#### NBER WORKING PAPER SERIES

#### THE LONG RUN IMPACTS OF COURT-ORDERED DESEGREGATION

Garrett Anstreicher Jason Fletcher Owen Thompson

Working Paper 29926 http://www.nber.org/papers/w29926

### NATIONAL BUREAU OF ECONOMIC RESEARCH 1050 Massachusetts Avenue Cambridge, MA 02138 April 2022

We thank Bob Thomas for assistance in applying for and accessing the Census data; Sarah Reber for sharing data from Office of Civil Rights school surveys; the authors of Taylor et al. [2016] and Bailey et al. [2020] for guidance on the use of the NUMIDENT files; and Trishia Cueto for excellent research assistance. This material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation Graduate Research Fellowship Program under Grant No. DGE-1747503. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation. Support was also provided by the Graduate School and the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Research and Graduate Education at the University of Wisconsin-Madison with funding from the Wisconsin Alumni Research Foundation. Any views expressed are those of the authors and not those of the U.S. Census Bureau or the National Bureau of Economic Research. The Census Bureau's Disclosure Review Board and Disclosure Avoidance Officers have reviewed this information product for unauthorized disclosure of confidential information and have approved the disclosure avoidance practices applied to this release. This research was performed at a Federal Statistical Research Data Center under FSRDC Project Number 1849. (CBDRB-FY22-P1849-R9537 and CBDRB-FY22-P1849-R9383)

NBER working papers are circulated for discussion and comment purposes. They have not been peer-reviewed or been subject to the review by the NBER Board of Directors that accompanies official NBER publications.

© 2022 by Garrett Anstreicher, Jason Fletcher, and Owen Thompson. All rights reserved. Short sections of text, not to exceed two paragraphs, may be quoted without explicit permission provided that full credit, including © notice, is given to the source.

The Long Run Impacts of Court-Ordered Desegregation Garrett Anstreicher, Jason Fletcher, and Owen Thompson NBER Working Paper No. 29926 April 2022 JEL No. I24,J71,J78

#### **ABSTRACT**

Court ordered desegregation plans were implemented in hundreds of US school districts nationwide from the 1960s through the 1980s, and were arguably the most substantive national attempt to improve educational access for African American children in modern American history. Using large Census samples that are linked to Social Security records containing county of birth, we implement event studies that estimate the long run effects of exposure to desegregation orders on human capital and labor market outcomes. We find that African Americans who were relatively young when a desegregation order was implemented in their county of birth, and therefore had more exposure to integrated schools, experienced large improvements in adult human capital and labor market outcomes relative to Blacks who were older when a court order was locally implemented. There are no comparable changes in outcomes among whites in counties undergoing an order, or among Blacks who were beyond school ages when a local order was implemented. These effects are strongly concentrated in the South, with largely null findings in other regions. Our data and methodology provide the most comprehensive national assessment to date on the impacts of court ordered desegregation, and strongly indicate that these policies were in fact highly effective at improving the long run socioeconomic outcomes of many Black students.

Garrett Anstreicher 1180 Observatory Drive Room 7316 Madison, Wisc 53706 United States anstreicher@wisc.edu

Jason Fletcher University of Wisconsin-Madison La Follette School of Public Affairs 1225 Observatory Drive Madison, WI 53706 and NBER jfletcher@lafollette.wisc.edu Owen Thompson Department of Economics Williams College 24 Hopkins Hall Drive Williamstown, MA 01267 and NBER ot3@williams.edu

# 1 Introduction

Beginning with the 1954 Brown v. Board of Education ruling and continuing through the 1990s, most large school districts in the US were placed under court orders requiring them to reduce their levels of racial segregation. These orders were extremely controversial and often faced fierce local resistance, but were nonetheless substantively implemented and were almost always followed by significant reductions in measured racial segregation [Welch and Light, 1987, Kluger, 2011].

Court ordered school desegregation arguably constituted the most ambitious attempt in modern US history to reduce racial inequality in educational access, and a full understanding of its impacts is of clear importance from both a research and policy perspective. This paper provides new evidence on what is perhaps the central question regarding the efficacy of these orders: Whether they improved the long run socioeconomic outcomes of the minority students they were intended to benefit.

Key to our contribution is the use of Census and ACS samples that have recently been matched to respondent's counties of birth using the Social Security Administration's Numident file. This makes it possible to observe both childhood geographic locations and adult human capital and labor market outcomes for several million individuals who were attending school in the period when major desegregation orders were being rolled out. As discussed below, previous studies on this topic have had to either rely on much smaller samples like the PSID to observe both childhood location and adult outcomes (e.g. Johnson [2011]), or have used larger Census samples but have only been able to estimate contemporaneous or short run effects (e.g. Guryan [2004]).

Using this novel data source and exploiting the staggered timing of court orders, we estimate event study specifications that compare the long run outcomes of individuals who were relatively young when an order was implemented in their county of birth, and therefore had more exposure to the post-integration educational environment, to individuals who were older when an order was locally implemented and therefore had fewer years of postintegration schooling. In conjunction with the large sample sizes available in our data, this approach allows us to precisely estimate non-parametric "dose-response" relationships between years of exposure to the court orders and adult outcomes, rather than relying on binary or linear treatment measures.

Integration orders plausibly impacted multiple inputs of the educational production function simultaneously, including peers and school resources, and potentially had subtle psychosocial benefits as well by promoting more generally equitable and inclusive education systems.<sup>1</sup> To gain a better sense of what the treatment actually consisted of, we begin by reporting 'first stage' estimates of how the court orders in our sample impacted contemporaneous measures of racial segregation and school characteristics. These analyses indicate that the court orders we study led Black students to be spread more evenly across the schools in treated districts and to be exposed to more white peers, and also increased per-pupil funding and decreased student-teacher ratios at the schools attended by Blacks. Notably, these first stage estimates indicate that court orders had much larger effects on both segregation and school characteristics in the South than in other regions, and we may expect any psychosocial benefits of the orders to be greater in the South as well, given the region's history of overt state-sponsored discrimination and de-jure school segregation.

We then report our main reduced form estimates of how childhood exposure to desegregation orders affected a variety of adult socioeconomic outcomes. These analyses indicate that greater exposure to post-integration educational environments did indeed improve the human capital and labor market outcomes of African Americans in adulthood. Mirroring the first stage estimates, we find that these effects were concentrated in the South, with no substantive effects outside of the South. Among Southern Blacks, having a desegregation order implemented in an individual's county of birth prior to age 5 improves an index of their adult human capital by over .3 standard deviations relative to having an order implemented at age 17, and increases an index of their economic self-sufficiency by approximately 0.5 standard deviations. Significant effects are also observed across a variety of disaggregated adult outcomes variables, including high school completion, years of educational attainment, labor force attachment, and hourly wages.

Our estimation approach has the desirable feature of building in placebo tests that help establish the key identifying assumption of parallel trends. Most importantly, we do not expect to observe any trends in adult outcomes across individuals who were over age 17 when an order was implemented, since none of these individuals had any exposure to court ordered desegregation.<sup>2</sup> Additionally, while the expected effects of court orders on white students are not necessarily zero, we can reasonably expect smaller effects for whites than African

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>While difficult to quantify, the psychological benefits of integrated education weighed substantially in key judicial rulings, with Chief Justice Warren famously writing in the *Brown* decision that segregation "generates a feeling of inferiority as to [minority student's] status in the community that may affect their hearts and minds in a way unlikely to ever be undone."

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>As we discuss below, expected trends across younger age-at-order values are more ambiguous, so we consider ages 17-24 to be the primary test of 'pre-trends.'

Americans, such that large effects among whites might raise concerns that unobserved factors correlated with the desegregation orders are driving any effects. Whites can therefore serve as a useful group for comparison.

Reassuringly, we find no significant trends across individuals ages 17-24 at the time of a local order, and we consistently find little or no effect on whites, patterns that are consistent with the parallel trends assumption holding. Our key findings are also robust to a variety of modeling and specification choices, and to implementing a version of the procedure suggested by Sun and Abraham [2021] to address potential biases that can occur in two-way fixed effects specifications in settings like ours where treatment timing varies across units, which is the topic of an influential recent methodological literature.

Our paper contributes to several important literatures. Most directly, we build on a number of previous studies evaluating the effects of school desegregation on student outcomes, primarily but not exclusively educational attainment [Guryan, 2004, Rivkin and Welch, 2006, Ashenfelter et al., 2006, Card and Rothstein, 2007, Reber, 2010, Lutz, 2011, Johnson, 2011, Bergman, 2018, Tuttle, 2019].

Of these, our work most closely resembles Guryan [2004] and Johnson [2011].<sup>3</sup> Guryan [2004] uses Census data to estimate whether the high school drop-out rates of young African Americans differentially improved in counties where desegregation rulings were implemented between 1970 and 1980, and finds significant relative reductions in Black dropout rates in the locations where court order were implemented. Because Guryan [2004] uses Census samples containing only *current* county of residence among young adults, rather than geographic locations during childhood, he focuses on contemporaneous high school completion as the outcome measure and relies primarily on binary difference-in-difference models across the 1970 and 1980 Censuses rather than dynamic event study specifications. In contrast, Johnson [2011] uses data from the Panel Study of Income Dynamics (PSID) that does contain childhood location, as well as a wide variety of adult outcomes, and estimates event study models broadly similar to our own preferred specifications below. However, after basic restrictions, his PSID sample contains fewer than 4,500 Black respondents spread across over 600 school districts, and the PSID sample is subject to longstanding questions related to its national representativeness, especially the 'poverty' subsample. These issues sometimes make the estimates from [Johnson, 2011] imprecise or difficult to interpret.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup>Johnson [2011] is a permanent working paper, with many of its key results published in book form for a popular audience in Johnson and Nazaryan (2019).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup>Bergman [2018] and Tuttle [2019] also study the effects of desegregation orders on student outcomes, but are distinct from our work and that of Guryan [2004] and Johnson [2011] in that they are each case

We build on these studies by using comprehensive exposure and long run outcome measures within a national sample that is sufficiently large and representative to produce precise and stable estimates and to evaluate heterogeneity across basic characteristics like region and race. Our combination of data and research design allow us to provide, in our view, the highest quality national assessment of the long run impacts of court ordered desegregation to date.

Our work is also related to a broader literature that evaluates the effects of school desegregation on a wide variety of outcomes including white flight [Reber, 2005, Baum-Snow and Lutz, 2011], school finances [Cascio et al., 2010, Reber, 2011], teacher labor markets [Jackson, 2009, Thompson, Forthcoming], and crime [Weiner et al., 2009]. Our findings additionally have implications for the extensive literature on how factors like school resources and teacher characteristics influence student outcomes [Hanushek, 1986, 2003, Jackson et al., 2016, Hyman, 2017, Lafortune et al., 2018, Cascio et al., 2013, Card and Krueger, 1992a,b, Chetty et al., 2011]. Many of these studies find significant heterogeneity by race, and our analysis provides a notable new evidence that "schools matter" for shaping long run adult outcomes as well as influencing racial inequality.

Finally, from a methodological perspective our work builds on a number of recent papers that have used large national data sets newly linked with county-level exposure variation to evaluate the long run impacts of various policies and shocks. These include Community Health Centers [Bailey and Goodman-Bacon, 2015], Head Start [Bailey et al., 2020], the Food Stamp Program [Hoynes et al., 2016, Bailey et al., 2020a], air pollution [Isen et al., 2017] and recessions [Stuart, 2020].

# 2 Background

The landmark 1954 Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka Kanses decision ruled that the de-jure segregation of schools was unconstitutional, overturning the "separate but equal" doctrine of *Plessy v. Ferguson* that had prevailed since 1896. While some meaningful school desegregation did occur after *Brown* in 'border' areas like Washington DC and West Virginia, the ruling lacked strong enforcement mechanisms, and even a full decade after *Brown* fewer than 5% of Black students in the eleven states of the Former Confederacy were attending integrated schools [Cascio et al., 2010].

studies of a single desegregation order and use idiosyncratic features of those plan's assignment rules to provide compelling identification but less comprehensive scope.

The pace of school integration accelerated dramatically after passage of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, which authorized the US attorney general to bring suits against districts failing to desegregate (Title IV) and allowed federal agencies to withhold funding to non-compliant state and local governments (Title VI). The latter provision was given greater bite by the 1965 passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which greatly expanded federal educational funding and increased the opportunity cost for schools to not comply with integration requirements [Cascio et al., 2013].

An additional key judicial ruling in 1968 was Green v. County School Board of New Kent County. Prior to Green there was significant legal ambiguity as to what constituted compliance with Brown and with the Civil Rights Act, especially the status of "freedom of choice" plans, which technically allowed minority students to enroll in historically white schools but typically led to only token desegregation. Green provided a far more specific and stringent set of criteria than previous rulings, requiring integration in every facet of school operations from staffing to transportation to extracurricular activities. Another landmark case from this period, Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg (1971) explicitly sanctioned the use of district-wide busing to achieve desegregation. The Green and Swann rulings serve as the judicial basis for most of the desegregation orders that we study here.

While early judicial and legislative integration policy was heavily focused on de-jure school segregation in the South, in 1973 the Supreme Court ruled in *Keyes v. School District No. 1, Denver* that the forms of de-facto school segregation common in many large cities outside of the South were also unconstitutional. This paved the way for desegregation orders nationwide during the 1970s and into the early 1980s, including high profile cases in cities like Boston, Chicago, Los Angeles and Detroit that are included in our analysis.

The specific methods used by the courts to achieve racial integration were highly varied, and many districts adopted multiple plans over time that utilized different techniques. The broad approaches used in the court orders that we study include majority-to-minority transfer plans, which allow either all students or sometimes only minority students to voluntarily transfer into schools where their racial group was under-represented; the establishment of magnet schools with district wide catchment and race-specific enrollment preferences or quotas; a wide array of "rezoning" approaches that redrew attendance zones, often noncontiguously, to increase integration levels; and "pairing and clustering" approaches that paired together a predominantly white and a predominantly minority school then reassigned students across the schools, often through restructuring by grade level. These approaches proved far more effective at substantively reducing segregation than "freedom of choice" plans or other earlier approaches.

The ambitious scope of the described efforts bears emphasis. For a brief but critical period, a series of landmark judicial rulings and federal legislative efforts forcefully obligated US school systems to take robust actions to reduce racial inequality, even in the face of strong and sometimes violent local resistance. There have arguably not been equally substantive efforts to increase educational access for African American students before or since. Understanding the long run impacts of these ambitious initiatives is of clear importance.

