

**University of South Florida**

---

**From the Selected Works of Deirdre Cobb-Roberts**

---

Fall 2004

# Accountability in a Postdesegregation Era: The Continuing Significance of Racial Segregation

Kathryn M Borman, *University of South Florida*

Tamela Eitle, *University of Miami*

Deanna Michael, *University of South Florida*

David J Eitle, *Florida International University*

Reginald Lee, *University of South Florida*, et al.



Available at: [https://works.bepress.com/deirdre\\_cobb-roberts/2/](https://works.bepress.com/deirdre_cobb-roberts/2/)



---

Accountability in a Postdesegregation Era: The Continuing Significance of Racial Segregation in Florida's Schools

Author(s): Kathryn M. Borman, Tamela McNulty Eitle, Deanna Michael, David J. Eitle, Reginald Lee, Larry Johnson, Deirdre Cobb-Roberts, Sherman Dorn and Barbara Shireliffe  
Reviewed work(s):

Source: *American Educational Research Journal*, Vol. 41, No. 3, Accountability and Equity (Autumn, 2004), pp. 605-631

Published by: [American Educational Research Association](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3699440>

Accessed: 01/08/2012 17:39

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



*American Educational Research Association* is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *American Educational Research Journal*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

## Accountability in a Postdesegregation Era: The Continuing Significance of Racial Segregation in Florida's Schools

Kathryn M. Borman

*University of South Florida*

Tamela McNulty Eitle

*University of Miami*

Deanna Michael

*University of South Florida*

David J. Eitle

*Florida International University*

Reginald Lee, Larry Johnson, Deirdre Cobb-Roberts,

Sherman Dorn, and Barbara Shircliffe

*University of South Florida*

*In the wake of both the end of court-ordered school desegregation and the growing popularity of accountability as a mechanism to maximize student achievement, the authors explore the association between racial segregation and the percentage of students passing high-stakes tests in Florida's schools. Results suggest that segregation matters in predicting school-level performance on the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test after control for other known and purported predictors of standardized test performance. Also, these results suggest that neither recent efforts by the state of Florida to equalize the funding of education nor current efforts involving high-stakes testing will close the Black-White achievement gap without consideration of the racial distribution of students across schools.*

**KEYWORDS:** accountability, desegregation, education reform, segregation.

During the past 50 years, *Brown v. Board of Education* (1954) has shaped debates about and strategies for achieving equity and excellence in schooling, not only through court orders to desegregate and decades of court supervision of school districts, but also because all other policy initiatives designed to reduce educational inequality since *Brown* have been implemented in the context of school desegregation. Although many school districts have now been declared "unitary,"<sup>1</sup> a legal status indicating that a district has removed all vestiges of past discrimination and is released from court

oversight, the basic ideal represented in *Brown*—the right to equal educational opportunity—remains a part of the national debate on education and a significant rationale for state and federal accountability policies today.

Under the force of *Brown*, a wide variety of race-specific efforts to provide Black students with educational opportunities equal to those of White students were implemented. These efforts included using race as a factor in

---

KATHRYN M. BORMAN is a Professor of Anthropology and Associate Director, David C. Anchin Center, University of South Florida, 4202 E. Fowler Avenue, EDU160B, Tampa, FL 33620-5650; e-mail [borman@tempest.coedu.usf.edu](mailto:borman@tempest.coedu.usf.edu). She specializes in educational reform and policy as well as evaluation studies.

TAMELA McNULTY EITLE is an Assistant Professor, Department of Sociology, University of Miami, P.O. Box 248162, Coral Gables, FL 33124-2030; e-mail [teitle@miami.edu](mailto:teitle@miami.edu). Her areas of specialization include segregation, school politics, and social organization of education.

DEANNA MICHAEL is an Assistant Professor, Department of Social and Psychological Foundations, University of South Florida, 140 Seventh Avenue South, COQ236B, St. Petersburg, FL 33701; e-mail [dmichael@stpt.usf.edu](mailto:dmichael@stpt.usf.edu). Her research area is the history of educational policy, and she is writing a book on President Jimmy Carter's involvement in education policy.

DAVID J. EITLE is an Assistant Professor, Department of Criminal Justice, Florida International University, 355A PCA Building, University Park, FL 33199; e-mail [eitled@fiu.edu](mailto:eitled@fiu.edu). His research interests include exploring how the institutional and organizational characteristics of schools and their surrounding communities influence student violence, misbehavior, and substance use on campus.

REGINALD LEE is a Research Associate, David C. Anchin Center, University of South Florida, 4202 E. Fowler Avenue, EDU162, Tampa, FL 33620-5650; e-mail [Rlee@tempest.coedu.usf.edu](mailto:Rlee@tempest.coedu.usf.edu). His research has focused on minority student representation in special education and school reform.

LARRY JOHNSON is an Assistant Professor, College of Education, University of South Florida, 140 Seventh Avenue South, COQ 201, St. Petersburg, FL 33701; e-mail [ljohnson@stpt.usf.edu](mailto:ljohnson@stpt.usf.edu). He is writing a book on the development of community colleges.

DEIRDRE COBB-ROBERTS is an Associate Professor, Department of Psychological and Social Foundations, University of South Florida, 4202 E. Fowler Avenue, EDU162, Tampa, FL 33620-5650; e-mail [Cobb-Rob@tempest.coedu.usf.edu](mailto:Cobb-Rob@tempest.coedu.usf.edu). Her areas of specialization include the history of American higher education and multicultural education.

SHERMAN DORN is an Associate Professor, Department of Psychological and Social Foundations, University of South Florida, 4202 E. Fowler Avenue, EDU162, Tampa, FL 33620-5650; e-mail [dorn@mail.usf.edu](mailto:dorn@mail.usf.edu). His research interests include educational policy.

BARBARA SHIRCLIFFE is an Associate Professor, Department of Social and Psychological Foundations, University of South Florida, 4202 E. Fowler Avenue, EDU162, Tampa, FL 33620-5650; e-mail [Shirclif@tempest.coedu.usf.edu](mailto:Shirclif@tempest.coedu.usf.edu). She specializes in school segregation, desegregation, and community institutions.

---

student assignment, desegregating teaching staffs, busing students to achieve racial balance, and creating magnet schools to diversify school populations (Orfield & Eaton, 1996). One of the original justifications for school desegregation was the contention that Black students would have increased access to educational resources and opportunities if they attended schools with White students. It was argued that this access would have a substantive impact on Black students' educational achievement, postsecondary educational opportunities, and future life chances. However, extant research investigating the relationship between desegregation and academic achievement among Blacks has not provided unequivocal evidence in support of this fundamental argument. While studies that have focused on the long-term consequences of school desegregation for Blacks have produced largely consistent results and demonstrated positive relationships (see Wells & Crain, 1994, for a review of earlier research), considerably more debate and inconsistency remain in the findings gleaned from studies exploring the short-term effects of school desegregation on achievement (see Braddock & Eitle, 2003, for a review of previous research; see Crain & Mahard, 1983, for a meta-analysis).

Consistent with the idea (forwarded in *Brown* and in other school desegregation cases) that access to predominantly White institutions would enhance the social mobility and life chances of Blacks, research on long-term consequences has provided evidence that attending a desegregated school is associated with obtaining employment in desegregated occupational work groups (Braddock & McPartland, 1989) and attending desegregated colleges (Braddock, 1980). However, many studies (see Crain & Mahard, 1983) on the short-term outcomes of school desegregation have failed to reveal any positive effects. These studies have focused almost exclusively on immediate effects on standardized test scores, with little or no consideration of implementation or context (Brown, 1996; Grant, 1996), although considerable evidence indicates that resegregation within schools is a problem (Eyler, Cook, & Ward, 1983; Kaeser, 1979; Mills & Bryan, 1976). Studies of school desegregation that have considered second-generation segregation (allocation of opportunities within schools), implementation (teacher attitudes, classroom organization), and allocation of other educational resources (funding, quality of teachers) as mediating factors have shown that resegregation may undermine the goals of desegregation (Condron & Roscigno, 2003; Eitle & Eitle, in press; Epstein, 1985; Meier, Stewart, & England, 1989; Mickelson, 2001). Hence, the failure of earlier studies to account for second-generation school segregation may help explain the inconsistency of these studies in regard to finding support for a positive association between school desegregation and short-term academic achievement among Black students. Nonetheless, questions remain as to whether or not school desegregation will produce the academic achievement gains among minority students assumed in the *Brown* decision.

