Education Next*, Vol 10, No. 3 (2010), by Gary Ritter, Nathan Jensen, Brian Kisida, and Joshua McGee
 Article available at <http://educationnext.org/a-closer-look-at-charter-schools-and-segregation>

Appendix Table 1: Segregation in Traditional Public Schools

Metropolitan Areas (CBSAs)	Total Enrollment (2007-08)	TPS students in hypersegregated minority schools (percent): metro area	TPS students in hypersegregated minority schools (percent): central city	Difference (percentage points)
New York City, NY	2,683,866	32%	72%	40%
Los Angeles, CA	2,094,763	53%	87%	34%
Chicago, IL	1,591,820	29%	77%	48%
Dallas, TX	1,166,268	23%	78%	55%
Houston, TX	1,121,079	35%	68%	33%
Atlanta, GA	911,285	27%	70%	43%
Philadelphia, PA	857,817	17%	65%	48%
Washington, DC	835,485	20%	86%	66%
Riverside, CA	816,664	29%	14%	-15%
Miami, FL	778,544	42%	65%	23%
Detroit, MI	747,802	18%	94%	76%
Phoenix, AZ	740,688	19%	49%	30%
Boston, MA	650,862	7%	46%	39%
Minneapolis, MN	531,180	4%	23%	19%
San Francisco, CA	527,587	25%	60%	35%
San Diego, CA	481,940	24%	36%	12%
Denver, CO	405,818	11%	42%	31%
Tampa, FL	390,223	4%	12%	8%
San Antonio, TX	387,622	31%	42%	11%
Orlando, FL	347,669	9%	17%	8%
Sacramento, CA	341,764	10%	30%	20%
Kansas City, MO	334,405	6%	25%	19%
Cleveland, OH	313,333	14%	50%	36%
Columbus, OH	296,924	6%	25%	19%
Indianapolis, IN	291,132	4%	11%	7%
Cincinnati, OH	264,629	6%	19%	13%
San Jose, CA	259,801	32%	51%	19%
Portland, OR	254,723	0%	1%	1%
Milwaukee, WI	239,912	17%	49%	32%
Fresno, CA	189,302	37%	40%	3%
Honolulu, HI	179,897	21%	21%	0%
Tucson, AZ	147,907	24%	26%	2%
New Orleans, LA	135,354	17%	100%	83%
Albuquerque, NM	133,683	21%	26%	5%
Dayton, OH	127,455	8%	28%	20%
Toledo, OH	108,871	4%	9%	5%
Colorado Springs, CO	108,626	0%	0%	0%
Santa Rosa, CA	66,218	5%	11%	6%
Prescott, AZ	26,788	0%	0%	0%

Supplemental Material for “A Closer Look at Charter Schools and Segregation,” *Education Next*, Vol 10, No. 3 (2010), by Gary Ritter, Nathan Jensen, Brian Kisida, and Joshua McGee
 Article available at <http://educationnext.org/a-closer-look-at-charter-schools-and-segregation>

Appendix Table 2: Charter and Traditional Public School Students in Intensely Segregated Minority Schools

(reprinted from pp. 41-42 of the Civil Rights Project Report, <http://www.civilrightsproject.ucla.edu/news/pressreleases/CRP-Choices-Without-Equity-report.pdf>)

Metropolitan Areas (CBSAs)	White Difference (Charter-Public)	Charter	Public	Difference (percentage points)
Albuquerque, NM	-3%	38%	21%	17%
Atlanta, GA	-5%	22%	27%	-5%
Boston, MA	-33%	32%	7%	25%
Chicago, IL	-39%	91%	29%	62%
Cincinnati, OH	-60%	67%	6%	61%
Cleveland, OH	-44%	53%	14%	39%
Colorado Springs, CO	3%	0%	0%	0%
Columbus, OH	-19%	25%	6%	19%
Dallas, TX	-17%	49%	23%	26%
Dayton, OH	-55%	56%	8%	48%
Denver, CO	6%	11%	11%	0%
Detroit, MI	-45%	66%	18%	48%
Fresno, CA	7%	23%	37%	-14%
Honolulu, HI	7%	32%	21%	11%
Houston, TX	-22%	75%	35%	40%
Indianapolis, IN	-39%	47%	4%	43%
Kansas City, MO	-62%	85%	6%	79%
Los Angeles, CA	3%	49%	53%	-4%
Miami, FL	-3%	41%	42%	-1%
Milwaukee, WI	-37%	55%	17%	38%
Minneapolis, MN	-37%	49%	4%	45%
New Orleans, LA	-35%	76%	17%	59%
New York City, NY	-37%	85%	32%	53%
Orlando, FL	2%	3%	9%	-6%
Philadelphia, PA	-26%	50%	17%	33%
Phoenix, AZ	6%	16%	19%	-3%
Portland, OR	10%	3%	0%	3%
Prescott, AZ	9%	0%	0%	0%
Riverside, CA	19%	6%	29%	-23%
Sacramento, CA	5%	18%	10%	8%
San Antonio, TX	-23%	86%	31%	55%
San Diego, CA	1%	27%	24%	3%
San Francisco, CA	-10%	53%	25%	28%
San Jose, CA	7%	31%	32%	-1%
Santa Rosa, CA	8%	9%	5%	4%
Tampa, FL	0%	19%	4%	15%
Toledo, OH	-14%	12%	4%	8%
Tucson, AZ	7%	17%	24%	-7%
Washington, DC	-38%	91%	20%	71%