## 3 Data and Research Design

## 3.1 Court Orders

We focus on the set of all districts where, as of 1968, there were at least 15,000 total students and where 10-90% of the students were Black, yielding a national sample of 187 medium to large districts with racially diverse student bodies.<sup>5</sup> This sample is substantially broader than the 125 district sample that was constructed by Welch and Light [1987] and used in numerous subsequent studies, while also maintaining focus on districts that are sufficiently large and diverse that the basic features of court ordered desegregation policies are applicable.<sup>6</sup> The 187 districts in our sample are listed in the Online Appendix, and included 60% of all Black students attending public US schools in 1968.<sup>7</sup> For each of these districts, we then gathered data on desegregation plans from a variety of sources.

Many of the districts were included in the data collection efforts of Welch and Light [1987], and where available we use the year of the plan implementation listed in their Table A3.<sup>8</sup>

 $<sup>^5\</sup>mathrm{Data}$  on 1968 enrollments are from the 1968 Office of Civil Rights school survey, which was generously made available by Sarah Reber.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup>For instance smaller districts frequently operate only one high school, which will by construction have the same racial composition as the district's overall population of high school students, and race-based school reassignments are moot in districts where virtually all the students are white or Black.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup>We focus on desegregation order's impacts among African Americans, rather than a broader set of racial and ethnic minorities, primarily because African Americans were the main focus of segregation related litigation efforts, although we do note that *Keyes* extended desegregation remedy requirements to Hispanics, and Antman and Cortes [2021] find significant benefits of pre-*Brown* integration rulings among Mexican-Americans in California. An additional, more practical consideration is that we are only able to observe location of birth for individuals with social security numbers, which is a more significant limitation among Hispanics and other minority populations with large amounts of recent immigration than among Blacks.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup>Many districts were subject to multiple court order over the course of several years, especially in the South. In these cases we use the year of the order that corresponded to the largest change in the dissimilarity index as listed in Table A3 of Welch and Light [1987].

For districts not included in the Welch and Light [1987] sample, we use databases of court orders compiled by ProPublica [2014] and by the American Communities Project directed by John Logan at Brown University [Logan, 2021]. In many cases these sources do not specify the date of plan implementation, or have conflicting dates and limited information about the substance of the relevant orders. In these instances, we use contemporaneous newspaper accounts, government reports, and other sources to determine the year in which court orders were substantively implemented in each of the studied districts. Detailed documentation of the sources used to date each court order, as well as notes related to district mergers, cross district desegregation plans, and other idiosyncratic features of orders, are provided in the Online Appendix.<sup>9</sup>

Districts that met the sample criteria but were never placed under a court order are retained and are used as controls in some specifications, as discussed in the methodology section below. Approximately 10% of our sample consists of these 'untreated' districts. In practice, all southern districts in our sample were placed under desegregation orders at some point in the 1960s and 1970s, such that all of the untreated districts are located in the North, which as we discuss below has some implications for our empirical strategy, and more generally provides an additional reason it is appropriate to disaggregate the analysis by region.

Both cities and counties are commonly used as school district boundaries in the US, whereas the Numident file we use for linking to childhood geographic information only consistently contains *county* of birth. In our baseline estimates we simply assign municipal districts to the county in which they were located, and as a robustness check we estimate our preferred models using the subset of districts operated by counties, where assignment of individuals to school districts is less ambiguous. We also note that any measurement error due to the misassignment of individuals in city school districts to counties would likely bias our estimates towards zero.

Figure 1 shows the distribution of plan implementation years within the sample that we use to estimate our preferred event study specifications.<sup>10</sup> The figure indicates that the most intensive period of court ordered desegregation occurred in 1969, 1970 and 1971 and

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup>Our use of the years that orders were *implemented* follows Guryan [2004] but differs from Johnson [2011], who uses the year that the orders were *ruled*, which he argues is more exogenous than implementation dates. Because there were often lags of many years or even decades between rulings and implementations, and there were typically no significant reductions in segregation in these intermediate periods, we feel that the use of implementation dates is the preferable approach.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup>As discussed below, to construct an estimation sample that is balanced in event time we restrict our main analysis to events occurring from 1969 through 1980.

that these order were predominantly, but not exclusively, in the South. A steady flow of approximately five major rulings per year were then implemented throughout the 1970s, and these later rulings were concentrated outside of the South.

### 3.2 Outcome Data

We measure long run outcomes using restricted versions of the 2000 Long-Form Census and the 2001-2015 American Community Survey (ACS). These samples are multiple orders of magnitude larger than available longitudinal samples like the PSID or NLSY, jointly covering over 20% of the US population. Critically, we are able to link these large Census and ACS samples to the SSA Numident file via Protected Identity Keys (PIKs; essentially scrambled Social Security Numbers) to obtain information on respondent's counties of birth.<sup>11</sup>

After basic restrictions, our working sample contains over 5.1 million individuals. These individuals identified as being non-Hispanic white or African American, and were born between 1945 and 1985. Following Bailey et al. [2020], we also limit the sample to individuals who are aged 25 to 54 and exclude observations that had allocated or missing values for any outcomes of interest, and also drop any individuals who are linked to the same PIK and who are assigned more than one possible county of birth. We collapse our data by birth year, survey year, county of birth, race, and sex in our regression analyses to reduce computation and weight all models by the number of people represented (that is, the sum of individual survey weights) in each cell [Solon et al., 2015].

Our primary outcomes of interest are summary indices of human capital and economic self-sufficiency, and we follow the outcome variable constructions used by Bailey et al. [2020]. The human capital index includes binary indicators for attainment of a high school degree, some college, a four-year college degree, and an advanced/professional postgraduate degree, continuous years of schooling, and a indicator for working in a professional occupation. The economic self-sufficiency index includes dummy variables for employment, poverty status, income from public assistance, non-zero family income, and non-zero income from other non-governmental sources, continuous measures of weeks and hours worked, and the logs of labor income, income from non-governmental sources, and the ratio of family income to the poverty threshold. The poverty status and public assistance indicators are reverse-coded so

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>11</sup>Public-use versions of the long-form Census and ACS contain *state* of birth and in some cases *current* county of residence, but not county of birth. The Numident data provides a string variable recording place of birth as written onto Social Security card applications, and we use the crosswalk created by Taylor et al. [2016] in Census project 1248 to map string values in the Numident data to consistent birth counties.

that all positive subcomponent values indicate improvements. We convert all subcomponents into z-scores and average them while weighting each subcomponent equally. For transparency and completeness, we report estimates for each subcomponent in addition to the summary indices.<sup>12</sup>.

Table 1 presents summary statistics for our working sample. The typical individual is exposed to a court desegregation order at approximately age 8, and is approximately age 41 when observed in the data. Education, labor force attachment, earnings and other outcome measures display commonly observed gaps with respect to race and gender.

## **3.3** Empirical Strategy

Our empirical approach relies on county-level differences in the years that school desegregation orders were implemented, which led to individual differences in age at the time that a local order was implemented. Specifically, we estimate the following flexible event study specification:

$$Y_{bcst} = \theta_c + \alpha_{s(c)b} + \gamma_t + \lambda_s + \boldsymbol{X}_c \boldsymbol{\beta} \cdot \boldsymbol{b} + \sum_{\tau = -5}^{24} \delta_\tau \mathbb{1}\{T_c^* - \boldsymbol{b} = \tau\} + \varepsilon_{bcst},$$
(1)

where  $Y_{bcst}$  represents a mean outcome for individuals from birth cohort b, born in county c, are of sex s, and are observed in calendar year t. To be as flexible as possible in assessing racial and regional heterogeneity in effects, we estimate this specification separately for whites and Blacks as well as for individuals born in the South versus the North.<sup>13</sup> Fixed effects for county of birth, survey year and sex  $\theta_c$ ,  $\gamma_t$ ,  $\lambda_s$  respectively account for time-invariant differences in outcome variable means across counties, national-level changes affecting all cohorts in a given year, and mean-level gender differences in outcomes. State-of-birth-bycohort fixed effects,  $\alpha_{s(c)b}$ , are also included, and account for any general cohort trends that occur at the national or state level, including for example contemporaneous federal or state policy changes or macroeconomic conditions, among many other factors. Interacting the cohort fixed effects with state indicators is more flexible, but also leads our specification to largely rely on differences in the county-level timing of school desegregation orders *within* 

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>12</sup>We also investigated as outcome variables incarceration, marital status, homeownership, and disability status and did not find evidence for exposure to school desegregation orders significantly impacting any of them. These results were not disclosed to reduce the number of disclosures submitted for review to the Census Bureau.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>13</sup>Our baseline results define the South as the eleven states of the former confederacy and the North as all other states, and below we demonstrate robustness to alternative regional definitions.

states. This will exclude variation from states that only had school desegregation orders implemented in one particular year<sup>14</sup>, so as a robustness check we report results that instead use Census division by birth cohort fixed effects, and do not find any substantive changes in our results.

Following the literature [Bailey and Goodman-Bacon, 2015, Hoynes et al., 2016, Bailey et al., 2020], we also include a vector of year-1960 county characteristics  $X_c$  and interact them with a linear trend in birth year. The characteristics in this vector include the 1960 poverty rate, log county population, population share over age 65, under age 5, living in an urban setting, and non-white. We also include vote shares for Strom Thurmond in the 1948 presidential election (who ran on an explicitly segregationist platform) as a proxy for county-level preferences for racial segregation. While this relatively extensive set of covariates improves precision and makes the identifying assumptions more likely to hold, below we also demonstrate that our key findings are robust to more parsimonious specification that controls only for county, cohort and gender fixed effects, which provides more transparency in terms of the conditional sources of identifying variation.

The key parameters of interest are the event study coefficients,  $\delta_{\tau}$ .  $T_c^*$  denotes the year that county c experienced a school desegregation court order, and  $\delta_{\tau}$  are therefore differencein-differences estimates that track the effects of exposure to a school desegregation court order implementation at age  $\tau$  relative to ages 17-18. We include event-time dummies for treatment from ages -5 to 24, where this range was chosen to be a sufficiently wide to observe both a phase-in period of exposure among individuals who were very young (or not yet born) when a local integration order was implemented, as well as the period where individuals had already completed schooling at the time of the order. We restrict our working sample to be balanced in event time, and because our outcome data contains the 1945-1985 cohorts, constructing a balanced panel requires restricting the analysis to orders occurring from 1969 through 1980.<sup>15</sup> We group event times into two-year bins to increase precision and decrease the number of disclosed estimates for Census Bureau review, and standard errors are clustered at the county level to account for arbitrary serial correlation of error terms within counties [Bertrand et al., 2004].

The key identifying assumption is the familiar parallel trends assumption, which in this application holds that the timing of local court order implementations, and by extension the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>14</sup>Among former confederate states, this includes Arkansas and South Carolina.

 $<sup>^{15}</sup>$ There are 16 court orders that occurred outside of this range, such that imposing balanced in event time retains 92% of the districts in our sampling frame.

age of a given individual at the time of an order, were conditionally unrelated to the counterfactual trends in outcomes. This assumption could be violated if, for instance, desegregation orders were first sought and implemented in counties where the potential outcomes of African American children were trending positively even in the absence of school integration orders, or if desegregation orders were implemented concurrently with other county level policies that had positive effects on the long run trajectories of Black children.

In our view the most compelling evidence on this assumption is provided by the placebo tests built into our event study design as discussed above, specifically whether we observe null pretrends beyond age 17 - that is, insignificant estimates of  $\delta_{\tau}$ ,  $\tau \in [18, 24]$  - and whether we observe small or negligible treatment effect estimates among whites, who were not the primary target of the desegregation orders we study.

To provide additional evidence on the nature of the timing of desegregation orders, Table 2 reports the results of regressing the year that an integration order was implemented in each county in our working sample onto the following 1960 county characteristics: Total population, the share of the population that was ages 0-4, lived in an urban area, and was non-white, median family income and the share of the population with family incomes below 3,000 dollars, and median educational attainment and the share of the population with 12 or more years of schooling. Table 2 first reports estimates of the association between year of court order and each of these county characteristics individually, and then in the final column of includes all county characteristics simultaneously. Because desegregation order timing varied strongly by region we condition on a South dummy in each specification, but include no other controls.

The estimates in Table 2 indicate that more urban counties were placed under desegregation orders somewhat later than more rural counties, but that no other pre-treatment county characteristics had statistically or economically significant associations with treatment timing, conditional on region. On balance we feel that the patterns shown in Table 2 are consistent with the validity of our key identifying assumption that treatment timing was quasi-random.

Finally, we note that previous studies on this topic have argued that the NAACP Legal Defense Fund, the main organization litigating school integration cases in this period, strategically brought suits in localities where they believed that they had the highest probability of winning, and therefore establishing favorable legal precedents, rather than localities where the expected benefits of integration would be greatest [Guryan, 2004, Johnson, 2011]. This legal strategy decreases the likelihood that the timing of integration cases was partially a function of time varying determinants of African American children's long term outcomes, which would lend further support to the parallel trends assumption.

# 4 Results

#### 4.1 First Stage Effects

Before evaluating the effects of desegregation orders on the long-term outcomes of exposed children, we provide 'first-stage' estimates that use a specification with a structure similar to Equation 1 to study how the orders impacted several contemporaneous school characteristics. These estimates provide a more concrete picture of what the 'treatment' generated by the orders consists of, and also provides guidance on which settings the largest effects on children's long-term could be expected in.

We begin by assessing the effects of the orders on standard measures of racial segregation, since reducing segregation was their explicit goal. To do so we use school-level data on student racial compositions that was originally collected in Office of Civil Rights (OCR) surveys and then digitized and generously made available by Sarah Reber, and use this data to calculate the Dissimilarity Index and the Exposure Index at the district-year level from 1968-1980.<sup>16</sup> As calculated here, the Dissimilarity Index measures how evenly Black and white students are spread across the schools within a district, while the Exposure Index measures how many white schoolmates the typical Blacks student in a district has.<sup>17</sup> Using these data and measures, we estimate the following event study specification:

$$I_{dt} = \lambda_d + \gamma_t + \sum_{\tau=-1}^5 \delta_\tau \mathbb{1}\{t - t_d^* = \tau\} + \varepsilon_{dt}, \qquad (2)$$

where  $I_{dt}$  is a segregation index for district d in year t,  $\lambda$  and  $\gamma$  are district and year fixed effects, and  $t_d^*$  indicates the year in which the district was treated.<sup>18</sup> The key parameters of

 $<sup>^{16}</sup>$  This data is available annually from 1968-1974 and biannually from 1976-1980, for a total of 10 school years. Of the 160 districts in our working sample that underwent desegregation orders, school level integration data is available in all 10 years for 149 of them.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>17</sup>See Massey and Denton [1988] and O'Flaherty [2015] for complete definitions and discussions of these indices.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>18</sup>Since district level data on the school characteristics studied in this section are available, we estimate the specifications at the school district level, whereas our estimates for long-term outcomes use Census data that is available at the county level. The results of first-stage regressions at the county level are very similar to the district level results reported here.

interest are  $\delta_{\tau}$ , which capture the effects of the order on the specified outcome at event time  $\tau$ .