Despite the unresolved questions regarding the short-term effectiveness of desegregation (in producing academic achievement gains among Black students) and whether racial integration was actually being achieved, Orfield and Eaton (1996) argued that the Supreme Court decisions of the 1990s effectively

moved the debate from questions regarding how to best achieve school desegregation to how to dismantle it. In the case of school districts that have earned “unitary status” from the courts, race-based policies for student assignment are no longer a legal option for ensuring equal educational opportunity, even if racial segregation and isolation still characterize the experience of minority students in those districts.

Today, the focus of federal and state policymakers has clearly shifted from concerns about racial segregation as an obstacle to achieving educational equality to an emphasis on accountability as a mechanism to enhance academic achievement. The logic of the accountability mechanism is relatively simple: Setting high standards governing what students should know and be able to do at each grade level and instituting high-stakes tests (with both incentives and disincentives for school districts, schools, and students to maximize performance on these tests) are the best ways to improve academic achievement or to “leave no child behind.” Thus, in the past decade, two major trends have emerged with regard to efforts to maximize academic achievement among minorities: the waning of the importance of racial integration as a mechanism for improving academic achievement and attainment among Blacks and other minorities and the implementation of high-stakes testing as a mechanism designed to improve academic achievement overall. Accountability through schoolwide testing at “strategic” grade levels, coupled with the dismantling of desegregation, potentially obscures a core aspect of the *Brown* decision: the idea that a separate education is inherently unequal.

The nexus between the dismantling of desegregation and the emphasis on high-stakes testing as a means to maximize student achievement is the focus of this article. In order to situate our inquiry in this nexus and establish its particular contributions, we briefly document the history of segregation/desegregation in Florida and the series of policy steps that Florida has undertaken during the past half century to enhance equity in educational outcomes. This history demonstrates the difficulties faced by states and schools in reaching such goals.

We then examine the relationship between variations in school segregation and school-level performance on the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT) in an attempt to understand whether such variations help explain students’ performance on Florida’s high-stakes tests. Evidence that school segregation is associated with test performance in Florida would raise considerable doubt about both the *fundamental fairness* of using such accountability mechanisms to target incentives and disincentives toward school districts, schools, and students and the *effectiveness* of high-stakes testing mechanisms in maximizing student academic achievement if the racial distribution of students across schools is not considered. Because Florida has been a national leader in anticipating and implementing the provisions of the No Child Left Behind Act, and has done so amid increasingly diverse enrollments, increasing school segregation, and the granting of unitary status to many Florida districts, findings from this state may help inform national debates about implementing accountability-based reform in the postdesegregation era.

## The Florida Context

Prior to 1954, in Florida, like other southern states, there were dual systems of education, one for White students and another for Blacks. In this section, we discuss the desegregation of Florida districts, state-legislated educational reform programs designed to achieve equity, the dismantling of desegregation in Florida, and current accountability reforms. However, readers should be aware that all of this occurred in a context of demographic shifts, including rapid growth in the Hispanic<sup>2</sup> and minority populations. These demographic changes resulted in a substantial increase in the percentage of Florida students attending predominantly minority schools. Nonetheless, Hispanic students were not considered in the original desegregation cases and remained outside the scope of Florida's desegregation orders despite the state's changing demographics and the 1973 *Keyes v. Denver School District* decision.<sup>3</sup> Hence, the history we outline largely focuses on the educational opportunities of Black students in the state.

### Avoiding Desegregation: The Minimum Foundation Program and the Florida Pupil Assignment Law

Nine years before the 1954 *Brown* decision, Florida Governor Millard Caldwell appointed a blue ribbon committee to suggest needed changes in the state's educational policies. The legislation that came from the committee's report, establishing the Minimum Foundation Program (MFP), was intended to equalize educational funding among districts by distributing state funds based on a county's ability to support its schools (Colburn & Scher, 1980). With this bill, the legislature set a minimum statewide property tax level to allow each of the state's 67 counties to raise a certain percentage of the funds needed for each teaching unit (White, 1981). Unlike past funding legislation, the MFP guaranteed funding to a school whether it served Black students or White students. Local districts, whether wealthy or impoverished, were now able to hire qualified teachers and offer students a basic level of education.

The explicit reason given by Caldwell and his supporters for increasing state support for education was to attract more business to the state in the post-World War II period. However, this increasing financial support for education coincided with the legal efforts of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) to pressure state governments to desegregate (Colburn & Scher, 1980). By increasing funding for poorer school districts and pressing for equitable distribution of state funds for Black and White schools, many White Florida politicians hoped to prove that Black children would be provided an education equal to that provided to the state's White children, even if in separate schools (Colburn, 1996). In fact, both Florida Attorney General Richard Ervin and School Superintendent Thomas Bailey believed that school segregation was constitutionally defensible given the state's achievements in equalizing school funding. Under the MFP, the racial gap in per-pupil expenditures had been reduced. In the 1945-1946 school year, expenses for all public schools in Florida per pupil enrolled were

\$91.80 for White students and \$52.61 for Black students (*Biennial Report*, 1946). By the 1954–1955 school year, expenses per pupil were \$193.04 for White students and \$179.07 for Black students (*Biennial Report*, 1955). During these years, the funds spent on Black children increased from 57% of those spent on White children to 93%. In a 1952 report, Bailey wrote of the “rapid progress” made toward equalizing Black and White schools, demonstrating Florida’s “good faith.” Bailey’s (1952) comments indicating that he did not believe anyone would challenge the Florida constitution in view of this substantial progress suggest that school officials planned to attempt to prove that separate meant equal in Florida.

In 1955, on the same day the U.S. Supreme Court demanded that southern districts assume responsibility for desegregating schools, Florida Governor LeRoy Collins signed the Florida Pupil Assignment Law. This law, which was strengthened in 1956, empowered county school boards to assign pupils to schools on the basis of “sociological, psychological and like intangible socio-scientific factors” (Hillsborough County School District, 1960). The law essentially provided a loophole for schools wishing to avoid desegregation. For example, the application for pupil special assignment in Hillsborough County (Tampa), Florida, was six pages long and requested information from the receiving principal about the “compatibility of the student to the education program” and the “psychological effect of [the] prospective student on your local community” (Hillsborough County School District, 1960). If the principal indicated that the student would not “fit in,” the school board could reject the request. Because many African American children were 2 to 3 years behind their White counterparts, school boards could use a number of tests to limit Black enrollment in White schools.

It was not until 1964 and the passage of the Civil Rights Act that school districts in Florida, along with those in other southern states, faced increasing pressure to develop desegregation plans that actually resulted in school desegregation. During the late 1960s and 1970s, federal courts ruled that school districts had to desegregate and should use transportation to do so. The Supreme Court upheld the constitutionality of busing in the famous 1971 decision *Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg* (Orfield, 1978).

### **Achieving Equity: School Desegregation and Florida’s Accountability Act**

Despite the anti-busing campaigns led by Governor Claude Kirk, several counties throughout Florida adopted court-ordered mandatory desegregation plans, and many involved busing. An early part of many of these desegregation plans was the dissolution of formerly all-Black schools and the transfer of students to White schools (Eitle, in press; Shircliffe, 2002). In some districts, this strategy was met with frustration and despondency by Black parents, who felt that the burden of desegregation was being placed disproportionately on Black students (Shircliffe, 2002). By the mid-1980s, magnet schools had become a popular method for achieving school desegregation in Florida districts, and a few districts, such as Hillsborough County (Tampa), were



actually being heralded as models of successful desegregation (Clotfelter, 2004; Sinclair, 1978; U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1977). Other districts such as Duval (Jacksonville), Miami-Dade, and Orange (Orlando) County preserved a number of majority Black schools that seemed untouched by school desegregation efforts. The extent of school desegregation varied from district to district, with many schools becoming more racially balanced and others experiencing little change.