Supplemental Material for “A Closer Look at Charter Schools and Segregation,” *Education Next*, Vol 10, No. 3 (2010), by Gary Ritter, Nathan Jensen, Brian Kisida, and Joshua McGee
 Article available at <http://educationnext.org/a-closer-look-at-charter-schools-and-segregation>

Appendix Table 3: Charter and Traditional Public School Students in Intensely Segregated Minority Schools
 -- Comparison of the Results of the Civil Rights’ Project (CRP) Methodology with the Results of Our Methodology
 Focused on Schools in Central Cities (Data from CCD 2007-08)

Metro Areas, alphabetical	CRP -	CRP -	Difference (Charter % MINUS TPS %)	Ritter et	Ritter et	Difference (Charter % MINUS TPS %)
	CBSA Area % of Charter Students in HyperSeg Min. Schools	CBSA Area % of TPS Students in HyperSeg Min. Schools		al - Central Cities % of Charter Students in HyperSeg Min. Schools	al - Central Cities % of TPS Students in HyperSeg Min. Schools	
Albuquerque, NM	38%	21%	17%	38%	26%	12%
Atlanta, GA	22%	27%	-5%	25%	70%	-45%
Boston, MA	32%	7%	25%	100%	46%	54%
Chicago, IL	91%	29%	62%	97%	77%	20%
Cincinnati, OH	67%	6%	61%	70%	19%	51%
Cleveland, OH	53%	14%	39%	62%	50%	12%
Colorado Springs, CO	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Columbus, OH	25%	6%	19%	28%	25%	3%
Dallas, TX	49%	23%	26%	78%	78%	0%
Dayton, OH	56%	8%	48%	54%	28%	26%
Denver, CO	11%	11%	0%	46%	42%	4%
Detroit, MI	66%	18%	48%	95%	94%	1%
Fresno, CA	23%	37%	-14%	37%	40%	-3%
Honolulu, HI	32%	21%	11%	5%	21%	-16%
Houston, TX	75%	35%	40%	81%	68%	13%
Indianapolis, IN	47%	4%	43%	45%	11%	34%
Kansas City, MO	85%	6%	79%	86%	25%	61%
Los Angeles, CA	49%	53%	-4%	81%	87%	-6%
Miami, FL	41%	42%	-1%	61%	65%	-4%
Milwaukee, WI	55%	17%	38%	63%	49%	14%
Minneapolis, MN	49%	4%	45%	68%	23%	45%
New Orleans, LA	76%	17%	59%	80%	100%	-20%
New York City, NY	85%	32%	53%	94%	72%	22%
Orlando, FL	3%	9%	-6%	21%	17%	4%
Philadelphia, PA	50%	17%	33%	64%	65%	-1%
Phoenix, AZ	16%	19%	-3%	34%	49%	-15%
Portland, OR	3%	0%	3%	10%	1%	9%
Prescott, AZ	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Riverside, CA	6%	29%	-23%	0%	14%	-14%
Sacramento, CA	18%	10%	8%	44%	30%	14%
San Antonio, TX	86%	31%	55%	79%	42%	37%
San Diego, CA	27%	24%	3%	47%	36%	11%
San Francisco, CA	53%	25%	28%	33%	60%	-27%
San Jose, CA	31%	32%	-1%	41%	51%	-10%
Santa Rosa, CA	9%	5%	4%	21%	11%	10%
Tampa, FL	19%	4%	15%	31%	12%	19%
Toledo, OH	12%	4%	8%	20%	9%	11%
Tucson, AZ	17%	24%	-7%	16%	26%	-10%
Washington, DC	91%	20%	71%	92%	86%	6%
Weighted Average	44%	25%	19%	63%	53%	10%

Supplemental Material for “A Closer Look at Charter Schools and Segregation,” *Education Next*, Vol 10, No. 3 (2010), by Gary Ritter, Nathan Jensen, Brian Kisida, and Joshua McGee
 Article available at <http://educationnext.org/a-closer-look-at-charter-schools-and-segregation>

Appendix Figure 1: Difference in Percentage of Students in Hypersegregated Schools: Charter vs. Traditional Public Schools