Because the OCR school desegregation data is available for a relatively narrow range of years and because for current purposes we are primarily interested in how integration levels change after an order is implemented, rather than testing for the presence of pre-trends, we estimate event time coefficients ranging from -1 (the year prior to the order and our reference category) to +5.<sup>19</sup> This allows us to use a panel that is balanced in event time while retaining all court orders occurring between 1969 and 1975.

Results of estimating Equation 2 are reported in Figure 2. The top panel of the figure uses the Exposure Index as the dependent variable while the lower panel uses the Dissimilarity Index, and for both outcomes we report results separately for southern versus non-southern districts. Figure 2 has several important features.

First, the orders resulted in qualitatively large reductions in racial segregation across both regions and both indices. On average, five years after an order, the Dissimilarity Index had risen by approximately 0.3 in the South and by 0.1 outside of the South, while the analogous changes for the Exposure Index were approximately 0.4 and 0.2.

Second, the first-stage effects are 2-3 times larger in the South than outside of the South. This suggests that larger effects on long-term outcomes can reasonably be expected within the South, although this prediction is somewhat ambiguous since the relationship between exposure to integrated schools and long-term outcomes may also vary by region.

Finally, there are large increases in integration immediately in the year of the order, but within the South these are followed by more gradual additional desegregation in subsequent years, and integration is still trending positively after five years. This more gradual phasing-in of integration suggests that we would expect to begin observing treatment effects among individuals who were younger than school going age at the time of the order. For instance, two individuals who were respectively ages 0 and 5 at the time of a local desegregation order would both have attended post-order schools for the entirety of their education, but the patterns in Figure 2 suggest that the individual who was zero at the time of the order would have attended more thoroughly integrated schools, and may have experienced better long-term outcomes as a result.<sup>20</sup>

 $<sup>^{19}\</sup>mathrm{In}$  our primary results for long-term outcomes, we focus considerable attention on establishing null pre-trends.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>20</sup>In addition to the phase-in of actual integration, there may be negative effects of being exposed to the very earliest years of court ordered integration plans, since as noted these plans were extraordinarily controversial and were often fiercely and even violently resisted by local white populations.

In addition to reducing racial segregation itself, court ordered integration may have affected other characteristics of the schools attended by Black students. For instance it is much less practical to maintain large school quality disparities when Black and white students attend the same schools, and some federal school funding streams were explicitly conditioned on districts complying with court orders and other integration requirements. Given this, court ordered desegregation may have affected the relative resources of the schools attended by African Americans students, in addition to the racial composition of their peers. To help assess this possibility, Figure 3 estimates additional 'first-stages' that use per-student funding and student-teacher ratios as dependent variables.

Data on per-student funding is drawn from the Census Bureau's Annual Survey of State and Local Government Finances, as harmonized by Pierson et al. [2015]. These surveys contain data for 105 of the treated districts in our sample, and are available in 1967 and then annually from 1970 onward. Data on teacher employment, needed to calculate studentteacher ratios, is available from a combination of Office of Civil Rights (OCR) surveys and Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) surveys for virtually all of the treated districts in our sample from 1968-1976. These ranges of data availability allow us to estimate specifications structurally similar to Equation 2 for event times ranging from -2 to +10 with respect to per-student funding and from -1 through +5 with respect to student-teacher ratios.

Because we are specifically interested in the extent to which court orders differentially affected the characteristics of schools attended by Black students, we estimate specifications separately for districts where the pre-treatment share of Black students was less than 25% versus districts where the pre-treatment share of Black students was 25% or greater.<sup>21</sup>

The results for per-student funding are reported in the upper panel of Figure 3, and indicate that within the South, per-student funding grew by approximately 20% in the decade following an integration order among districts where less than 25% of the students were Black at baseline, but grew by approximately 40% within districts that had a baseline share of Black students greater than or equal to 25%. This faster funding growth in districts with more Black students would lead to significant improvements in the relative financial resources available to African American students in the period following a court order, and are consistent with the findings of Cascio et al. [2010] and Reber [2010]. The analogous estimates for the North show that while northern districts did experience increasing per-student funding in the decade following an integration order, these increases did not significantly differ by

 $<sup>^{21}{\</sup>rm The}$  median Black share in this sample was 26.9%, so that this threshold divides the districts approximately in half.

baseline racial composition, such that there would not have been differential improvements in the financial resources available to northern African American students.

The results for student-teacher ratios are reported in the lower panel of Figure 3, and follow similar patterns. Specifically, within the South average class sizes fell by approximately three students per teacher within five years of an order in heavily Black school districts, but were essentially unchanged in districts with less than 25% Black students at baseline. In contrast, in the North, there were less clear overall class size reductions, and those that did occur appear to have been somewhat stronger in districts with less than 25% African American students.

On balance, the results in Figures 2 and 3 suggest that the court orders we study had qualitatively large effects on both peer racial composition and school characteristics, and that these effects were strongly concentrated in the South and phased in over a period of at least five years. These basic patterns inform the estimation and interpretation of our main results for long-term outcomes in the next section.

#### 4.2 Baseline Findings

In Figure 4 we report the results of estimating Equation 1 using the human capital and economic self-sufficiency indices as the dependent variables. Results are shown separately for Blacks and whites, and for counties in and out of the South.

Figure 4a indicates that among southern African Americans, shown with red triangles, earlier exposure to school integration orders had large positive effects on human capital outcomes. Specifically, being born five years prior to an order is estimated to increase the human capital index by almost .4 standard deviations relative to being age 17 at the time of the order. This effect declines modestly between ages -5 and 0 at the time of the order, and then shows a more rapid monotonic decline as age at the time of a local order increases from 0 to 17. Figure 4b reports results for the economic self-sufficiency index within the South, and shows slightly larger treatment effects among Blacks but very similar overall patterns. The fact that effects begin phasing in before age five, the typical age for school entry, is likely attributable to the court orders themselves often taking five or more years to be fully implemented, as documented above.

Critically from an identification perspective, neither Figure 4a nor Figure 4b indicate any *additional* declines in outcomes across African Americans who were ages 17-24 at the time of a local order. This is analogous to a flat 'pre-trend' in a typical event study design, and is

reassuring given that individuals in this range did not have differential exposure to the court orders. Figure 4a and Figure 4b also find no economically or statistically significant effects for either outcome among southern whites, shown with blue squares, which we interpret as further evidence that the patterns among southern Blacks reflect the causal impacts of court ordered desegregation, and not factors general to individuals of all races from particular counties and birth cohorts.

Figures 4c and 4d report analogous results for the North, and in strong contrast to the patterns in the South, no significant exposure effects are observed for either racial group. There are a number of plausible explanations for these strong regional differences. First, the concentration of effects within the South does mirror the 'first stage' results in Figure 2, and orders in the North may have simply had less bite than in the South. This is not a complete explanation, however, given that the first stage effects on segregation in the North were still substantial, even though they were smaller than in the South. The regional differences in Figure 4 could also reflect more salient psycho-social impacts of court orders in the South, or the higher baseline levels of segregation in the region. Likewise, districts or families in the North may have responded to the orders in ways that attenuated their effects, for instance by migrating to suburban school districts or enrolling in private schools. Such responses to black in-migration have been documented in the literature [Derenoncourt, 2021, Boustan, 2010], and it is notable that there is a greater prevalence of county-operated districts in the South and fewer parochial schools, which may have made exiting a district more costly or impractical for white families in the South.

Regardless of the exact reasons, the extent to which the benefits of court ordered integration appear to have been concentrated in the South is striking, and is essential for a full understanding of court ordered desegregation's effects. Many of the most politically contentious integration fights occurred in large northern cities like Boston, Detroit and Chicago, and the paucity of long run improvements in the human capital or labor market outcomes of African American children from northern districts like these is an important null finding. We note that this regional heterogeneity would have been difficult to detect without the very large sample sizes provided by our data.

#### 4.3 Estimates for Index Subcomponents

To explore the specific outcomes driving the baseline results in Figure 4, we next report results for each subcomponent of the human capital and economic self-sufficiency indices. The analyses in this section, and for most of the remainder of the paper, focus on southern Blacks, since the baseline results identify this as the population that was substantively impacted by court ordered desegregation. The unreported analogous estimates for northern Blacks and for whites in all regions are uniformly small and statistically insignificant.

Figure 5 presents the impacts of school desegregation orders on the human capital index sub-components. The strongest effects are for high school attainment and years of schooling: Full exposure to court ordered integration is estimated to increase the probability of high school completion by approximately 15 percentage points, and to increase total years of schooling by approximately one full year. These effects are broadly consistent with those obtained by Johnson [2011], who estimates approximately a 25 percentage point improvement in high school graduation and a one year increase in educational attainment.<sup>22</sup> Likewise Guryan [2004] estimates that contemporaneous Black high school dropout rates declined by 3.8 percentage points over the ten years between the 1970 and 1980 Censuses within districts that implemented school desegregation orders over this span. This magnitude is highly consistent with our estimates of the first 10 years of exposure (that is, treatment ages 7 to 17).

The other results in Figure 5 indicate that these increases in high school completion did not consistently translate into higher rates of post-secondary schooling, with positive but imprecise estimates for attaining "some college" and no clear relationship between school desegregation orders and Black attainment of four-year or advanced degrees.

Figure 6 reports results for the subcomponents of the economic self-sufficiency index among southern Blacks, and finds more even results over the subcomponents. Earlier exposure to desegregation is associated with stronger labor force attachment, whether measured as employment, hours worked, or weeks worked. Individuals treated at earlier ages also experience lower rates of poverty and public assistance receipt, as well as approximately 30% higher annual wage earnings.<sup>23</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>22</sup>There are several factors that make our estimates not directly comparable to Johnson [2011]. For instance Figure 5 uses a southern sample while Johnson [2011] uses a national sample, and our samples differ meaningfully in salient characteristics, with for instance a high school completion rate in the relevant PSID sample of 77% vs. 88% in our working sample, which may be attributable to the relatively small sample sizes or over-representation of low income African Americans in the PSID.

 $<sup>^{23}</sup>$ In the online appendix, we show results for additional earnings measures, including the log of total earnings +1 and total earnings measured in levels, which both retain zero earners in the sample, as well as for hourly wage measures. These analyses continue to find strong effects on total earnings when zero earners are included, but less clear impacts on hourly wages, suggesting that the effects of school integration on earnings worked primarily though extensive margins.

#### 4.4 Robustness

Figure 7 assesses the sensitivity of our main results to a number of alternate specifications, again focusing on the southern African American sample.

We first assess the robustness of our findings to a variety of basic modeling and specification choices: We replace our state-by-cohort fixed effects with division-by-cohort fixed effects, which allows us to use variation from states that only had counties treated in one particular year<sup>24</sup>; we replace the interacted 1960s county characteristics with county-specific linear cohort trends to account for potential pre-treatment county characteristics that we do not control for in our baseline specification; we estimate a model with minimal controls that includes only sex and county and cohort fixed effects; and we include all states belonging in the Southern Census region instead of former confederate states (thus adding Oklahoma, Arkansas, West Virginia, Kentucky, Maryland, and Delaware). Figure 7 shows that in all of these cases and for both outcomes indices, the estimates of  $\delta_{\tau}$  are substantively and statistically indistinguishable from the results of our preferred baseline specification.

Figure 7 also reports the results of two checks that address the potential for mismeasurement of exposure to court ordered integration. First, we report results that use the sub-sample of respondents from counties where there is a single school district operated for the full county, rather than counties that also contain a city-operated district. Because substantial numbers of school districts are operated at the municipal level, but we are only able to match individuals to their counties of birth, exposure is potentially measured more accurately for individuals from locations with a single county-operated school system.<sup>25</sup> Second, because exposure would be mismeasured for individuals who moved away from their county of birth prior to completing schooling, we report results that use the sub-sample of individuals who were still residing in their county of birth when they were enumerated in the Census or ACS. While such individuals likely differ on other dimensions as well, and treatment itself may affect migration propensities, patterns within this sub-sample at a minimum less likely to be biased by mismeasured exposure due to childhood migration.

The relevant results in Figure 7 show that for both outcome indices, the magnitudes of the treatment effects are moderately stronger within the sub-sample of non-movers, consistent with exposure being better measured in this population. Likewise, restricting the analysis

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>24</sup>In the south, this adds Arkansas and South Carolina.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>25</sup>Additionally, county operated districts may be less subject to white flight, as noted, tend to me more rural, and likely vary along other dimensions as well, and it is jot generally possible to reliably distinguish the importance of these various factors from improved exposure measurement.

to full-county districts makes the magnitudes of the effects for the ESS index substantially stronger, while having minimal effects on magnitudes of the HC index estimates. Overall these results suggest that, in line with expectations, our baseline findings are if anything attenuated by childhood migration or by inaccurately matching individuals to municipal versus county-operated school districts, making our baseline estimates lower-bounds.

Next, we address the potential estimation issues that can occur in two-way fixed effects specifications like Equation 1 when treatment turns on at different times across units, as highlighted in a recent methodological literature [de Chaisemartin and D'Haultfœuille, 2020, Sun and Abraham, 2021, Goodman-Bacon, 2021, Callaway and Sant'Anna, 2021].

The key conceptual issue raised in this literature is that estimates from typical two-way fixed effects specifications are partially based on comparisons of units that were treated in later periods to units that were already-treated in earlier periods. Such comparisons between sets of units that were both already treated are often problematic, since trends in early-treated units are potentially impacted by treatment itself and do not provide a valid counterfactual for later-treated units. These issues are particularly acute when treatment effects are heterogeneous across units or with time since treatment, and in many applications can lead to severe biases including reversing the sign of difference-in-difference estimates [Goodman-Bacon, 2021] or producing wholly spurious apparent pre-trends in event studies [Sun and Abraham, 2021].

Several approaches to resolving this issue have been proposed in the literature, typically through some type of re-weighting. These alternative estimators all have the common feature of focusing on "good comparisons" between the outcomes of already-treated observations and the outcomes of not-yet-treated or never-treated observations, and not on "bad comparisons" that use already-treated observations as controls.