Simultaneous with the actual implementation of court-ordered desegregation in Florida, Governor Reubin Askew pushed to reform the MFP to close some of the loopholes that allowed wealthy counties to avoid taxing themselves equitably. Askew (1973) argued that funding equality would make genuine educational opportunity possible. The Florida Education Finance Program was established to replace the MFP; this program restructured the funding formula based on full-time equivalency and local contributions, with the state making up any difference from the minimum level of required funding (Citizens Education Committee, 1971). The new funding system also addressed the costs of different grades, special programs, cost-of-living differences in each county, and the cost of busing in rural areas (Citizens Education Committee, 1971). Through this complex formula, Governor Askew and the legislature intended to address the varying economic conditions in the school districts.

This funding formula was accompanied by the Florida Accountability Act, described by Askew as a means to assess schools and to “more fully predict the needs and prescribe the programs for each individual as an individual” (Askew, 1971). From 1972 through 1978, the legislature variously added and removed provisions to the Florida Accountability Act, including requirements that preservice teachers take a state examination before they could be certified and that principals and superintendents justify their budgets in annual reports outlining the effectiveness of their expenditures (Herrington & McDonald, 2001; Kimbrough, Alexander, & Wattenbarger, 1984). As part of evaluating the effectiveness of expenditures, students were required to be assessed in Grades 3, 5, 8, and 11 and to pass an additional test in order to graduate from high school (Herrington & McDonald, 2001). Information on the numbers of students who passed and failed these tests was included in district and school annual reports to the public. This focus on assessments and the graduation requirement reflected the national push in the 1970s for schools to go “back to basics” by centering on reading, writing, and mathematics (White, 1981).

Under the Florida Accountability Act, the only group held accountable in any concrete way was high school seniors. The students who failed the test were most often impoverished and minority students who had not had access to the same curricula, or even books, to which students in predominantly White and affluent schools had access (Tractenberg & Kahn, 1980). This approach to accountability looked to the students to attain goals set by the legislature and the State Department of Education, even though resources to achieve those goals had been denied many students in the past. In 1979, the *Tampa Times* reported that despite 8 years of integrated schooling in

Hillsborough County, only 89% of Black 11th graders had passed the communication section of Florida's functional literacy test, and only 38% had passed the math section. Conversely, 99% of White students (Asians and American Indians were included as White) had passed the communication section, and 81% had passed the math section (Brunais, 1979).

Once Florida implemented testing requirements, lawyers acting on behalf of students who failed the graduation test filed a class-action lawsuit challenging the denial of a high school diploma. In *Debra P. v. Turlington* (1979), the plaintiffs charged that the test contained culturally biased material and that withholding a diploma on the basis of test scores discriminated against minority students. The federal court concurred and charged the state with providing a test based on information that students were actually taught. The judge also decreed that the test could not be administered until students who had been under the dual education system in Florida had graduated. The court delayed the implementation of the test until the 1982–1983 school year (*Debra P. v. Turlington*, 1979; Tractenberg & Kahn, 1980).

That year the administration of Governor Bob Graham developed the Raise Achievement in Secondary Education program, which increased the course requirements for high school graduation, significantly increased state funding for education from kindergarten to the university level, and instituted a state-mandated curriculum and graduation testing (Herrington & McDonald, 2001). The mandate established in *Debra P. v. Turlington* that the state test students only on material they had been taught was now supported by the state-mandated curriculum and increased funding, and so all districts, rich and poor, would offer the same basic curricula. This funding, however, addressed only the basic curriculum. Wealthy districts continued to offer more than the basics, while impoverished ones such as Gadsden (a historically Black rural district) could provide only the minimum requirements.

### **Dismantling Desegregation and Instituting Accountability: Unitary Status and the A+ Plan**

The administration of Governor Lawton Chiles (1991–1998) continued the state's commitment to testing as a means of accountability and incorporated the business goals of America 2000 into educational reform. At the close of the 20th century, Florida's population had grown to more than 15 million, making it the fourth most populous state in the union. Many analysts attribute the growth of national and international markets as the catalyst for Sunbelt development and related educational policies aimed at creating "good" workers for Florida's burgeoning industrial economy (Cobb, 1990). The need for an educated workforce now became preeminent. To ensure the production of well-trained workers, Florida's schools, it was reasoned, must be held accountable for the quality of their graduates (Florida Commission on Education Reform and Accountability, 1994).

The educational reform package, Blueprint 2000, answered this need by decentralizing school management while ensuring that accountability contin-

ued to be focused on the school and the student. Decentralization would give control of education back to the local districts, to “encourage innovation, risk taking, and successful student learning,” while the state set standards and coordinated the comprehensive system and assessment testing (Florida Department of Education, 1998). Local control consisted of assigning school personnel, parents, and community members responsibility for schools’ budgets and programs. These “stakeholders” would sit on school advisory committees and make decisions about how to address the needs of the students and the community. They would also design programs to achieve the goals established by the state and be held accountable for student progress, which would be measured by the FCAT, the assessment package for Blueprint 2000 that was based on statewide tests to be developed by the department of education. Rewards and sanctions for schools were to be determined by the state. If schools made adequate progress, they could receive financial rewards, special school designations, and publicity. The state developed the Florida School Recognition Program to reward schools that either maintained high levels of achievement or showed exemplary improvement. If a school did not show adequate progress after 3 years, it would be subject to actions by the State Board of Education, the governor, and the cabinet (Florida Department of Education, 1998).

In 1995, the commissioner of education, Frank Brogan, publicized lists of the lowest performing schools (Hegarty, 1995). This publication of school names served as the beginning of the implementation of sanctions against schools that did not make adequate progress. These sanctions did not take the economic or social conditions of schools into account. Schools located in high poverty areas were expected to perform as well as those located in privileged, economically thriving communities. By the end of the 1990s, Blueprint 2000 had become the A+ Plan under Governor Jeb Bush. The supposed premise of the A+ Plan is that every child can learn and no child should be left behind. This premise mirrors that of the more recent reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (“No Child Left Behind”) passed by Congress and signed into law by President George W. Bush in 2001.

A major aspect of Governor Bush’s A+ Plan is ensuring the accountability of the state’s public education sector. The A+ Plan uses student performance on the criterion-referenced portion of the FCAT in reading and mathematics to determine the overall performance of schools and rank these schools using an A through F grading system. In 1999–2000, the second year of the state’s implementation of the plan, school grades were based on the performance of students in Grade 4, 5, 8, or 10. Schools showing improvement to A status were provided incentives in the form of stipends awarded to teachers and principals, while beleaguered D and F schools were offered little real assistance. More recently, this lack of any real assistance for failing schools has become even more evident and disturbing to educators. In 2002, the Florida Legislature appropriated more than \$122 million from lottery proceeds to provide high-performing schools \$100 per student. While many schools accepted the funds, some A schools refused them, dismayed that their colleagues in F schools received no resources to improve student performance.

To address this criticism, the Bush administration elected to send out a call for volunteers to serve as tutors and coaches for F schools as an approach to assisting these schools, most of which were located in resource-poor districts facing many complex social and economic challenges.

Despite the aforementioned court orders and substantial decreases in the segregation of Black students during the 1980s, in the 1990s Florida's schools became increasingly more segregated, particularly in the largest urban districts. Six of the seven largest school districts in Florida experienced increases in levels of segregation, with the Hillsborough County school district, once heralded as a model of successful desegregation, seeing the largest increases in school segregation during the past decade (Eitle, 2003). Even under these conditions of increasing segregation, Florida districts have sought and obtained unitary status and abandoned mandatory programs designed to achieve district-wide desegregation. Federal courts have viewed patterns of increasing school segregation resulting from factors such as changing demographics due to the growth of White suburbs, the expansion of city ghettos, and immigration as beyond the control of local school boards. Therefore, as counties such as Hillsborough moved from mandatory to voluntary desegregation plans during the 1990s, school officials were not held accountable for resegregation unless plaintiffs could prove they caused it. Nevertheless, racial segregation concentrates poverty in majority Black schools while reducing poverty in predominantly White schools (Orfield & Eaton, 1996). This reality probably has consequences for educational equity.