To evaluate these potential issues in the current setting, we first report a simple descriptive figure that transparently characterizes the main comparisons underlying our baseline event study estimates, and helps assess whether those estimates are influenced by the use of already-treated units as controls. We then implement the estimator recommended by Sun and Abraham [2021], which excludes potential "bad comparisons" in a more systematic fashion. Both approaches suggest that our main estimates are not an artifact of any biases stemming from the variable timing of court ordered integration.

Beginning with the maximally transparent descriptive approach, recall from Figure 1 that within the South, where our effects are concentrated, a large majority of the court orders occurred in just three years from early in the study period: 1969, 1970 and 1971.

More specifically these three years contain 85% of all the orders in our working southern sample. Given this, while treatment timing is technically variable in our application, and the presence of later-treated units is needed to reliably estimate the cohort and year fixed effects, most of the identifying variation in exposure comes from early-treated counties.

To characterize this key identifying variation, Figure 8 restricts the sample to southern Blacks from counties with court orders in 1969, 1970 or 1971, and then simply plots mean values of our outcome indices across the 1955-1970 birth cohorts.<sup>26</sup> The figure indicates that Black individuals from early-treated counties experienced clear improvements in outcomes across birth cohorts. These simple, strong cohort trends among early-treated individuals are the key pattern that drive our main findings, and are obviously not based on any comparisons that use these early-treated units as controls.

A more comprehensive approach to addressing treatment-timing related issues in an event study context like ours is provided by the procedure outlined in Sun and Abraham [2021]. Specifically Sun and Abraham [2021] propose that researchers first estimate separate event-study coefficients for the sets of units that were treated in each period, which the authors refer to as "treatment cohorts." In the current application, the treatment cohorts are simply the sets of counties that were placed under a desegregation order in 1969, 1970,...,1980. Since they include only one cohort of treated units, each resulting set of cohort-specific event time coefficients do not rely on any comparisons between two groups of already-treated units, and the Sun and Abraham [2021] procedure then simply takes the weighted average of the cohort-specific event time coefficients, using the share of treated units from each treatment cohort as weights.

Estimating separate event time coefficients for each treatment cohort of course requires a consistent set of control units, and Sun and Abraham [2021] recommend using never-treated units when available, and units from the last-treated cohort when there are no untreated units. One issue with implementing the Sun and Abraham [2021] procedure in the current application is that the timing and geographic patterns of desegregation orders do not provide an ideal set of counties from either type of control group. Specifically, all of the southern counties in our sample experienced court orders at some point, such that no untreated units are available, and only two southern counties experienced orders in the last-treated cohort,

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>26</sup>Within the early-treated counties these birth cohorts were approximately ages 0-17 at the time of a local order. Patterns for birth cohorts outside of this range are qualitatively similar, but become unstable due to increasingly small cell-sizes and increasingly strong correlations between birth cohort and the calendar years and ages when outcomes are observed, which we cannot control for when evaluating simple means in Figure 8, but do control for in the more comprehensive approach below.

1980. These last-treated units were Dougherty County GA, which contains Albany, and Travis County, TX which contains Austin, and such a small and idiosyncratic set of counties is unlikely to provide a stable, credible control group. Another issue with using these lasttreated counties as the control group in the current application is that the version of the Sun and Abraham [2021] procedure which uses the last treatment cohort as the control group requires excluding observations from the time periods after the last-treated cohort was treated. However, because we are estimating the impacts of childhood exposures, and not contemporaneous effects as in most event studies, it is unclear what set of years or cohorts, if any, occur "after" the counties with a 1980 court order were treated.

In light of these issues, we report versions of the Sun and Abraham [2021] estimator that use two types of never-treated units as controls: Whites from counties in the South that had court orders, and Blacks from counties in the North that were never placed under a court order. Figure 9 reports Sun and Abraham [2021] estimates using these two types of never-treated units as controls, as well as the baseline estimates for reference. In both cases the alternative estimates are reassuringly similar to the baseline estimates.

While neither of the never-treated control groups used in Figure 9 is ideal individually, taken together we believe the results provide reasonably compelling evidence that our main findings are not driven by comparisons that use early-treated counties as controls for later-treated counties. This is especially true in light of the patterns in Figure 8, which demonstrated that our key findings are driven by positive cross birth-cohort trends among southern Blacks from early-treated counties.

#### 4.5 Heterogeneity

One of the key advantages of the large sample sizes available in our data is that we are able to generate reasonably precise estimates within sub-populations of potential interest. We have already shown that disaggregating by region and race is critical for a complete understanding of court ordered integration's long term impacts, and in this section we extend our analysis of heterogeneity to several additional dimensions, with the results reported in Figure 10.

One obvious characteristic across which effects may vary is gender, especially given that studies of educational programs frequently find differential effects for boys and girls. The first row of Figure 10 shows the results of estimating our baseline specification separately for men and women. Perhaps surprisingly, heterogeneity over sex appears quite limited, with Southern African American men and women benefiting comparably from exposure to school desegregation orders with respect to both human capital acquisition and economic self sufficiency.

In addition to the individual characteristic of gender, there are various county level characteristics that plausibly modified the impacts of court ordered desegregation. One such characteristic is the degree of underlying racial inequality preceding the order, as racial inequality may be related to the change in resources available to black students after the order was implemented. As such, the second row of Figure 10 estimates our baseline model separately for counties with low versus high levels of pre-treatment Black-white inequality. We specifically measure racial inequality as the ratio of mean Black wages to mean white wages in 1960, measured at the public-use microdata area (PUMA) level in the 1960 Census accessed via IPUMS [Ruggles et al., 2020].<sup>27</sup> The results indicate that there was strong heterogeneity in effects over pre-treatment county level racial inequality. Indeed, the estimates of  $\delta_{\tau}$  for low-inequality counties are indistinguishable from zero and strongly statistically distinct from the estimates for high-inequality counties. While the imperfect available measures of inequality warrant some caution in interpreting these results, we do view them as suggestive evidence that school desegregation had larger benefits for Blacks in areas with higher levels of racial inequality.

# 5 Discussion and Conclusion

A large majority of major US school districts were compelled by the judicial system to increase racial integration in the 1970s and 1980s, and the era of court ordered desegregation was a far more wide-reaching and proactive attempt to equate educational access across racial groups than any set of educational policies implemented before or after this period. With the benefit of newly available Census and ACS data linked to childhood geographic locations via Social Security Administration records, this paper has provided what we believe to be the most authoritative national evidence to date on whether court ordered integration had positive long-term impacts on the educational and labor market outcomes of the minority students it was designed to benefit.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>27</sup>We link PUMAs to Commuting Zones using crosswalks developed by Autor and Dorn [2013] and split counties in our sample in half, weighted by population, based on the level of income inequality in their parent CZ. While this does assume that the parent CZ is a good proxy for the income inequality level of the county of interest, our use of major metro counties result in them being the major population center of their parent CZ in the first place. For instance the typical Southern county in our sample accounts for 55% of the population of its parent CZ.

Our primary finding was that court ordered integration did indeed have positive impacts for southern African American students, and that these effects were qualitatively quite large. For instance full exposure was estimated to have increased high school graduation rates by approximately 15 percentage points, increased employment rates by approximately 10 percentage points, and increased hourly wages by approximately 30%. However, these impacts apply only to southern school districts, and effects for African Americans in the North were indistinguishable from zero.

This strong regional heterogeneity, which would have been difficult or impossible to detect with other currently available data sources, has important implications for evaluating both the historical record of court ordered desegregation and the potential effects of current and future desegregation initiatives.

With respect to the historical record on the efficacy of court ordered integration, our results suggest that the most impactful legacy of these policies lies in their systematic dismantling of the overtly segregated educational systems that prevailed in the Jim Crow South. The large estimated effects on concrete measurable outcomes like adult educational attainment and poverty rates strongly indicate that this effort was not merely symbolic in nature, but was rather a generational achievement that tangibly improved the long term well-being of southern African American children. The null effects among southern whites further suggests that these gains among Black students did not come at the expense of their white peers.

The distinct paucity of effects outside of the South, however, suggests that there are also limitations to the efficacy of legally imposed integration initiatives in certain settings. Most saliently, despite strong de-facto segregation and widespread racial animus, northern school districts did not share the South's history of overt state-sponsored racial discrimination in education, such that court ordered integration was a less direct challenge to the status quo of northern education systems. The nature and intensity of white resistance to integration orders in the North may very well have contributed to these regional differences as well, with the close proximity of racially homogeneous suburban districts and relatively affordable private school alternatives facilitating large scale white flight and mitigating the benefits of desegregation activity.

Our null results for northern school districts therefore do raise questions as to whether ongoing or potential future integration initiatives are likely to be effective in settings where they are not part of a transformative change to local education systems or where effective paths to avoiding integrated schools are available to white families, even as our large estiAnstreicher, Fletcher and Thompson

mated impacts for southern school districts provide compelling evidence that court ordered integration was extraordinarily effective in the context of the post Civil Rights era South.



Figure 1: Desegregation Orders by Year and Region

Notes: Figure shows the years that the orders in our estimation sample were implemented, by region

Variable	White Men	White Women	Black Men	Black Women
High School Degree	0.93	0.95	0.87	0.89
	(0.25)	(0.22)	(0.33)	(0.31)
Some College	0.61	0.48	0.50	0.50
-	(0.49)	(0.48)	(0.50)	(0.50)
Four-Year Degree	0.36	0.38	0.18	0.23
	(0.48)	(0.49)	(0.39)	(0.42)
Advanced Degree	0.04	0.03	0.01	0.01
	(0.20)	(0.17)	(0.11)	(0.12)
Years of Schooling	13.96	14.10	12.98	13.37
	(2.60)	(2.49)	(2.24)	(2.31)
Professional Occupation	0.33	0.35	0.19	0.26
	(0.47)	(0.48)	(0.39)	(0.44)
Employed	0.87	0.75	0.72	0.73
	(0.33)	(0.44)	(0.45)	(0.45)
In Poverty	0.06	0.08	0.20	0.23
	(0.24)	(0.27)	(0.40)	(0.42)
Weeks Worked	45.06	37.73	37.27	37.26
	(15.54)	(21.00)	(21.63)	(21.35)
Hours per Week	41.28	30.63	33.80	31.49
	(15.40)	(18.01)	(19.75)	(17.73)
Wage Earnings $(2012 \$1,000)$	59.74	33.39	33.77	28.07
	(59.27)	(38.12)	(36.42)	(28.81)
Hourly Wage	26.37	17.91	16.54	15.25
	(22.92)	(17.89)	(16.54)	(15.25)
Received Public Assistance Income	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.06
	(0.09)	(0.13)	(0.13)	(0.23)
Family Income-Poverty Ratio	4.79	4.58	3.52	2.95
	(2.65)	(2.70)	(2.36)	(2.30)
Married	0.65	0.65	0.46	0.34
	(0.48)	(0.48)	(0.50)	(0.47)
Incarcerated	0.01	0.00	0.07	0.01
	(0.10)	(0.05)	(0.25)	(0.08)
Homeowner	0.65	0.68	0.38	0.38
	(0.48)	(0.47)	(0.48)	(0.49)
Disabled	0.09	0.10	0.15	0.15
	(0.29)	(0.29)	(0.36)	(0.36)
Age when Treated	8.67	8.66	7.17	7.11
	(7.79)	(7.79)	(7.49)	(7.56)
Age	41.15	41.13	40.67	40.38
	(7.73)	(7.77)	(7.63)	(7.73)
Year of Birth	1965	1965	1966	1966
	(7.91)	(7.93)	(7.63)	(7.74)
N	2252000	2350000	238000	292000

### Table 1: Summary Statistics

**Notes:** Standard deviations in parentheses. Data from 2000 Long-Form Census and 2001-2015 American Community Survey. See text for details on sample restrictions. Observation counts rounded for disclosure avoidance purposes.

		***100 **		-	-3 552***	-4 915***		0 757***
outh -4.119***	-4.217*	-3.04/	-4.031***	$-3.919^{***}$		01711-	$-4.273^{***}$	-0.101
(0.515)	(0.489)	(0.504)	(0.612)	(0.643)	(0.634)	(0.500)	(0.492)	(0.758)
Otal Population (10,000s)         0.001           (0,004)         (0,004)								-0.001
960 % Under 4	0.066							0.242
	(0.156)							(0.179)
960 %  Urban		$0.034^{***}$						$0.052^{**}$
		(0.013)						(0.022)
960 % Nonwhite			-0.010					-0.029
			(0.027)	0000				(0.035)
959 Median Family Income				0.000				-0.001
959 % with Family Income Under \$3k				(0000)	-0.044			-0.046
2					(0.030)			(0.128)
960 Median Education						-0.061		0.638
						(0.201)		(0.921)
960 % with $12+$ Years of Education							-0.023	-0.158
							(0.029)	(0.134)
bservations 134	134	134	134	134	134	134	134	134

Table 2: Correlations Between County Characteristics and Treatment Timing



Figure 2: Changes in Segregation Indices after Court Orders, by Region

Notes: Figure presents estimates of  $\delta_{\tau}$  from Equation 2 for the Exposure Index and Dissimilarity Index. Data used are school-level racial compositions collected by Office of Civil Rights Surveys, digitized and shared by Sarah Reber. See Massey and Denton [1988] and O'Flaherty [2015] for complete definitions and discussions of the Exposure and Dissimilarity indices. Bands show 90% confidence intervals calculated with standard errors clustered at the school district level. Each district-year is given equal weight.





**Notes:** Figure presents estimates of  $\delta_{\tau}$  from Equation 2 using the log of per-student funding as the dependent variable in the upper panel and student-teacher ratios as the dependent variable in the lower panel. Estimates are further disaggregated by whether more or less than 25% of the district's students were Black in 1968, as indicated. Bands show 90% confidence intervals calculated with standard errors clustered at the school district level. Each district-year is given equal weight.



Figure 4: Baseline Results

Notes: Figures present estimates of  $\delta_{\tau}$  from Equation 1. Sample is balanced in event time. Dotted lines indicate 95% confidence intervals, constructed using standard errors clustered at the county level. The sample contains 5.1 million observations collapsed to the county, survey year, cohort, race, and sex level. Weights equal to the sum of individual survey weights in each cell are applied. Controls include 1960 county characteristics interacted with linear cohort trends, as well as fixed effects for county, survey year, sex and birth cohort x state of birth.



Figure 5: Results for HC Index Components

Notes: Figures present estimates of  $\delta_{\tau}$  from Equation 1 with the indicated dependent variable and only within the southern African American sample. Sample is balanced in event time. Dotted lines indicate 95% confidence intervals, constructed using standard errors clustered at the county level. The sample contains 5.1 million observations collapsed to the county, survey year, cohort, race, and sex level. Weights equal to the sum of individual survey weights in each cell are applied. Controls include 1960 county characteristics interacted with linear cohort trends, as well as fixed effects for county, survey year, sex and birth cohort x state of birth.



#### Figure 6: Results for ESS Index Components

Notes: Figures present estimates of  $\delta_{\tau}$  from Equation 1 with the indicated dependent variable and only within the southern African American sample. Sample is balanced in event time. Dotted lines indicate 95% confidence intervals, constructed using standard errors clustered at the county level. The sample contains 5.1 million observations collapsed to the county, survey year, cohort, race, and sex level. Weights equal to the sum of individual survey weights in each cell are applied. Controls include 1960 county characteristics interacted with linear cohort trends, as well as fixed effects for county, survey year, sex and birth cohort x state of birth.





**Notes:** Figures present estimates of  $\delta_{\tau}$  from Equation 1 for southern Blacks. Relative to the baseline specification,  $D \cdot Y$  FE replaces the state-by-birth year fixed effects with division-by-birth year fixed effects;  $D \cdot Y$  Trend replaces the interactions between 1960 county characteristics and survey year with a county-specific linear survey year trend; Parsimonious Controls conditions only on sex, county and cohort fixed effects; Alternate South defines the South as the states in the southern Census Region rather than the states of former Confederacy; Non-Movers excludes observations who were not residing in their county of birth at the time they were surveyed; and No City Districts includes only observations from counties that operated a single school district at the county level.



Figure 8: Average Index Values by Birth Cohort

**Notes:** Figures display mean levels of human capital and economic self-sufficiency indices over birth cohort for southern Blacks who were exposed to desegregation court orders in 1969, 1970, or 1971. See text for details on sample construction.



Figure 9: Results using Sun and Abraham [2021] Estimator

Notes: Figures present estimates of  $\delta_{\tau}$  from Equation 1 for Southern Blacks while implementing the Sun and Abraham [2021] estimator using either Southern Whites or never-treated North Blacks as control groups, as indicated. See text and Sun and Abraham [2021] for more detailed descriptions of the estimator.



Figure 10: Heterogeneity

(c) ESS Index, by County B-W Inequality

(d) HC Index, by County B-W Inequality

Notes: Figures present estimates of  $\delta_{\tau}$  from Equation 1 estimated within the indicated sub-populations. All regressions restricted to African Americans in the South. Inequality measured as ratio of average incomes between blacks and whites in 1960 for commuting zone that contains the relevant county. Sample is balanced in event time. Dotted lines indicate 95% confidence intervals, constructed using standard errors clustered at the county level. The sample contains 5.1 million observations collapsed to the county, survey year, cohort, race, and sex level. Weights equal to the sum of individual survey weights in each cell are applied. Controls include 1960 county characteristics interacted with linear cohort trends, as well as fixed effects for county, survey year, sex and birth cohort x state of birth.

# References

- F. M. Antman and K. Cortes. The long-run impacts of mexican-american school desegregation. NBER Working Paper 29200, 2021.
- O. Ashenfelter, W. J. Collins, and A. Yoon. Evaluating the Role of Brown v. Board of Education in School Equalization, Desegregation, and the Income of African Americans. *American Law and Economics Review*, 8(2):213–248, 2006. ISSN 14657252. doi: 10.1093/ aler/ahl001.
- D. H. Autor and D. Dorn. The growth of low-skill service jobs and the polarization of the US Labor Market. American Economic Review, 103(5):1553–1597, 2013. ISSN 00028282. doi: 10.1257/aer.103.5.1553.
- M. Bailey, S. Sun, and B. Timpe. Prep School for Poor Kids: The Long-Run Impacts of Head Start on Human Capital and Economic Self-Sufficiency. *American Economic Review*, Forthcoming, 2020.
- M. J. Bailey and A. Goodman-Bacon. The War on Poverty's Experiment in Public Medicine: Community Health Centers and the Mortality of Older Americans. *American Economic Review*, 105(3):1067–1104, 2015.
- M. J. Bailey, H. W. Hoynes, M. Rossin-Slater, and R. Walker. Is the Social Safety Net a Long-Term Investment? Large-Scale Evidence from the Food Stamps Program. 2020a.
- N. Baum-Snow and B. Lutz. School Desegregation, School Choice, and Changes in Residential Location Patterns by Race. American Economic Review, 101(December):3019–3046, 2011.
- P. Bergman. The risks and benefits of school integration for participating students: Evidence from a randomized desegregation program. *IZA Discussion Paper*, 2018.
- M. Bertrand, E. Duflo, and S. Mullainathan. How much should we Trust Difference-in-Differences Estimates? *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 119(1):249–275, 2004.
- L. P. Boustan. Was Postwar Suburbanization "White Flight"? Evidence from the Black Migration. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 125(1):417–443, 2010.

- B. Callaway and P. H. Sant'Anna. Difference-in-Differences with Multiple Time Periods. Journal of Econometrics, 225(2):200-230, 2021. ISSN 18726895. doi: 10.1016/j.jeconom. 2020.12.001. URL https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeconom.2020.12.001.
- D. Card and A. B. Krueger. School Quality and Black-White Relative Earnings: A Direct Assessment. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 107(1):151–200, 1992a.
- D. Card and A. B. Krueger. Does School Quality Matter? Returns to Education and the Characteristics of Public Schools in the United States. *Journal of Political Economy*, 100 (1):1–40, 1992b. ISSN 0022-3808. doi: 10.1086/261805.
- D. Card and J. Rothstein. Racial segregation and the black-white test score gap. *Journal* of *Public Economics*, 91(11-12):2158–2184, 2007.
- E. Cascio, N. Gordon, E. Lewis, and S. Reber. Paying for Progress: Conditional Grants and the Desegregation of Southern Schools. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 125(1): 445–482, 2010.
- E. U. Cascio, N. Gordon, and S. Reber. Local Responses to Federal Grants: Evidence from the Introduction of Title I in the South. *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy*, 5(3):126–159, 2013.
- R. Chetty, J. N. Friedman, N. Hilger, E. Saez, D. W. Schanzenbach, and D. Yagan. How does your Kindergarten Classroom Fflect your Earnings? Evidence from Project Star. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 126(4):1593–1660, 2011. ISSN 00335533. doi: 10. 1093/qje/qjr041.
- C. de Chaisemartin and X. D'Haultfœuille. Two-Way Fixed Effects Estimators with Heterogeneous Treatment Effects. American Economic Review, 110(9):2964–2996, 2020. ISSN 19447981. doi: 10.1257/aer.20181169.
- E. Derenoncourt. Can you move to opportunity? Evidence from the Great Migration. American Economic Review, Forthcoming, 2021.
- A. Goodman-Bacon. Difference-in-Differences with Variation in Treatment Timing. Journal of Econometrics, 225(2):254-277, 2021. ISSN 18726895. doi: 10.1016/j.jeconom.2021.03.
  014. URL https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeconom.2021.03.014.

- J. Guryan. Desegregation and Black Dropout Rates. *American Economic Review*, 94(4): 919–943, 2004.
- E. Hanushek. The Economics of Schooling: Production and Efficiency in Public Schools. Journal of Economic Literature, 24(3):1141-1177, 1986. doi: 10.2307/ 2725865. URL http://hanushek.stanford.edu/sites/default/files/publications/ Hanushek1986JEL24(3).pdf.
- E. Hanushek. The Failure of Input-based Schooling Policies. The Economic Journal, 113:F64-F98, 2003. URL http://hanushek.stanford.edu/sites/default/files/ publications/Hanushek2003EJ1132848529.pdf.
- H. Hoynes, D. W. Schanzenbach, and D. Almond. Long-Run Impacts of Childhood Access to the Safety Net. American Economic Review, 106(4):903–934, 2016. ISSN 00028282. doi: 10.1257/aer.20130375.
- J. Hyman. Does Money Matter in the Long Run? Effects of School Spending on Educational Attainment. American Economic Journal: Economic Policy, 9(4):256–280, 2017. ISSN 1945774X. doi: 10.1257/pol.20150249.
- A. Isen, M. Rossin-Slater, and W. R. Walker. Every Breath You Take—Every Dollar You'll Make: The Long-Term Consequences of the Clean Air Act of 1970. *Journal of Political Economy*, 125(3):848–902, 2017. ISSN 1537534X. doi: 10.1086/691465.
- C. K. Jackson. Student Demographics, Teacher Sorting, and Teacher Quality: Evidence from the End of School Desegregation. *Journal of Labor Economics*, 27(2):213–256, 2009. ISSN 0734306X. doi: 10.1086/599334.
- C. K. Jackson, R. C. Johnson, and C. Persico. The Effects of School Spending on Educational and Economic Outcomes: Evidence from School Finance Reforms. *The Quarterly Journal* of Economics, 131(1):157–218, 2016. ISSN 15314650. doi: 10.1093/qje/qjv036.
- R. C. Johnson. Long-Run Impacts of School Desegregation and School Quality. NBER Working Paper 16664, 2011.
- R. Kluger. Simple justice: The history of Brown v. Board of Education and Black America's struggle for equality. Vintage, 2011.

- J. Lafortune, J. Rothstein, and D. W. Schanzenbach. School Finance Reform and the Distribution of Student Achievement. American Economic Journal: Applied Economics, 10 (2):1–26, 2018. ISSN 19457790. doi: 10.1257/app.20160567.
- J. Logan. American communities project desegregation case data, brown university. https://s4.ad.brown.edu/Projects/USSchools/SchoolDLoad.htm, 2021.
- B. Lutz. The end of court-ordered desegregation. American Economic Journal: Economic Policy, 3(2):130–68, 2011.
- D. S. Massey and N. A. Denton. The dimensions of residential segregation. Social forces, 67 (2):281–315, 1988.
- B. O'Flaherty. The economics of race in the United States. Harvard University Press, 2015.
- K. Pierson, M. L. Hand, and F. Thompson. The government finance database: A common resource for quantitative research in public financial analysis. *PloS one*, 10(6):e0130119, 2015.
- ProPublica. A national survey of school desegregation orders. https://projects.propublica.org/graphics/desegregation-orders, 2014.
- S. J. Reber. Court-Ordered Desegregation: Successes and Failures Integrating American Schools since Brown versus Board of Education. *Journal of Human Resources*, 40(3): 559–590, 2005. ISSN 0022166X. doi: 10.3368/jhr.xl.3.559.
- S. J. Reber. School Desegregation and Educational Attainment for Blacks. Journal of Human Resources, 45(4):893–914, 2010. ISSN 0022166X. doi: 10.3368/jhr.45.4.893.
- S. J. Reber. From Separate and Unequal to Integrated and Equal? School Desegregation and School Finance in Louisiana. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 93(2):404–415, 2011. ISSN 00346535. doi: 10.1162/REST\_a\_00090.
- S. Rivkin and F. Welch. Has School Desegregation Improved Academic and Economic Outcomes for Blacks? In E. Hanushek and F. Welch, editors, *Handbook of the Economics of Education*, volume 2, pages 1019–1049. 2006. ISBN 9780444528193. doi: 10.1016/S1574-0692(06)02017-4.
- S. Ruggles, S. Flood, R. Goeken, E. Meyer, J. Pacas, and M. Sobek. IPUMS USA: Version 10.0 American Community Survey, 2020.

- G. Solon, S. J. Haider, and J. M. Wooldridge. What are we Weighting for? Journal of Human Resources, 50(2):301–316, 2015. ISSN 15488004. doi: 10.3368/jhr.50.2.301.
- B. A. Stuart. The Long-Run Effects of Recessions on Education and Income. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, Forthcoming, 2020. ISSN 1556-5068.
- L. Sun and S. Abraham. Estimating Dynamic Treatment Effects in Event Studies with Heterogeneous Treatment Effects. *Journal of Econometrics*, 225(2):175–199, 2021. ISSN 18726895. doi: 10.1016/j.jeconom.2020.09.006. URL https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeconom.2020.09.006.
- E. J. Taylor, B. A. Stuart, and M. J. Bailey. Summary of Procedure to Match NUMIDENT Place of Birth County to GNIS Places. Technical report, 2016.
- O. Thompson. School Desegregation and Black Teacher Employment. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, Forthcoming. doi: 10.2139/ssrn.3045424.
- C. Tuttle. The long-run economic effects of school desegregation. Available at SSRN, 3460993, 2019.
- D. A. Weiner, B. F. Lutz, and J. Ludwig. The Effects of School Desegregation on Crime. *NBER Working Paper 15380*, 2009. URL http://www.nber.org/papers/w15380.
- F. Welch and A. Light. New Evidence on School Desegregation. Number US Commission on Civil Rights. 1987.

# 6 Appendix

### 6.1 Alternate Earnings Measures

One concern with using log wage earnings is that our estimates may be attenuated by desegregation inducing negative selection into working at the extensive margin.<sup>28</sup> To assess the extent to which this may be happening, we also evaluate school desegregation order impacts on the log of wage earnings +1 as well as wage earnings in levels. Results from these alternative measures are presented in Figures 11a and 11b and indicate that treatment at age 5 compared to age 17 is associated with an additional \$5,000 of earnings (in constant 2012 dollars) and a 1 point increase in the log of wage earnings +1. We also study effects for hourly wages and log hourly wages to see if our effects for wage earnings are coming solely from increased labor force attachment or a combination of this with improved job quality. Figures 11c and 11d indicate that the former story is most likely the one at play: Effects for either measure of hourly wages are minimal, suggesting that while exposure to desegregation orders was successful in increasing labor force participation at both the extensive and intensive margin, it had limited impacts in improving the actual jobs that treated individuals matched to.

 $<sup>^{28}</sup>$ Bailey et al. [2020] contend with a similar issue.



Figure 11: Results for Alternate Earnings Measures

Notes: Figures present estimates of  $\delta_{\tau}$  from Equation 1 for Southern Blacks. Sample is balanced in event time. Dotted lines indicate 95% confidence intervals, constructed using standard errors clustered at the county level. The sample contains 5.1 million observations collapsed to the county, survey year, cohort, race, and sex level. Weights equal to the sum of individual survey weights in each cell are applied. Controls include 1960 county characteristics interacted with linear cohort trends, as well as fixed effects for county, survey year, sex and birth cohort x state of birth.