### Summary

The state of Florida has implemented myriad policies, including school desegregation, in an attempt to increase the academic achievement of Florida's students generally and to reduce earlier inequities in both opportunities and achievement for Florida's Black students. However, the emphasis on and implementation of accountability plans have led to a virtual neglect of the issue of race and achievement at a time when school segregation among Florida schools is accelerating. Given the incentives and disincentives fundamental to such accountability mechanisms, we argue that an examination of the possible influence of racial segregation on school-level FCAT performance is not only timely but of great importance because of the high-stakes implications associated with performance on the FCAT. Thus, our primary research question was whether school-level variation in racial segregation is associated with school-level performance on the FCAT.

To answer this question, we examine the relationship between two measures of segregation (racial composition and racial balance) and the percentage of students passing the FCAT while controlling for other salient school-level predictors of standardized test performance. Specifically, we consider whether or not per-pupil expenditures, an important tool used by the state of Florida (beyond integration efforts) to diminish the gap in educational achievement between Black and White students, are an important

predictor of FCAT performance in the context of racial composition and racial balance variables. We assert that evidence that per-pupil expenditures are not associated with FCAT performance, coupled with evidence that racial segregation measures are significant predictors of test performance, should raise concerns about both the fairness and the effectiveness of using high-stakes testing without consideration of the role of segregation in predicting test performance differences.

## Method

### Data

The data for this study were obtained from the Florida Department of Education. The state of Florida is composed of 67 public school districts, one in each county, serving more than 2.3 million students. Significant changes have occurred in the state's student population during the past decade. There was a 26% increase in the student population from 1991–2000, and Black and Hispanic student enrollments increased by 31% and 89%, respectively, during this period. While these changes have not been uniform across the state, they do affect a large proportion of Florida's students. For example, in 1991 only 17% of public school students in Florida attended school in a district that was at least 50% minority; by the year 2000, however, 41% of Florida public school students were enrolled in such districts. The *Florida Schools Indicators Report* and the *School Advisory Council Report* for the academic year 1999–2000 were the sources for the data analyzed here.<sup>4</sup> The Florida Department of Education collects comprehensive information from each school in each district at scheduled times during the school year. In the present analyses, data for elementary, middle, and high schools were assessed separately.

### Dependent Variables

On the basis of scaled FCAT scores, students are classified into one of five achievement levels for math and reading performance.<sup>5</sup> Our two dependent variables captured the percentages of students in a school (among those who were tested during 4th, 5th, 8th, and 10th grades) achieving Level 3, 4, or 5 on the math and reading portions of the test. Classification at one of these levels represents a passing score and demonstrates at least partial success with the most challenging content articulated in the Sunshine State Standards (Florida State Board of Education, 1996).

### Independent Variables

#### *Segregation Measures*

We used two different measures to capture racial segregation at the school level. *Racial composition*, a categorical measure of the relative percentage of a school's students who were Black ("percentage Black"), comprised four

categories: (a) more than 90% Black, (b) 50% to 90% Black, (c) 15% to 50% Black, and (d) less than 15% Black (the omitted category). While percentage of the student body that is Black is often measured as an interval-level variable in studies investigating the impact of school desegregation or segregation (Bankston & Caldas, 1996; Crain & Mahard, 1983; Hoxby, 2002), there is recent evidence that there are important tipping points in which differences in the racial composition of the student body have meaningful influences on the academic environment of the school (Brown, 1999). However, additional analyses (available from the authors upon request) in which percentage Black was substituted for the categorical variable produced results similar to those reported here.

In addition to the racial composition measure, we constructed a three-category measure of *racial balance* in which each school was classified as Black segregated, integrated, or White (or non-Black) segregated. A school was defined as a Black segregated school if the Black enrollment exceeded by more than 15% the average percentage Black enrollment in the school district. This measure, based on the definition of an integrated school as one that is within 15% of the Black enrollment in the entire school district, was used in many of the court cases in Florida and elsewhere as representing a legal definition of when a school was desegregated (Mickelson, 2001; U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1971; Valencia, 2000). A school was defined as White segregated<sup>6</sup> if its enrollment was 15% (or more) below the district average percentage Black, whereas a school was defined as integrated if the percentage of students who were Black fell within 15% (plus or minus) of the district percentage Black. This is an important additional component (beyond racial composition) for understanding how segregation may influence school-level standardized test performance, because districts that have relatively large Black enrollments will have many schools with largely Black student bodies, and these schools will not be considered Black segregated if they are racially balanced. Finally, we analyzed the racial composition measures and the racial balance measures in separate models because of the confounding influence of these two variables on school-level test performance.<sup>7</sup>

### *Other Measures*

We evaluated the importance of the segregation measures in terms of predicting the dependent variables in the context of assumed indicators of school-level standardized test performance. We included six such measures: percentage of students who are Hispanic (“percentage Hispanic”); per-pupil expenditures; instructional quality; percentage of students who enroll for the first time, reenroll (return to the school), or withdraw during the school year, divided by a given school’s total enrollment (“percentage mobility”); percentage of students eligible for the free lunch program (“percentage poverty”); and average class size. Per-pupil expenditures are considered to capture resource differences and were included because funding equalization has been a key focus of educational reform in Florida during the past half century, although

claims regarding any positive effects of expenditures on achievement are highly contested in the literature (Nyhan & Alkadry, 1999). As a result of the multicollinearity that exists among the three available indicators of per-pupil expenditures (i.e., per-pupil dollar expenditures for regular, at-risk, and exceptional educational programs), we conducted a principal-components analysis to extract a single factor representing such expenditures. Higher scores on this factor represented higher levels of resources invested per pupil.

Percentage Hispanic is an important variable in the state of Florida (a) given that in many school districts, particularly in southern Florida, more than 20% of the student body is Hispanic and (b) given previous research indicating that percentage Hispanic is inversely associated with standardized test performance (Natriello & Pallas, 2001; Valencia, 2000; Valenzuela, 1999). Instructional quality was an index constructed by summing the *z*-score transformations of two items: percentage of teachers with a master's degree and percentage of school staff who are specialists. Higher scores on this index represented greater instructional quality. As mentioned, percentage mobility was measured as the number of students enrolling for the first time, reenrolling (returning to the school), or withdrawing during the school year divided by total enrollment. Increases in student mobility should be associated with poorer school-level performance on standardized tests, since such movement reflects a disruption in the learning process for students (Entwisle, Alexander, & Olson, 1997).

Percentage poverty, measured as the percentage of students eligible for the free lunch program, is well established as an important predictor of student achievement. Unfortunately, this measure was available for consideration only in the elementary and middle school analyses. Finally, average class size was included because of the inconsistency in past research regarding the relationship between class size and academic achievement (Finn & Achilles, 1990; Hanushek, 1997; Nyhan & Alkadry, 1999) and because the state of Florida recently passed a state referendum dictating that class sizes in Florida public schools be reduced to ensure smaller classes. In the elementary school analyses, class size was measured as average class size in a given school. Class sizes in the middle and high school analyses were measured as the average number of students in language arts and math classes as reported by each school to the state of Florida. Such measures are more accurate indicators of class size than typical student/teacher ratios.

### **Analytic Strategy**

We evaluated the role of school segregation in predicting school-level variations in the percentage of students passing the FCAT in two stages. First, we examined mean differences in the percentage of students passing the FCAT across three distinct groups of schools—Black segregated schools, integrated schools, and White segregated schools—to establish whether segregated schools have significantly lower percentages of students passing the FCAT than integrated and predominantly White schools. Second, we used

multivariate models to evaluate the influence of segregation in the context of other important predictors of aggregate-level measures of student test performance. Schools were clustered within larger units (i.e., school districts), and thus standard ordinary least squares regression techniques were inappropriate because the assumption that the error terms were uncorrelated across observations was probably violated. To correct for the effect of clustering, we used a procedure available in Stata 7.0 that adjusts for clustering of units within larger contexts. In the Stata estimator, a Huber-White correction is used for standard errors. Finally, variance inflation factors calculated for each of the models analyzed suggested no significant concerns about multicollinearity; none of these factors approached 4, and the mean inflation factor for each model analyzed was less than 2.

### Results

Tables 1, 2, and 3 present selected variable means for Black segregated, integrated, and White segregated elementary, middle, and high schools. As expected, significantly lower percentages of students in Black segregated

*Table 1*  
**Mean Scores on Selected Variables: Segregated Black, Segregated White, and Integrated Elementary Schools**

Type of Variable	Black segregated schools (B; <i>n</i> = 309)	Integrated schools (I; <i>n</i> = 920)	White segregated schools (W; <i>n</i> = 318)	Scheffé test of significant differences <sup>a</sup>
% passing FCAT reading	31.85	54.63	55.83	B vs. I B vs. W
% passing FCAT math	27.25	46.38	51.25	B vs. I B vs. W I vs. W
Per-pupil expenditures	.45	-.09	-.18	B vs. I B vs. W I vs. W
Quality of instruction	.03	-.12	.30	B vs. I B vs. W I vs. W
Average classroom size	22.75	23.24	24.65	B vs. W I vs. W
% mobility	44.13	33.51	29.28	B vs. I B vs. W I vs. W
% poverty	81.29	50.15	43.40	B vs. I B vs. W I vs. W

<sup>a</sup>*p* < .05 (two-tailed test).



*Table 2*  
**Mean Scores on Selected Variables: Segregated Black,  
 Segregated White, and Integrated Middle Schools**

Type of Variable	Black segregated schools (B; <i>n</i> = 80)	Integrated schools (I; <i>n</i> = 367)	White segregated schools (W; <i>n</i> = 66)	Scheffé test of significant differences <sup>a</sup>
% passing FCAT reading	23.68	42.11	43.29	B vs. I B vs. W
% passing FCAT math	32.84	54.55	54.91	B vs. I B vs. W
Per-pupil expenditures	.33	-.02	-.26	B vs. I B vs. W I vs. W
Quality of instruction	.00	-.07	.35	B vs. W I vs. W
Average classroom size	25.93	26.13	29.58	B vs. W I vs. W
% mobility	39.37	29.65	26.67	B vs. I B vs. W
% poverty	67.34	42.03	40.55	B vs. I B vs. W

<sup>a</sup>*p* < .05 (two-tailed test).

*Table 3*  
**Mean Scores on Selected Variables: Segregated Black,  
 Segregated White, and Integrated High Schools**

Type of Variable	Black segregated schools (B; <i>n</i> = 42)	Integrated schools (I; <i>n</i> = 289)	White segregated schools (W; <i>n</i> = 37)	Scheffé test of significant differences <sup>a</sup>
% passing FCAT reading	18.48	28.38	31.97	B vs. I B vs. W
% passing FCAT math	31.95	53.06	54.81	B vs. I B vs. W I vs. W
Per-pupil expenditures	.21	-.02	-.12	B vs. I B vs. W
Quality of instruction	.14	-.05	.29	I vs. W
Average classroom size	27.83	25.83	29.87	I vs. W
% mobility	43.66	30.22	25.04	B vs. I B vs. W

Note. The Florida department of Education does not report poverty statistics for high schools.  
<sup>a</sup>*p* < .05 (two-tailed test).

schools passed the FCAT reading and math sections than students in either of the other two groups of schools (integrated and White segregated schools). For instance, it can be seen in Table 1 that, on average, only 31.85% of fifth-grade students at Black segregated schools passed the reading portion of the FCAT, as compared with 54.63% of fifth-grade students at integrated schools and 55.83% of fifth graders at White segregated schools. This pattern was reproduced across middle schools (Table 2) and high schools (Table 3) and was repeated when mean differences in the percentages of students passing the math portion of the FCAT were examined.

However, in only two of the six possible comparisons between the mean FCAT test performance of students in integrated versus White segregated schools were the differences statistically significant ( $p < .05$ ), and even in these comparisons, the gaps between the percentages of students passing the FCAT at integrated and White segregated schools were substantially smaller (i.e., approximately 2% and 5%) than the gaps between Black segregated and integrated schools' FCAT performances (i.e., approximately 21% and 19%, respectively). This pattern of differences reveals that mean FCAT test performance differed only between Black segregated schools and integrated schools or between Black segregated and White segregated schools. Schools that were integrated were roughly comparable in their FCAT performance to schools with relatively few Black students (i.e., White segregated schools).

When we consider other comparisons, of little surprise is the finding that Black segregated schools had significantly more impoverished students than either integrated or White segregated schools. Indeed, at the elementary school level, the distinction was somewhat surprising in its magnitude. Results showed that more than 80% of students in Black segregated schools were impoverished, as compared with 50% of students in integrated schools and 43% of students in White segregated schools. Clearly, the concentration of poverty in segregated schools is an important dimension in regard to understanding differences in standardized test performance (such as performance on the FCAT). We explored this connection further in the multivariate analyses.

Another notable finding is that Black segregated schools evidenced significantly higher per-pupil expenditures than either integrated or White segregated schools, reflecting the aforementioned efforts by Florida to reduce educational inequities, in addition to Title I funding and funding related to special needs students. However, average scores capturing quality of instruction suggested that instructional quality at White segregated middle and high schools was greater than that at either integrated or Black segregated middle and high schools, a factor that may have accounted for some of the disparities in FCAT performance. Not surprising, Black segregated schools exhibited significantly higher percentages of student mobility than either integrated or White segregated schools, and this may also have contributed to the lower average FCAT performance among students in these schools. Finally, White segregated middle and high schools appeared to have larger sizes classes than either Black segregated or integrated middle and high schools. This finding

may again reflect the policies enacted to reduce educational inequities and the availability of federal Title I funds for exceptional students.

Table 4 presents the results of the regression analyses predicting the percentage of fifth-grade students passing the math portion of the FCAT and the percentage of fourth-grade students passing the reading portion (in 1999–2000, only fourth graders took the reading portion of the FCAT, and only fifth graders were tested in math). In both the racial balance and racial

Table 4  
**Ordinary Least Squares Regression of Percentage of Elementary School Students Passing the Math and Reading Portions of the FCAT ( $n = 1,547$ )**

Type of variable	4th grade: balance	4th grade: composition	5th grade: balance	5th grade: composition
<b>Control</b>				
Per-pupil expenditures	-1.62* (0.78)	-1.32 (0.67)	0.13 (0.65)	0.19 (0.63)
Instructional quality	2.00** (0.70)	2.30** (0.64)	.80 (0.78)	1.02 (0.84)
% mobility	-0.02 (0.02)	-0.03 (0.02)	-0.00 (0.02)	-0.00 (0.02)
% Hispanic	-0.12*** (0.03)	-.17*** (0.03)	-0.01 (0.03)	-0.02 (0.03)
Average class size	-0.10 (0.06)	-0.05 (0.04)	-0.02 (0.05)	0.00 (0.04)
% poverty	-0.44*** (0.02)	-0.38*** (0.03)	-0.49*** (0.03)	-0.46*** (0.03)
<b>Segregation<sup>a</sup></b>				
<b>Racial balance</b>				
Black segregated school	-8.27*** (1.32)		-5.34** (1.88)	
Integrated school	0.21 (0.87)		-1.37 (1.32)	
<b>Racial composition</b>				
More than 90% Black		-18.19*** (1.80)		-9.42*** (1.68)
50%–90% Black		-12.65*** (1.40)		-6.51*** (1.41)
15%–50% Black		-3.88*** (0.86)		-2.88** (0.93)
Constant	81.11*** (1.49)	80.06*** (1.18)	73.20*** (1.58)	71.85*** (1.28)
$R^2$	.716	.735	.612	.618

Note. Robust standard errors are in parentheses.

<sup>a</sup>Default categories for the segregation measures were White segregated schools (for the racial balance models) and less than 15% Black (for the racial composition models).

\* $p < .05$ ; \*\* $p < .01$ ; \*\*\* $p < .001$  (two-tailed tests).

composition models predicting the percentage of students passing the reading portion of the FCAT at each school, three of the nonsegregation variables were found to be significant predictors of the dependent variable: instructional quality, percentage Hispanic, and percentage poverty. In schools with a higher percentage of poor students, a higher percentage of Hispanic students, and lower instructional quality, lower percentages of students passed the reading portion of the FCAT. Furthermore, spending exhibited an inverse association with the dependent variable in the racial balance model, whereas it failed to reach statistical significance in the racial composition model.