State Fips Code	County Name	City Name (when order applied to a municipal district)	Year of Implimentation	Source and other Notes (ACP refers to American Communities Project database; all press clippings available in online appendix)
20	Shawnee County	Topeka	1954	This is <i>the</i> Brown v Board, of course. Was actually enforced in Topeka and some other "border" regions, but not more widely.
22	Orleans Parish		1961	Welch & Light
34	Essex County	Newark	1961	Welch & Light
9	New Haven County	New Haven	1965	In Pro Publica and ACP with same date. From ACP: Guide v. Board of Education of the City of New Haven. Parents of junior high school students and taxpayers brought suit to enjoin board of education of city from carrying out certain plan for attendance at junior high schools. The Superior Court, Devlin, J., held that plan of board of education to pair two junior high schools into one attendance zone and then provide that all seventh grade pupils in entire zone attend one school and all eighth grade pupils in area attend other school was not illegal, though substantial factor influencing decision was desire to reduce to some extent racial imbalance existing. Judgment for board of education." So it seems like the district wanted to integrate, parents sued, and the judge sided with the school district. I'm coding as a court order. Listed as still active in both ACP and ProPublica.
24	Harford County		1965	Welch & Light
6	Alameda County	Oakland	1966	Welch & Light
9	Hartford County	Hartford	1966	From Press Clippings: The Hartford area had one of the nation's pioneering voluntary metropolitan desegregation plans, Project Concern, a small voluntary plan begun in the Hartford area in 1966 and involving a few hundred students from the city attending suburban schools. It continued into the mid-1990s and was later revived as part of the remedy in Sheff. It had only a very modest impact on the region's severe segregation but it was the site of important early sophisticated research documenting significant positive impacts from access to suburban schools.
24	Anne Arundel County		1966	From Press Clippings: In 1966, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and the U.S. Justice Department sued the county for failing to desegregate. Only then did Anne Arundel start complying with the law.
22	Lafourche Parish		1967	From ACP: Hill v. Lafourche Parish School Board. Choice of schools, student transfers, school services, . To eliminate discrimination in areas of choice of schools, student transfers, school services, facilities, activities and programs with further mandate that school board make annual reports to court
9	Fairfield County	Norwalk	1968	From ACP: Norwalk Core v. Norwalk Board of Education. Action by Black and Puerto Rican students attacking policy of city board of education respecting neighborhood schools. The District Court held that action by Black and Puerto Rican elementary school students in city to declare unconstitutional policy and practice of city board of education in denying only Black and Puerto Rican public elementary school children an integrated neighborhood school while at the same time establishing and maintaining such schools for all white public elementary school children in city could be maintained as a class action on behalf of all other Black and Puerto Rican public elementary school students in city for whom neighborhood schools would exist but for action of school board. Ordered that action be maintained as a class action and that notice be given. On plaintiffs' motion for temporary restraining order to prevent closing of Black neighborhood school, the District Court held that to deny, even temporarily, exposure of young children of all races to acknowledged benefits of integrated schools in order to preserve a segregated neighborhood school would strip plaintiffs' themselves to that extent of an essential element of the basic relief they seek. Class action by black and Puerto Rican school children and two associations seeking declaratory and injunctive relief against school board arising out of board's busing of black and Puerto Rican children out of their neighborhood sto white heighborhood schools without maintaining black neighborhood schools and without cross busing white children to black neighborhood schools. The United States District Court for the District of Connecticut denied preliminary injunction and dismissed the complaint on the merits and the school children and the associations appealed. The Court of Appeals held that evidence supported trial court's finding that board acted in utmost good faith, in nonarbitrary and deliberate manner, in order to insure racial balance and to provide high quality educati
12	Bay County		1968	From ACP: Youngblood v. Board of Public Instruction of Bay County. Also see press clipping
26	Kent County	Grand Rapids	1968	Welch & Light
37	Mecklenburg County		1968	Welch & Light
1	Montgomery County		1969	Branches v. Wallace). Not clear that there was something specific to Montgomery county schools. Actual integration occurred in 1969 and 1970
6	Contra Costa County	Richmond	1969	Now called West Contra Costa Unified, but still draws primary from city of Richmond
9	New Haven County	Waterbury	1969	From ACP: US v. Board of Education of Waterbury. Appeal was taken from an order of the United States District Court for the District of Connecticut selecting an amicus plan as a school desegregation remedy under a consent order. The Court of Appeals held that: (1) the consent order operated as a litigated finding of unconstitutional segregation and supplied the constitutional basis for a systemwide desegregation plan, and (2) the district court did not abuse its discretion in selecting the amicus plan. Intervenors filed motion for attorneys' fees and costs. The United States District Court for the District of Connecticut entered order denying the motion, and intervenors appealed. The Court of Appeals held that plaintiff intervenors, a group composed of an education committee and community leaders along with other individuals, who intervened after liability was established but made substantial contributions in successfully opposing unconstitutional proposals for relief and in negotiating an acceptable consent decree, constituted a "prevailing party" within Emergency School Aid Act and thus was eligible for an attorneys' fee award in the district court's discretion. Remanded. Relevant for all CT districts new reports says that "As racial segregation became an issue in Connecticut's schools, the State Board of Education asked local school boards to take immediate action to address this issue."

12	Escambia County Brevard County Lee County Leon County		1969 <u>1969</u> <u>1969</u> 1969	From contemporaneous govt report: In light of the U.S. Supreme Court's decision in Green v. County School Board of New Kent County., which ruled that a freedom-of-choice plan is acceptable only if it accomplishes elimination of the dual school system, the district court on January 23, 1969 ruled, therefore, that the existing freedom-of-choice plan was no longer acceptable. On April 21, 1969, the court finally approved and ordered implementation of a new plan submitted by the Escambia County School Board. Welch & Light Welch & Light From contemporaneous govt report in Press Clippings: On January 23, 1969, the court ordered the school district to adopt a plan consistent with the Supreme Court's ruling in Green v. County School Board of New Kent County, which required the school board to take prompt and effective action to eradicate its dual school system. In May 1969, the district court approved a plan which retained freedom-of-choice at the elementary and junior high schools, contemplated the continued operation of seven all-black elementary schools, and provided no specifics on how or when faculty integration would be achieved. Upon further appeal, the district court was ordered by the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals on December 12, 1969 to order submission of a plan for complete student and faculty desegregation by February 1, 1970. A supplemental order of the Court of Appeals, issued January 8, 1970, then authorized a delay of pupil desegregation until September 1970. This order was followed by a January 30, 1970 order of the district court <sup>6</sup> which finally directed the school board to (1) immediately desegregate faculty, other staff, and transportation; (2) complete the necessary alteration of records and assignment of students for their transfer at the beginning of the September 1970 school year, according to the plan prepared by the Fifth School Desegregation @n Center at the University of Miami; and (3) allow a minority transfer policy.' During the 1969-70 school, despite years of court action, three elem
12	Manatee County		1969	From ACP: Harvest v. Board of Public Instruction of Manatee County, FL. School desegregation case. The United States District Court for the Middle District of Florida, Lieb, Chief Judge, found board's plan as submitted to be inadequate and decreed that amended plan be submitted, and cross appeals were taken. The Court of Appeals held that where district court's order would approve plan proposed by school board and amended by court which did not establish racially unitary school system, order would be reversed and cause remanded for compliance with requirements of Supreme Court decision mandating that school districts may no longer operate dual system based on race or color.
12	Marion County		1969	See Press Clippings
12	Pinellas County		1969	Welch & Light
12	Polk County		1969	Welch & Light
12	Sarasota County		1969	See Press Clippings
12	Volusia County		1969	Welch & Light
17	Macon County	Decatur	1969	See Appendix A of the document in press clippings, which is a contemporaneous masters thesis. Undated HEW action listed in ACP database.
22	Bossier Parish		1969	ACP: Bossier Parish School Board v. Lemon. Also see press clippings
22	Caddo Parish		1969	Welch & Light
22	Calcasieu Parish		1969	Welch & Light
22	Jefferson Parish		1969	Welch & Light
22	Lafavette Parish		1969	See Press Clippings
22	Rapides Darish		1060	Welch & Light
	Rapides Failsii		1709	ween & Lagnt

				Error ACD. Montaille v. St. Landry David School Doard The United States Count of Appeals found the St
22	St. Landry Parish		1969	From ACP: Monteilh v. St. Landry Parish School Board. The United States Court of Appeals found the St. Landry Parish school system's freedom-of-choice plans to be ineffective in fostering desegregation. On August 9, 1969, the district court ordered implementation of a desegregation plan drafted by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The district court later approved modifications of the plan. Plaintiffs appealed and the panel remanded with instructions for the district court to implement a student assignment plan complying with Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education. On remand the district court approved various modifications to zone lines and grade structure. The court also ordered semiannual reports by the School Board and required the Board "specifically [to] assign personnel in the positions of the principal, assistant principal, guidance counselor, and head coach in each school so that the race of these does not indicate that the school was intended for Negro students or for white students." At the end of the order the court declared the St. Landry Parish school system "to be unitary in its entirety." The court retained jurisdiction to preserve the unitary system. A panel of this circuit affirmed the order on appeal, stating that the district court correctly retained jurisdiction without notice to the plaintiffs below and a hearing providing opportunity to plaintiffs to show that deliberate action by school authorities or some other agency of the State has affected the unitary status of this system so that further intervention of the district court is required. These two consolidated cases present challenges to desegregation efforts of the St. Landry Parish School Board and consolidation plan. We reverse the dismissal because the district court's approved in declared unitary. In the other, appellants challenge the Board's adoption of a high school construction and consolidation plan. We reverse the dismissal because the district court is approved of the construction plan, finding t
22	St. Mary Parish		1969	Erom ACP: Boudreaux v. Mary Parish School Board
22	St. Mary Falish		1909	From ACD, US and Smith as St. Tamma and Device School 10.
22	St. Tammany Parish		1969	From ACP: US and Smith V. St. Tammany Parish School Board
22	Tangipahoa Parish		1969	From ACP: Moore v. Tangipahoa Parish School Board
22	Terrebonne Parish		1969	Welch & Light
37	Cumberland County		1969	Welch & Light. Merged with Fayetteville City in 1985
37	New Hapover County		1969	Welch & Light
57	New Hallover County		1909	
48	Bexar County	San Antonio	1969	Welch & Light
51	Dittarlyapia Coupty	our mitorio	1060	Wolch & Light
51	Pittsylvania County		1969	
1	Jefferson County	Birmingham	1970	Welch & Light
6	Los Angeles County	Pasadena	1970	Welch & Light
0	Fairfield County	Stamford	1970	Welch & Light
,	Pairfield County	Stannord	1770	
12	Alachua County		1970	District Court for the Northern District of Florida, David L. Middlebrooks, Jr., J. The Court of Appeals, Bell, Circuit Judge, held that record in case indicated that two virtually all-Negro elementary schools within city and in close proximity to each other could be feasibly and practically paired and thereby resulting in substantial desegregation, and a biracial committee was appointed to act in advisory capacity with respect to the desegregation of another virtually all-Negro elementary school and three white majority elementary schools. Subsequently court ordered district to submit annual reports concerning desegregation.
12	Broward County		1970	Welch & Light
12	Miami-Dade County		1970	Welch & Light
12	Dalas Basah County		1070	Wolch & Light
12	Palm Beach County		1970	Weich & Light
12	Seminole County		1970	See Press Clippings
13	Fulton County	Atlanta	1970	Welch & Light
13	Bibb County	Atlanta	1970	From ACP: Majority-to-Minority Transfers/Bussing/Faculty Integration/Rezoning. School desegregation case. The United States District Court for the Middle District of Georgia denied injunctive relief, approved school board's desegregation plan, and deferred consideration of question involving assignment of teaching and administrative. personnel on racial basis, and the plaintiffs appealed. The Court of Appeals held that proposed desegregation plan including twelfth grade in 1964 and grades ten and eleven in September, 1965 would also be required to include grades one and nine in September, 1965. Affirmed in part; reversed in part; and remanded for further proceedings. Action to enjoin construction of school. The District Court held that where court had ordered school authorities to take affirmative action to disestablish segregated schools and to locate any new school with objective of eradicating vestiges of dual system, court would issue preliminary injunction against construction of proposed school which was to be built in predominantly Negro area and on inadequate site, and that no bond was required. The United States District Court for the Middle District of Georgia entered order from which appeal was taken. The Court of Appeals held that order approving freedom-of-choice plan, with modification to provide for more of a merger of student bodies where about 25% Of Negro students were enrolled in formerly all-white schools, only one white student was enrolled in 20 formerly all-Negro schools and about 9% Of white students were participating or waiting to participate on part-time basis in virtually all the all-Negro schools. Reversed and remanded. Plaintiff field motion for student bodies where about 25% Of Negro students would not be required, with exception of students exercising option to transfer under majority to minority transfer provision, in county-wide school system, in which elementary school attendance zone lines were drawn so as "to achieve the greatest possible degree of actual desegregation" of s
13	Fulton County		1970	and all black elementary schools were the product of residential segregation, desegregation plan rejecting pairing for majority black elementary schools and ordering zoning based on distances measured along available routes of transportation rather than straight line distances would be approved. Affirmed in part and remanded.
1.3	Houston County		1970	See Press Clippings

13	Chatham County		1970	See Press Clippings
22	East Baton Rouge		1970	Welch & Light
	Parish		1770	
22	Ouachita Parish		1970	From ACP: Taylor v. Ouachita Parish School Board. Denied substantial intradistrict remedial action,
				termination of overlapping zones and attendance options
28	Hinds County	Jackson	1970	From ACP: Singleton v. Jackson Municipal Separate School District. Ordered the district to immediately operate as unitary school systems within which no person is to be effectively excluded from any school because of race or color, it would be possible to merge faculties and staff, transportation, services, athletics and other extracurricular activities during present school term, but difficult to arrange merger of student bodies prior to fall term of 1970, a two-step merger plan would be implemented; one step, including merger of faculties and staff, to be accomplished by February 1, 1970; the other step, including student body merger, to be accomplished by fall term of 1970.
				Welch & Light. There is a one-way transfer program from st louis to suburban districts. Similar to Hartford
36	Monroe County	Rochester	1970	and St Louis
37	Gaston County		1970	Welch & Light
37	Guilford County	Greensboro	1970	From ACP: North Carolina State Board of Education v. Swann. Greensboro and Guilford County (as well as another city, High Point) merged in 1991. But given that late date we treat them as separate districts. Seems like many NC districts desegregated after 1970 Swann ruling.
37	Guilford County		1970	From ACP: North Carolina State Board of Education v. Swann. Greensboro and Guilford County (as well as another city, High Point) merged in 1991. But given that late date we treat them as separate districts. Seems like many NC districts desegregated after 1970 Swann ruling.
37	Johnston County		1970	From ACP: North Carolina State Board of Education v. Swann. Seems like many NC districts desegregated after 1970 Swann ruling.
37	Wake County		1970	From ACP: North Carolina State Board of Education v. Swann. Seems like many NC districts desegregated after 1970 Swann ruling. Raleigh City and Wake County merged in 1976. We treat it as a county district.
45	Berkeley County		1970	From ACP: US v. Barnwell County No 19 et al
45	Charleston County		1970	Welch & Light
45	Richland County		1970	Welch & Light. Columbia Public Schools is now called Richland County schools, but the borders did not change and always included Columbia and the surrounding county
45	Aiken County		1970	See Press Clippings
45	Greenville County		1970	Welch & Light
45	Horry County		1970	See Press Clippings
47	Shelby County		1970	From ACP: Robinson v. Shelby County Board of Education, 1970
48	Nueces County	Corpus Christi	1970	From ACP: Cisneros v. Corpus Christi Independent School District. Pairing and clustering plan. Largely for Mexican American students, but applied to African Americans as well. City of Corpus Christi also served by other districts, but this is the main one.
48	Harris County	Houston	1970	Welch & Light. Two-way voluntary interdistrict busing program for students of all races with several suburban districts
48	Jefferson County	Port Arthur	1970	From ACP: US. v. State of Texas. School districts were found to be drawn on racial lines. Suit was to create biracial school districts by combining all black districts with districts that were already biracial.
48	Smith County	Tyler	1970	From ACP: Morales v. Shannon. Freedom of Choice; neighborhood attendance zones; ability grouping; bilingual-bicultural programs
48	Wichita County	Wichita Falls	1970	From ACP: US. v. State of Texas. On DOJ list of affected districts
51	Norfolk city	Norfolk	1970	Welch & Light
51	Richmond city	Richmond	1970	See Press Clippings
51	Roanoke city	Roanoke	1970	Welch & Light
51	Virginia Beach city	Virginia Beach	1970	See Press Clippings
1	Jefferson County		1971	Welch & Light
1	Mobile County		1971	Welch & Light
5	Pulaski County	Little Rock	1971	Welch & Light
6	San Francisco County	San Francisco	1971	Welch & Light
12	Duval County		1971	Welch & Light
12	Hillsborough County		1971	Welch & Light
13	Muscogee County		1971	Welch & Light
18	Allen County	Fort Wayne	1971	Welch & Light
20	Sedgwick County	Wichita	1971	Welch & Light
26	Kalamazoo County	Kalamazoo	1971	From ACP: Oliver v. School District of the city of Kalamazoo. School desegregation case. The United States District Court for the Western District of Michigan, Southern Division, Noel P. Fox, J., granted preliminary injunction directing board of education immediately to implement attendance plan and defendants appealed. The Court of Appeals held that grant of preliminary injunction was not contrary to rule of equity or improvident exercise of judicial discretion.
26	Oakland County	Pontiac	1971	From ACP: Black and White Children of Pontiac School System v. School District of City of Pontiac. Action seeking injunction restraining school district from transporting children pursuant to order entered in desegregation case. The United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan dismissed complaint, and plaintiff appealed. The Court of Appeals, held that complaint was properly dismissed on ground that suit was an attempt collaterally to attack desegregation order entered in the principal case; since the District Court had maintained jurisdiction of the case proper avenue for relief if there were unanticipated problems which had developed in carrying out the order was by way of an application to intervene and a motion for additional relief in the principal case.
37	Forsyth County		1971	From ACP: Winston-Salem-Forsyth County Board of Education v. Scott. The Supreme court denied district's attempt to delay the implementation of the court ordered desegregation plan. Further, the Supreme court indicated that due to lack of compelling evidence by the district, it was not willing to disturb the court order.
40	Tulsa County	Tulsa	1971	Welch & Light
47	Davidson County		1971	Welch & Light. Nashville City and Davidson County merged in 1963, 8 years before the order.
48	Dallas County	Dallas	1971	Welch & Light
51	Alexandria city	Alexandria	1971	See Press Clippings
51	Arlington County		1971	Welch & Light
51	Chesapeake city	Chesapeake	1971	See Press Clippings
51	Hampton city	Hampton	1971	See Press Clippings

51	Newport News city	Newport News	1971	See Press Clippings
51	Portsmouth city	Portsmouth	1971	See Press Clippings
10		Tortsmouth	1071	W-1-1- 9 T-1-4
12	Richmond County		1972	From ACP: Acree v Drummond. On motion for injunctive relief pending appeal or, alternatively for summary reversal of denial by the United States District Court for the Southern District of <b>Georgia</b> of a citation for contempt against <b>county</b> school <b>board</b> and others, the Court of Appeals held that school desegregation case was not appropriate for issuance by it of an original injunction, in view of state of record currently before it, and especially in view of desegregation requirements recently enunciated by the United States Supreme Court. Proceedings on motion to require board to present new plan with unitary, nonracial school attendance zones. The District Court held that zoning would have to be of primary significance in any new plan presented by board, whose freedom of choice plan for desegregating schools had not worked, but court would give consideration to plan combining automatic assignment of pupils within designated geographical zones and limited freedom of choice of schools. The District Court held that geographical attendance zone plan submitted by school board to achieve desegregation of county school system would be temporarily approved by the court and permitted to be effected at beginning of 1969-70 school year, but plan would not be permanent. The plaintiffs appealed. The Court of Appeals held that i ordered District Court no later than July 28, 1970 and that the District Court must enter its order no later than August 3, 1970. On remand from the Court of Appeals, hel United States District of Georgia at Augusta, entered order and plaintiffs appealed. The Court of Appeals held that District Court could utilize "forced bussing" to achieve school desegregation. The Court also held that trial court could not permit Board of Education to rely on inferiority of certain school facilities to which children were to be transferred as a justification to rely on inferiority of certain school facilities to which children were to be transferred as a justification for continued racial discrimination. Aff
21	Fayette County		1972	Welch & Light. Contains Lexington, but Lexington part of county system
26	Ingham County	Lansing	1972	Welch & Light
32	Clark County	-	1972	Welch & Light
40	Oklahoma County	Oklahoma City	1972	Welch & Light
	U O	2	4070	Knoxville County and Knoxville City schools merged in 1987. Treat as county district. See press clippings for
47	Knox County		1972	desegregation timing
48	Potter County	Amarillo	1972	Welch & Light
17	Winnebago County	Rockford	1973	Welch & Light
18	Marion County	Indianapolis	1973	Beginning in 1981 Indianapolis implemented an interdistrict bussing plan with several suburban districts. Still assign individuals treatment based on being born in city of Indianapolis, even though some may have bussed to suburbs
19	Black Hawk County	Waterloo	1973	ACP lists an HEW action adopted in 1973. Detailed historical account in Press Clippings
				Welch & Light
24	Prince George's County		1973	
39	Hamilton County	Cincinnati	1973	Welch & Light
40	Comanche County	Lawton	1973	Welch & Light
47	Shelby County	Memphis	1973	Welch & Light Memphis merged with Shelby County in 2011 long after the order
48	Tarrant County	Fort Worth	1973	Welch & Light
48	McLennan County	Waco	1973	Welch & Light
54	Raleigh County	Waco	1973	Welch & Light
8	Denver County		1974	Denver is a consolidated city-county
24	Baltimore city	Baltimore	1974	Welch & Light
24	Suffally County	Battan	1974	Welch & Light
25	Suffolk County	Boston Carries Call	1974	Weich & Light
25	Hampden County	Springfield	1974	Welch & Light
27	Hennepin County	Minneapolis	1974	Welch & Light
41	Multnoman County	Portland	19/4	Weich & Light
47	Hamilton County	Chattanooga	1974	Protracted litigation, but news accounts indicate actual enforcement began in 19/4. Chattanooga city was
				merged with Hamilton county ion 1995.
21	Jefferson County		1975	Welch & Light. Louisville City and Jefferson County combined in 1975. Most African American students were
24	W/ C		4075	In Louisvine, about nan bussed to county schools and vice-versa.
48	Midland County	Detroit	1975	From ACP: U.S. v. Midland ISD. The court of appeals ordered the district court to have a plan to desegregate Mexican-Americans and blacks
55	Racine County	Racine	1975	See Press Clippings
6	Sacramento County	Sacramento	1976	Welch & Light
25	Bristol County	New Bedford	1976	Welch & Light
31	Douglas County	Omaha	1976	Welch & Light
39	Montgomery County	Davton	1976	Welch & Light
55	Milwaukee County	Milwaukee	1976	Welch & Light
6	San Diego County	San Diego	1977	Welch & Light
20	Wyandotte County	Kansas City	1977	Welch & Light
29	Lackson County	Kansas City	1977	Welch & Light
30	Summit County	Akron	1977	Welch & Light
6	Kern County	Bakersfield	1978	In ACP, also see Press Clippings
6	Erespo County	Fresno	1978	Welch & Light
6	Los Angeles County	I no Angeles	1079	Welch & Light
6	San Bernardino County	San Bernardino	1978	Welch & Light
10	New Castle County		1978	In 1976 11 districts in New Castle County, largest being Wilmington, consolidated to a county district.
42	Philadelphia County	Philadelphia	1978	Welch & Light
48	Lubbock County	Lubbock	1978	Welch & Light
53	King County	Seattle	1978	
39	Cuyahoga County	Cleveland	1979	Weich & Light
39	Franklin County	Columbus	1979	Weich & Light