In regard to the segregation measures, the results of the model including the measures of racial balance are presented in the first column of Table 4. This model reveals that significantly lower percentages of students in Black segregated schools than in White segregated schools passed the fourth-grade reading FCAT. However, there were no significant differences between integrated schools and White segregated schools in terms of percentage of students passing the reading portion of the FCAT.

With regard to the racial composition of the schools, the findings were significant and in the expected direction. In comparison with schools with relatively few Black students enrolled (i.e., fewer than 15% of students), schools with a greater proportion of Black students enrolled evidenced a significantly lower percentage of fourth graders passing the FCAT reading test. For example, in a school with less than 15% Black enrollment (and for which other variables exhibited values close to their overall means), approximately 54% of the student population would be expected to pass the reading section of the FCAT. However, in a similar school with more than 90% Black enrollment, only 36% of the students would be expected to pass the reading section of this test. Schools with larger percentages of Black students performed poorer, independent of other predictors of percentage of students passing the reading FCAT.

In the model predicting fifth-grade students' performance on the math portion of the FCAT, only one control variable—percentage poverty—was found to be significant. All else equal, as percentage poverty increased, the percentage of students passing the math portion of the FCAT decreased. The findings for the model including measures of racial balance were parallel to those reported for the model predicting fourth-grade students' reading FCAT performance. Approximately 5% fewer students passed the math portion of the FCAT in Black segregated schools than in White segregated schools. However, after control for other factors, integrated schools and White segregated schools did not vary significantly in their average performance.

Consistent with the predictions regarding percentages of students passing the reading FCAT, the racial composition measures were again predictive of the percentages of students passing the math portion of the FCAT. Significantly lower proportions of students in schools with high percentages of Black students than in schools with lower percentages of Black students passed the math portion of the FCAT.

Results from the models examining predictors of middle school students' performance on the FCAT are shown in Table 5. Analyses revealed that two control variables, percentage mobility and percentage poverty, were negatively associated with school-level math and reading test performance across all four models. In schools with greater student mobility and a higher percentage of students in poverty, fewer students passed the math and reading portions of the FCAT. In addition, per-pupil expenditures were negatively associated with

Table 5  
**Ordinary Least Squares Regression of Percentage of Middle School Students Passing the Math and Reading Portions of the FCAT (*n* = 513)**

Type of variable	8th grade: balance	8th grade: composition	8th grade: balance	8th grade: composition
<b>Control</b>				
Per-pupil expenditures	-1.80* (0.88)	-1.52 (0.87)	-2.15* (0.90)	-1.75* (0.81)
Instructional quality	1.73 (1.12)	1.79 (1.02)	1.60 (1.02)	1.63 (0.90)
% mobility	-0.24*** (0.04)	-0.27*** (0.04)	-0.25*** (0.06)	-0.29*** (0.06)
% Hispanic	-0.01 (0.04)	-0.06* (0.03)	0.00 (0.05)	-0.05 (0.05)
Average class size	0.13 (0.07)	0.17 (0.08)	-0.37* (0.18)	0.30 (0.19)
% poverty	-0.47*** (0.04)	-0.41*** (0.05)	-0.48*** (0.05)	-0.41*** (0.07)
<b>Segregation<sup>a</sup></b>				
<b>Racial balance</b>				
Black segregated school	-2.30 (2.29)		-5.15 (2.68)	
Integrated school	1.45 (1.27)		1.25 (1.58)	
<b>Racial composition</b>				
More than 90% Black		-11.44** (3.19)		-13.72** (4.19)
50%–90% Black		-8.22** (2.54)		-12.40** (3.80)
15%–50% Black		-0.89 (1.17)		-1.54 (1.48)
Constant	64.36*** (2.34)	64.04*** (2.91)	90.24*** (5.15)	89.32*** (5.30)
<i>R</i> <sup>2</sup>	.728	.741	.671	.687

Note. Robust standard errors are in parentheses.

<sup>a</sup>Default categories for the segregation measures were White segregated schools (for the racial balance models) and less than 15% Black (for the racial composition models).

\**p* < .05; \*\**p* < .01; \*\*\**p* < .001 (two-tailed tests).

eighth graders' math performance on the FCAT in both the racial balance and composition models, and such spending was negatively associated with eighth graders' reading performance in the racial balance model. While the spending coefficient did not reach statistical significance in the model predicting percentage of students passing the reading portion of the FCAT when the racial composition measures were included, this coefficient did approach statistical significance ( $p < .10$ ).

In the racial composition models, the same pattern of findings emerged as in the analyses of elementary schools focusing on racial composition: As percentage of Black students increased, there was an expected decrease in the percentage of students passing the FCAT (both the math and reading portions). One caveat that should be noted was that the difference between the effect of a school being between 15% and 50% Black and the default category—less than 15% Black—failed to reach statistical significance, suggesting that there was no difference between average performance on the FCAT in these two categories of for schools. This implies that there is a potential threshold racial composition effect that leads to significantly lower percentages of students passing the FCAT, rather than a simple linear relationship between racial composition and school-level test performance. However, the racial balance models revealed that being enrolled in a Black segregated or integrated school (vs. a White segregated school) was not a significant predictor of either dependent variable at the middle school level. That is, whether or not a school was racially balanced relative to the district's racial composition did not appear to have predictive utility.

A similar portrait of the predictors of high school students' performance on the FCAT is offered by the findings shown in Table 6. Three of the control variables were found to be statistically significant ( $p < .05$ ) in the high school models: instructional quality, percentage Hispanic, and percentage mobility. In schools with greater levels of instructional quality, less mobility, and fewer Hispanic students, higher percentages of students passed the math and reading portions of the FCAT than in their counterpart schools. Surprisingly, average class size was found to be a significant predictor of school-level FCAT math test performance (in the racial composition model), but in a direction opposite from that predicted. That is, increases in class size were associated with increases in the percentage of students passing the math portion of the FCAT. Finally, it must be noted that percentage poverty was not available for inclusion in the high school models. Thus, to the extent that racial composition, racial balance, and percentage poverty are interrelated, the magnitudes of the race variable coefficients were probably influenced by the exclusion of the poverty measure at the high school level.

The pattern of findings regarding the association between school racial composition and the dependent variable at the high school level was similar to that found in the middle school analyses. Racial composition was negatively associated with the percentage of students passing both the math and reading portions of the FCAT. However, even in schools with between 15% and 50% Black students, significantly lower percentages of students passed

Table 6

**Ordinary Least Squares Regression of Percentage of High School Students Passing the Math and Reading Portions of the FCAT ( $n = 368$ )**

Type of variable	10th grade: balance	10th grade: composition	10th grade: balance	10th grade: composition
Control				
Per-pupil expenditures	0.34 (1.48)	1.67 (1.15)	-2.61 (2.27)	0.33 (1.38)
Instructional quality	6.12*** (0.91)	6.62*** (0.84)	4.71*** (1.06)	5.50*** (0.99)
% mobility	-0.24*** (0.05)	-0.23*** (0.06)	-0.28*** (0.07)	-0.26*** (0.07)
% Hispanic	-0.25*** (0.04)	-0.25*** (0.03)	-0.27*** (0.06)	-0.31*** (0.04)
Average class size	0.05 (0.13)	0.23 (0.12)	-0.03 (0.21)	0.40* (0.17)
Segregation <sup>a</sup>				
Racial balance				
Black segregated school	-13.04*** (3.41)		-21.49*** (4.77)	
Integrated school	-5.41* (2.37)		-4.26 (2.95)	
Racial composition				
More than 90% Black		-24.39*** (1.79)		-43.05*** (2.53)
50%–90% Black		-13.66*** (2.09)		-27.26*** (2.39)
15%–50% Black		-2.36* (0.93)		-5.76*** (1.36)
Constant	42.67*** (5.49)	34.63*** (4.19)	69.24*** (7.50)	58.49*** (1.36)
$R^2$	.403	.484	.425	.579

Note. Robust standard errors are in parentheses. The Florida department of Education does not report poverty statistics for high schools.

<sup>a</sup>Default categories for the segregation measures were White segregated schools (for the racial balance models) and less than 15% Black (for the racial composition models).

\* $p < .05$ ; \*\*\* $p < .001$  (two-tailed tests).

the FCAT than in schools with relatively few Black students (i.e., fewer than 15%). With regard to the racial balance variables, these analyses revealed that a much lower percentage of students passed the FCAT in Black segregated schools than in White segregated schools. The difference between integrated schools and White segregated schools failed to reach statistical significance in terms of predicting the percentage of 10th graders passing the math portion of the FCAT. In integrated schools, however, a lower percentage of students passed the reading portion of the test than in White segregated schools.

In summary, two important patterns are revealed in these analyses. First, the racial composition of the student body is an important predictor of the

percentage of students passing the FCAT math and reading tests, regardless of the grade at which testing takes place (4th–5th grade, 8th grade, or 10th grade). Increases in the percentage of Black students enrolled in a school are associated with fewer students passing the FCAT, independent of other important predictors such as instructional quality, average class size, and per-pupil expenditures. Second, the racial balance (or imbalance) of schools is associated with significantly lower percentages of students passing the FCAT reading and math tests at the elementary and high school levels. Black segregated schools perform significantly less well than White segregated schools at both the elementary and high school levels. However, in three of the four models the difference between the effect of being enrolled in an integrated school and that of being enrolled in a White segregated school was not statistically significant, suggesting that the relationship between the racial balance measures and the dependent variable is not simply an artifact of the racial composition of schools. Relative racial balance appears to matter only if schools are Black segregated—students in schools with relatively racially balanced student populations and students in schools with relatively low percentages of Black students appear to perform in a relatively similar manner on the FCAT, after control for other salient predictors of school-level standardized test performance.

## Conclusion

In the 50 years since the landmark decision in the *Brown* case, the legacy of this decision continues to structure the debate about how to best close the achievement gap between Black and White students. Unfortunately, there is growing evidence that the logic and spirit of *Brown*—that separate is inherently unequal—are no longer of central import in the educational policies currently being implemented to raise academic achievement standards generally and to close the race gap specifically. We have documented the history of one state's efforts to close the Black-White achievement gap in the decades since *Brown*. Consistent with national trends, Florida has moved away from racial integration as a solution to the Black-White achievement gap problem and has now turned its attention to an accountability mechanism complete with disincentives (and the withholding of incentives) for schools whose student bodies do not meet performance benchmarks.

The results of our analyses suggest great caution in abandoning school integration as a mechanism to close the racial gap. Controlling for other known and argued predictors of school-level standardized test performance, including per-pupil expenditures and percentage poverty, our analyses revealed that race still matters: Both the racial composition of a school and whether a school was Black segregated (relative to the school district's racial composition) predicted the percentage of students passing the FCAT. Indeed, the fact that students in integrated schools did not perform significantly worse on the FCAT test than students in White segregated schools can be interpreted as *prima facie* evidence that integrating Black and White students makes a difference in terms



of school-level performance on high-stakes tests. While the models including measures of racial balance did not explain as much of the variation in the dependent variable as the racial composition variables, the overall picture that these analyses paint is one wherein segregated schools can be viewed as institutions of concentrated disadvantage (Wilson, 1987). Such schools must grapple with several adverse factors that simultaneously limit the academic achievement of their student bodies. Furthermore, our analyses suggest that policies that attempt to resolve the achievement gap by funding equity or classroom size changes may not be successful if they do not accept the premise of *Brown*—that integration is fundamental to ensuring educational equality.

While our study provides an important examination of how the distribution of race influences school-level high-stakes test performance, it involves some obvious limitations. For example, our analysis was cross sectional in nature. Arguably, a superior test would consist of a longitudinal analysis attempting to determine whether changes in the predictor variables predict changes in the percentages of students passing the FCAT over time. It is our hope that, as the FCAT continues to be employed as a form of high-stakes testing over the next few years, additional analyses can be conducted to better assess the dynamic aspects of the relationships examined in the present study. On a related note, we were able to evaluate only a relatively static state of the outcomes of extant educational policies in Florida, namely de facto segregation (court-ordered segregation policies had concluded) and educational equity policies and their relationship to school-level FCAT performance. A superior test would be to evaluate how specific changes in Florida's educational equity policies influence changes in the dependent variable over time. However, the FCAT has not been used for a sufficiently long time period to allow such analyses. Furthermore, we examined only school-level factors and their relationship with the dependent variable; we did not employ measures of local community or school district measures to evaluate variations in the dependent variable.<sup>8</sup> Further analyses including such measures may provide greater clarification of how segregation influences school-level high-stakes testing performance. Finally, the present results do not inform us about the influence of racial segregation on individual test performance. Such analyses are crucial to develop a comprehensive understanding of the consequences of school segregation for educational achievement.

In conclusion, we acknowledge that we have not tested the utility of accountability mechanisms for raising educational achievement or for closing the racial gap in educational achievement. Rather, our analyses represent only an initial foray into examining whether distribution of students by race is an important component in predicting school-level FCAT performance. We suggest that our results lead to an important conclusion: Using accountability mechanisms to evaluate schools and dole out incentives and disincentives without taking into account the racial distribution of students is clearly unfair and probably will not maximize the efficiency of such initiatives in accomplishing their objectives. School districts that are not guided by the logic of *Brown* and fail to take into consideration the importance of racial integration

will likely face difficult problems ahead as disincentives accumulate for failing schools with large Black enrollments. Given the national popularity of high-stakes testing, the FCAT represents a harbinger of what is likely to occur throughout the United States. We implore policymakers to remember the legacy of *Brown* when considering the use of accountability mechanisms.

### Notes

We gratefully acknowledge the support of the Spencer Foundation through a major grant to the first author establishing the Consortium for Education Research in Florida in the David C. Anchin Center, College of Education, University of South Florida. We would also like to thank Lee Anne Bell, the editor of this special issue, and Maenette Benham, the editor of *AERJ*, for their encouragement, as well as the anonymous reviewers whose helpful comments improved the article.

<sup>1</sup>In *Green v. County School Board of New Kent County* (1968), the Supreme Court ruled that desegregation must be achieved with respect to several factors, including student enrollments, facilities, staff, extracurricular activities, and transportation. After this decision, these “*Green* factors” were commonly used as goals for desegregation plans and more recently have become a court standard for assessing whether school districts are to be legally declared “unitary” (Orfield & Eaton, 1996).

<sup>2</sup>We use the term *Hispanic* rather than *Latino* to be consistent with the term used by the state of Florida in describing student demographics.

<sup>3</sup>*Keyes v. Denver School District No. 1* (1973) was the first school desegregation case to recognize Latinos’ right to desegregation.

<sup>4</sup>The Florida Schools Indicators Report can be found at <http://info.doe.state.fl.us/fsir/>. The School Advisory Council Report can be found at <http://www.firn.edu/doe/eias/eiaspubs/pdf/sacrfn.pdf>.

<sup>5</sup>The error associated with classification of students into achievement levels on the FCAT is discussed in a technical report available at <http://www.firn.edu/doe/sas/pdf/fc00tech.pdf>.

<sup>6</sup>We originally included a Hispanic segregated school measure as well but found no difference between this measure and the White segregated minority measure; thus, we collapsed the two measures into one category referred to here as White (non-Black) segregated.

<sup>7</sup>In separate analyses, we also included the district-level measure of percentage Black as a control variable. Because this variable failed to reach statistical significance and failed to influence the predictive utility of the dichotomous measure of segregated school status, we omitted it from the analyses reported here.

<sup>8</sup>Although our measure of Black segregated school status is a school-level measure, its value was determined relative to the racial composition of the school district.

### References

- Askew, R. (1971, April 6). *Governor's address*. Tallahassee: Florida State Archives.
- Askew, R. (1973, April 3). *Address to the legislature*. Tallahassee: Florida State Archives.
- Bailey, T. (1952, February 6). *Present status of Negro education in Florida's public schools*. Tallahassee: Florida State Archives.
- Bankston, C., & Caldas, C. (1996). Majority African American schools and social injustice: The influence of de facto segregation on academic achievement. *Social Forces*, 75, 535–552.
- Biennial report: Report of the superintendent of public instruction of the state of Florida*. (1946). Tallahassee, FL: T. J. Appleyard.
- Biennial report: Report of the superintendent of public instruction of the state of Florida*. (1955). Tallahassee, FL: T. J. Appleyard.
- Braddock, J. H. (1980). The perpetuation of segregation across levels of education: A behavioral assessment of the contact hypothesis. *Sociology of Education*, 53, 178–186.

- Braddock, J. H., & Eitle, T. M. (2003). The effects of school desegregation. In J. A. Banks & C. M. Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (2nd ed., pp. 828–846). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Braddock, J. H., & McPartland, J. M. (1989). Social psychological processes that perpetuate racial segregation: The relationship between school and employment desegregation. *Journal of Black Studies, 19*, 267–289.
- Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas, 347 U.S. 483 (1954).
- Brown, K. (1996). Revisiting the Supreme Court's opinion in *Brown v. Board of Education* from a multiculturalist perspective. In E. C. Lagemann & L. P. Miller (Eds.), *Brown v. Board of Education: The challenge for today's schools* (pp. 44–53). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Brown, S. (1999, August). *High school racial composition: Balancing excellence and equity*. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Sociological Association, Chicago.
- Brunais, A. (1979, September 17). Black children have not yet gone to the head of the class. *Tampa Times*, pp. B1, B2.
- Citizens Education Committee. (1971). *Partial transcript of meeting of Citizens Education Committee*. Tallahassee, FL: Author.
- Clotfelter, C. T. (2004). *After Brown: The rise and retreat of school desegregation*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Cobb, J. A. (1990). The Sunbelt south: Industrialization in regional, national, and international perspective. In R. A. Mohl (Ed.), *Searching for the Sunbelt: Historical perspectives on a region* (pp. 25–46). Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press.
- Colburn, D. R. (1996). Florida politics in the twentieth century. In M. Gannon (Ed.), *The new history of Florida* (pp. 344–372). Tallahassee: University Press of Florida.
- Colburn, D. R., & Scher, R. K. (1980). *Florida's gubernatorial politics in the twentieth century*. Tallahassee: University Press of Florida.
- Condron, D. J., & Roscigno, V. J. (2003). Disparities within: Unequal spending and achievement in an urban school district. *Sociology of Education, 76*, 18–36.
- Crain, R., & Mahard, R. E. (1983). The effects of research methodology on desegregation achievement studies: A meta-analysis. *American Journal of Sociology, 88*, 839–854.
- Debra P. v. Turlington, 474 F. Supp. 244 (M.C. FL. 1979).
- Eitle, T. M. (2003, August). *Segregation, diversity, and accountability in Florida schools*. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Sociological Association, Atlanta, GA.
- Eitle, T. M. (in press). Diversity, desegregation, and accountability in Florida districts. In K. Borman & S. Dorn (Eds.), *The struggle for equity: Educational reform in Florida*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida.
- Eitle, T. M., & Eitle, D. J. (in press). Inequality, segregation, and the overrepresentation of African Americans in school suspensions. *Sociological Perspectives*.
- Entwisle, D. R., Alexander, K. L., & Olson, L. S. (1997). *Children, schools, and inequality*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Epstein, J. L. (1985). After the bus arrives: Resegregation in desegregated schools. *Journal of Social Issues, 41*, 23–43.
- Eyler, J., Cook, V., & Ward, L. (1983). Resegregation: Segregation within desegregated schools. In C. H. Rossell & W. D. Hawley (Eds.), *The consequences of school desegregation* (pp. 126–162). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Finn, J. D., & Achilles, C. M. (1990). Answers and questions about class size: A statewide experiment. *American Educational Research Journal, 27*, 557–577.
- Florida Commission on Education Reform and Accountability. (1994). *Blueprint 2000*. Tallahassee, FL: Author.

- Florida Department of Education. (1996). *Sunshine state standards*. Tallahassee, FL: State Board of Education.
- Florida Department of Education. (1998). *Florida's system of school improvement and accountability*. Tallahassee, FL: Bureau of Career Development and Educational Improvement.
- Grant, C. A. (1996). Reflections on the promise of *Brown* and multicultural education. In E. C. Lagemann & L. P. Miller (Eds.), *Brown v. Board of Education: The challenge for today's schools* (pp. 107–121). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Green v. County School Board of New Kent County, 391 U.S. 430 (1968).
- Hanushek, E. A. (1997). Assessing the effects of school resources on student performance: An update. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 19, 141–164.
- Hegarty, S. (1995, December 27). He's making waves in Florida education. *St. Petersburg Times*, p. A1.
- Herrington, C., & McDonald, V. M. (2001). Accountability as a school reform strategy: A 30-year perspective on Florida. In C. D. Herrington & K. Kasten (Eds.), *Florida 2001: Educational policy alternatives* (pp. 7–34). Jacksonville: Florida Institute of Education.
- Hillsborough County School District. (1960, September 21). *Application for pupil special assignment*. Unpublished document.
- Hoxby, C. (2002). The power of peers. *Education Next*, 2, 57–64.
- Kaeser, S. C. (1979). Suspensions in school discipline. *Education and Urban Society*, 11, 465–486.
- Keyes v. Denver School District No. 1, 413 U.S. 189 (1973).
- Kimbrough, R., Alexander, K., & Wattenbarger, J. (1984). Government and education. In M. J. Dauer (Ed.), *Florida's politics and government* (2nd ed., pp. 422–448). Gainesville: University Press of Florida.
- Meier, K., Stewart, J., & England, R. E. (1989). *Race, class, and education: The politics of second-generation discrimination*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Mickelson, R. A. (2001). Subverting Swann: First- and second-generation segregation in the Charlotte-Mecklenburg schools. *American Educational Research Journal*, 38, 215–252.
- Mills, R., & Bryan, M. M. (1976). *Testing . . . grouping: The new segregation in southern schools?* Atlanta, GA: Southern Regional Council.
- Natriello, G., & Pallas, A. M. (2001). The development and impact of high-stakes testing. In G. Orfield & M. L. Kornhaber (Eds.), *Raising standards or raising barriers? Inequality and high-stakes testing in public education* (pp. 19–38). New York: Century Foundation Press.
- Nyhan, R. C., & Alkadry, M. G. (1999). The impact of school resources on student achievement. *Journal of Education Finance*, 25, 211–227.
- Orfield, G. (1978). *Must we bus? Segregated schools and national policy*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institute.
- Orfield, G., & Eaton, S. (1996). *Dismantling desegregation: The quiet reversal of Brown v. Board of Education*. New York: New Press.
- Shircliffe, B. J. (2002). Desegregation and the historically Black high school. *Urban Review*, 34, 135–158.
- Sinclair, C. (1978, June 17). Desegregation's quiet success. *Washington Post*, pp. A1, A10.
- Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools, 402 U.S. 1, 15 (1971).
- Tractenberg, P. L., & Kahn, L. (1980). *State minimum competency testing programs: Legal implications of minimum competency testing: Debra P. and beyond*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Education.
- U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. (1971). *Mexican American education study, Report 1: Ethnic isolation of Mexican Americans in the public schools of the Southwest*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

*Accountability in a Postdesegregation Era*

- U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. (1977). *Statement on metropolitan school desegregation: A report of the United States Commission on Civil Rights*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Valencia, R. R. (2000). Inequalities and the schooling of minority students in Texas: Historical and contemporary conditions. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 22, 445–459.
- Valenzuela, A. (1999). *Subtractive schooling: U.S.-Mexican youth and the politics of caring*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Wells, A. S., & Crain, R. L. (1994). Perpetuation theory and the long-term effects of school desegregation. *Review of Educational Research*, 64, 531–556.
- White, A. O. (1981). State leadership and public education in Florida: The evolution of a system. In R. K. Goodenow & A. O. White (Eds.), *The education and the rise of the new South* (pp. 237–249). Boston: Hall.
- Wilson, W. J. (1987). *The truly disadvantaged: The inner city, the underclass, and public policy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Manuscript received December 9, 2003

Revision received May 10, 2004

Accepted June 1, 2004