13	Dougherty County		1980	Welch & Light
26	Genesee County	Flint	1980	From ACP: US v. Flint Community School District. Short on details, but also listed in ProPublica database and in Press Clippings, so order definitely existed and 1980 is best available date.
29	St. Louis city	St Louis	1980	Welch & Light. There is a one-way transfer program from st louis to suburban districts. Similar to Hartford and Rochester
34	Hudson County	Jersey City	1980	Welch & Light
36	Erie County	Buffalo	1980	Welch & Light
39	Lucas County	Toledo	1980	Welch & Light
42	Allegheny County	Pittsburgh	1980	Welch & Light
48	Travis County	Austin	1980	Welch & Light
18	St. Joseph County	South Bend	1981	Welch & Light
17	Cook County	Chicago	1982	Welch & Light
5	Pulaski County		1985	Listed as 1983 in Pro Publica. From press clipping: Nov. 7, 1985 The 8 the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals overturns consolidation, calling the remedy too extreme for the violation, instead ordering most Little Rock School District boundary lines to coincide with the city limits. As a result, the Pulaski County Special School District loses almost 8,000 students and 14 schools to the Little Rock School District.
6	Los Angeles County	Compton	Untreated	Welch & Light
6	Monterey County	*	Untreated	Only encompasses part of county, but spans many cities.
6	Los Angeles County	Pomona	Untreated	In no database, can't find news reports
6	Orange County	Santa Ana	Untreated	In no database, can't find news reports
6	San Joaquin County	Stockton	Untreated	In no database, can't find news reports
9	Fairfield County	Bridgeport	Untreated	ACP says that there was an HEW action in 1969, Conn. has been encouraging adoption of satisfactory plan, threatening to cut off state funds. But no contemporaneous press reports or jumps observed in actual segregation levels. Relevant for all CT districts new reports says that "As racial segregation became an issue in Connecticut's schools, the State Board of Education asked local school boards to take immediate action to address this issue."
4 🗖			T.T. 1	
17	St. Clair County	East Saint Louis	Untreated	Listed as untreated in Welch & Light. Only an ambiguous entry in ACP
17	Peoria County	Peoria	Untreated	Constructed in Welch & Light. Only an ambiguous entry in ACP Only entry in ACP is a dismissal. No press accounts
17 17 17 18	Peoria County Madison County	Peoria Peoria	Untreated Untreated	Listed as untreated in Welch & Light. Only an ambiguous entry in ACP         Only entry in ACP is a dismissal. No press accounts         Only entry is from ACP (Parents for Quality Education with Integration v. State of Indiana) and does not appear to have ruled against Anderson school specifically and is also not until 1993: The Court of Appeals held that Eleventh Amendment permitted continuation of a desegregation suit against state defendants after a court- approved settlement between plaintiffs and local school defendants; if state had not taken affirmative steps to discharge its duty to dismantle the dual school system, it could be enjoined by federal court. The state was dismissed as a defendant in 1992. Therefore the actual desegregation plan effected Fort Wayne only.
17 17 18 18	St. Clair County         Peoria County         Madison County         Lake County	East Saint Louis Peoria Anderson Gary	Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated	Listed as untreated in Welch & Light. Only an ambiguous entry in ACP         Only entry in ACP is a dismissal. No press accounts         Only entry is from ACP (Parents for Quality Education with Integration v. State of Indiana) and does not appear to have ruled against Anderson school specifically and is also not until 1993: The Court of Appeals held that Eleventh Amendment permitted continuation of a desegregation suit against state defendants after a court- approved settlement between plaintiffs and local school defendants; if state had not taken affirmative steps to discharge its duty to dismantle the dual school system, it could be enjoined by federal court. The state was dismissed as a defendant in 1992. Therefore the actual desegregation plan effected Fort Wayne only.         Control in Welch & Light, and only entry in ACP was dismissed in 1964
17 17 18 18 18 18	St. Clair County         Peoria County         Madison County         Lake County         Delaware County	East Saint Louis         Peoria         Anderson         Gary         Muncie	Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated	Listed as untreated in Welch & Light. Only an ambiguous entry in ACP         Only entry in ACP is a dismissal. No press accounts         Only entry is from ACP (Parents for Quality Education with Integration v. State of Indiana) and does not appear to have ruled against Anderson school specifically and is also not until 1993: The Court of Appeals held that Eleventh Amendment permitted continuation of a desegregation suit against state defendants after a court- approved settlement between plaintiffs and local school defendants; if state had not taken affirmative steps to discharge its duty to dismantle the dual school system, it could be enjoined by federal court. The state was dismissed as a defendant in 1992. Therefore the actual desegregation plan effected Fort Wayne only.         Control in Welch & Light, and only entry in ACP was dismissed in 1964         Only entry in ACP was late and not implemented. No press mentions
17 17 18 18 18 18 26	St. Clair County         Peoria County         Madison County         Lake County         Delaware County         Saginaw County	East Saint Louis         Peoria         Anderson         Gary         Muncie         Saginaw	Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated	<ul> <li>Listed as untreated in Welch &amp; Light. Only an ambiguous entry in ACP</li> <li>Only entry in ACP is a dismissal. No press accounts</li> <li>Only entry is from ACP (Parents for Quality Education with Integration v. State of Indiana) and does not appear to have ruled against Anderson school specifically and is also not until 1993: The Court of Appeals held that Eleventh Amendment permitted continuation of a desegregation suit against state defendants after a court- approved settlement between plaintiffs and local school defendants; if state had not taken affirmative steps to discharge its duty to dismantle the dual school system, it could be enjoined by federal court. The state was dismissed as a defendant in 1992. Therefore the actual desegregation plan effected Fort Wayne only.</li> <li>Control in Welch &amp; Light, and only entry in ACP was dismissed in 1964</li> <li>Only entry in ACP was late and not implemented. No press mentions</li> <li>Welch &amp; Light</li> </ul>
17 17 18 18 18 18 26 34	St. Clair County         Peoria County         Madison County         Lake County         Delaware County         Saginaw County         Camden County	East Saint Louis         Peoria         Anderson         Gary         Muncie         Saginaw         Camden	Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated	Lasted as untreated in Welch & Light. Only an ambiguous entry in ACPOnly entry in ACP is a dismissal. No press accountsOnly entry is from ACP (Parents for Quality Education with Integration v. State of Indiana) and does not appear to have ruled against Anderson school specifically and is also not until 1993: The Court of Appeals held that Eleventh Amendment permitted continuation of a desegregation suit against state defendants after a court- approved settlement between plaintiffs and local school defendants; if state had not taken affirmative steps to discharge its duty to dismantle the dual school system, it could be enjoined by federal court. The state was dismissed as a defendant in 1992. Therefore the actual desegregation plan effected Fort Wayne only.Control in Welch & Light, and only entry in ACP was dismissed in 1964Only entry in ACP was late and not implemented. No press mentionsWelch & LightNo significant entries in ACP, ProPublica, no press reports
17 17 18 18 18 18 26 34 34	St. Clair County         Peoria County         Madison County         Lake County         Delaware County         Saginaw County         Camden County         Union County	East Saint Louis Peoria Anderson Gary Muncie Saginaw Camden Elizabeth	Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated	Listed as untreated in Welch & Light. Only an ambiguous entry in ACPOnly entry in ACP is a dismissal. No press accountsOnly entry is from ACP (Parents for Quality Education with Integration v. State of Indiana) and does not appear to have ruled against Anderson school specifically and is also not until 1993: The Court of Appeals held that Eleventh Amendment permitted continuation of a desegregation suit against state defendants after a court- approved settlement between plaintiffs and local school defendants; if state had not taken affirmative steps to discharge its duty to dismantle the dual school system, it could be enjoined by federal court. The state was dismissed as a defendant in 1992. Therefore the actual desegregation plan effected Fort Wayne only.Control in Welch & Light, and only entry in ACP was dismissed in 1964Only entry in ACP was late and not implemented. No press mentionsWelch & LightNo significant entries in ACP, ProPublica, no press reportsNo significant entries in ACP, ProPublica, no press reports
17 17 18 18 18 18 26 34 34 34 34	St. Clair County         Peoria County         Madison County         Lake County         Delaware County         Saginaw County         Camden County         Union County         Passaic County	East Saint Louis         Peoria         Anderson         Gary         Muncie         Saginaw         Camden         Elizabeth         Paterson	Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated	Listed as untreated in Welch & Light. Only an ambiguous entry in ACP         Only entry in ACP is a dismissal. No press accounts         Only entry is from ACP (Parents for Quality Education with Integration v. State of Indiana) and does not appear to have ruled against Anderson school specifically and is also not until 1993: The Court of Appeals held that Eleventh Amendment permitted continuation of a desegregation suit against state defendants after a court- approved settlement between plaintiffs and local school defendants; if state had not taken affirmative steps to discharge its duty to dismantle the dual school system, it could be enjoined by federal court. The state was dismissed as a defendant in 1992. Therefore the actual desegregation plan effected Fort Wayne only.         Control in Welch & Light, and only entry in ACP was dismissed in 1964         Only entry in ACP was late and not implemented. No press mentions         Welch & Light         No significant entries in ACP, ProPublica, no press reports         No significant entries in ACP, ProPublica, no press reports         No significant entries in ACP, ProPublica, no press reports
17 17 18 18 18 18 26 34 34 34 34 34	St. Clair County         Peoria County         Madison County         Lake County         Delaware County         Saginaw County         Camden County         Union County         Passaic County         Mercer County	East Saint Louis Peoria Anderson Gary Muncie Saginaw Camden Elizabeth Paterson Trenton	Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated	<ul> <li>Listed as untreated in Welch &amp; Light. Only an ambiguous entry in ACP</li> <li>Only entry in ACP is a dismissal. No press accounts</li> <li>Only entry is from ACP (Parents for Quality Education with Integration v. State of Indiana) and does not appear to have ruled against Anderson school specifically and is also not until 1993: The Court of Appeals held that Eleventh Amendment permitted continuation of a desegregation suit against state defendants after a court- approved settlement between plaintiffs and local school defendants; if state had not taken affirmative steps to discharge its duty to dismantle the dual school system, it could be enjoined by federal court. The state was dismissed as a defendant in 1992. Therefore the actual desegregation plan effected Fort Wayne only.</li> <li>Control in Welch &amp; Light, and only entry in ACP was dismissed in 1964</li> <li>Only entry in ACP was late and not implemented. No press mentions</li> <li>Welch &amp; Light</li> <li>No significant entries in ACP, ProPublica, no press reports</li> <li>No significant entries in ACP, ProPublica, no press reports</li> <li>No significant entries in ACP, ProPublica, no press reports</li> <li>No significant entries in ACP, ProPublica, no press reports</li> <li>No significant entries in ACP, ProPublica, no press reports</li> </ul>
$     \begin{array}{r}       17 \\       17 \\       18 \\       18 \\       18 \\       26 \\       34 \\       34 \\       34 \\       34 \\       34 \\       34 \\       36 \\     \end{array} $	St. Clair County         Peoria County         Madison County         Madison County         Lake County         Delaware County         Saginaw County         Camden County         Union County         Passaic County         Mercer County         New York County	East Saint Louis         Peoria         Anderson         Gary         Muncie         Saginaw         Camden         Elizabeth         Paterson         Trenton         New York	Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated	Listed as untreated in Welch & Light. Only an ambiguous entry in ACP Only entry in ACP is a dismissal. No press accounts Only entry is from ACP (Parents for Quality Education with Integration v. State of Indiana) and does not appear to have ruled against Anderson school specifically and is also not until 1993: The Court of Appeals held that Eleventh Amendment permitted continuation of a desegregation suit against state defendants after a court- approved settlement between plaintiffs and local school defendants; if state had not taken affirmative steps to discharge its duty to dismantle the dual school system, it could be enjoined by federal court. The state was dismissed as a defendant in 1992. Therefore the actual desegregation plan effected Fort Wayne only. Control in Welch & Light, and only entry in ACP was dismissed in 1964 Only entry in ACP was late and not implemented. No press mentions Welch & Light No significant entries in ACP, ProPublica, no press reports No significant entries in ACP, ProPublica, no press reports
$     \begin{array}{r}       17 \\       17 \\       18 \\       18 \\       26 \\       34 \\       34 \\       34 \\       34 \\       34 \\       36 \\       36 \\       36 \\     \end{array} $	St. Clair County         Peoria County         Madison County         Madison County         Lake County         Delaware County         Saginaw County         Camden County         Union County         Passaic County         Mercer County         New York County         Niagara County	East Saint Louis         Peoria         Anderson         Gary         Muncie         Saginaw         Camden         Elizabeth         Paterson         Trenton         New York         Niagara Falls	Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated	<ul> <li>Listed as untreated in Welch &amp; Light. Only an ambiguous entry in ACP</li> <li>Only entry in ACP is a dismissal. No press accounts</li> <li>Only entry is from ACP (Parents for Quality Education with Integration v. State of Indiana) and does not appear to have ruled against Anderson school specifically and is also not until 1993: The Court of Appeals held that Eleventh Amendment permitted continuation of a desegregation suit against state defendants after a court- approved settlement between plaintiffs and local school defendants; if state had not taken affirmative steps to discharge its duty to dismantle the dual school system, it could be enjoined by federal court. The state was dismissed as a defendant in 1992. Therefore the actual desegregation plan effected Fort Wayne only.</li> <li>Control in Welch &amp; Light, and only entry in ACP was dismissed in 1964</li> <li>Only entry in ACP was late and not implemented. No press mentions</li> <li>Welch &amp; Light</li> <li>No significant entries in ACP, ProPublica, no press reports</li> <li>No significant entries in ACP, ProPublica, no press reports</li> <li>No significant entries in ACP, ProPublica, no press reports</li> <li>No significant entries in ACP, ProPublica, no press reports</li> <li>No significant entries in ACP, ProPublica, no press reports</li> <li>No significant entries in ACP, ProPublica, no press reports</li> <li>No significant entries in ACP, ProPublica, no press reports</li> <li>No significant entries in ACP, ProPublica, no press reports</li> <li>No significant entries in ACP, ProPublica, no press reports</li> <li>No significant entries in ACP, ProPublica, no press reports</li> <li>No significant entries in ACP, ProPublica, no press reports</li> <li>No significant entries in ACP, ProPublica, no press reports</li> <li>No significant entries in ACP, ProPublica, no press reports</li> <li>No significant entries in ACP, ProPublica, no press reports</li> <li>Welch &amp; Light</li> </ul>
$     \begin{array}{r}       17 \\       17 \\       18 \\       18 \\       26 \\       34 \\       34 \\       34 \\       34 \\       34 \\       36 \\$	St. Clair County         Peoria County         Madison County         Madison County         Lake County         Delaware County         Saginaw County         Camden County         Union County         Passaic County         Mercer County         New York County         Niagara County         Onondaga County	East Saint Louis         Peoria         Anderson         Gary         Muncie         Saginaw         Camden         Elizabeth         Paterson         Trenton         New York         Niagara Falls         Syracuse	Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated	Listed as untreated in Welch & Light. Only an ambiguous entry in ACP Only entry in ACP is a dismissal. No press accounts Only entry is from ACP (Parents for Quality Education with Integration v. State of Indiana) and does not appear to have ruled against Anderson school specifically and is also not until 1993: The Court of Appeals held that Eleventh Amendment permitted continuation of a desegregation suit against state defendants after a court- approved settlement between plaintiffs and local school defendants; if state had not taken affirmative steps to discharge its duty to dismantle the dual school system, it could be enjoined by federal court. The state was dismissed as a defendant in 1992. Therefore the actual desegregation plan effected Fort Wayne only. Control in Welch & Light, and only entry in ACP was dismissed in 1964 Only entry in ACP was late and not implemented. No press mentions Welch & Light No significant entries in ACP, ProPublica, no press reports No significant entries in ACP, ProPublica. See Press Clippings for description of non-enforcement in Syracuse
$     \begin{array}{r}       17 \\       17 \\       18 \\       18 \\       26 \\       34 \\       34 \\       34 \\       34 \\       34 \\       36 \\$	St. Clair County         Peoria County         Madison County         Madison County         Lake County         Delaware County         Delaware County         Saginaw County         Camden County         Union County         Passaic County         Mercer County         New York County         Niagara County         Onondaga County         Westchester County	East Saint Louis         Peoria         Anderson         Gary         Muncie         Saginaw         Camden         Elizabeth         Paterson         Trenton         New York         Niagara Falls         Syracuse         Yonkers	Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated	Listed as untreated in Welch & Light. Only an ambiguous entry in ACP         Only entry in ACP is a dismissal. No press accounts         Only entry is from ACP (Parents for Quality Education with Integration v. State of Indiana) and does not appear to have ruled against Anderson school specifically and is also not until 1993: The Court of Appeals held that Eleventh Amendment permitted continuation of a desegregation suit against state defendants after a court- approved settlement between plaintiffs and local school defendants; if state had not taken affirmative steps to discharge its duty to dismantle the dual school system, it could be enjoined by federal court. The state was dismissed as a defendant in 1992. Therefore the actual desegregation plan effected Fort Wayne only.         Control in Welch & Light, and only entry in ACP was dismissed in 1964         Only entry in ACP was late and not implemented. No press mentions         Welch & Light         No significant entries in ACP, ProPublica, no press reports         No significant entries in ACP, ProPublica, no press reports         No significant entries in ACP, ProPublica, no press reports         No significant entries in ACP, ProPublica, no press reports         No significant entries in ACP, ProPublica, no press reports         No significant entries in ACP, ProPublica, no press reports         No significant entries in ACP, ProPublica, no press reports         No significant entries in ACP, ProPublica, no press reports         No significant entries in ACP, ProPublica, no press reports         No significant entries in ACP, ProPublica. Se
$     \begin{array}{r}       17 \\       17 \\       18 \\       18 \\       18 \\       26 \\       34 \\       34 \\       34 \\       34 \\       34 \\       36 \\       36 \\       36 \\       36 \\       36 \\       36 \\       39 \\       \end{array} $	St. Clair CountyPeoria CountyPeoria CountyMadison CountyMadison CountyLake CountyDelaware CountyDelaware CountySaginaw CountyCamden CountyUnion CountyPassaic CountyMercer CountyMercer CountyNew York CountyNiagara CountyNiagara CountyOnondaga CountyWestchester CountyStark County	East Saint Louis         Peoria         Anderson         Gary         Muncie         Saginaw         Camden         Elizabeth         Paterson         Trenton         New York         Niagara Falls         Syracuse         Yonkers         Canton	Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated	Lasted as untreated in Welch & Light. Only an ambiguous entry in ACP         Only entry in ACP is a dismissal. No press accounts         Only entry is from ACP (Parents for Quality Education with Integration v. State of Indiana) and does not appear to have ruled against Anderson school specifically and is also not until 1993: The Court of Appeals held that Eleventh Amendment permitted continuation of a desegregation suit against state defendants after a court- approved settlement between plaintiffs and local school defendants; if state had not taken affirmative steps to discharge its duty to dismantle the dual school system, it could be enjoined by federal court. The state was dismissed as a defendant in 1992. Therefore the actual desegregation plan effected Fort Wayne only.         Control in Welch & Light, and only entry in ACP was dismissed in 1964         Only entry in ACP was late and not implemented. No press mentions         Welch & Light         No significant entries in ACP, ProPublica, no press reports         No significant entries in ACP, ProPublica, no press reports         No significant entries in ACP, ProPublica, no press reports         No significant entries in ACP, ProPublica, no press reports         No significant entries in ACP, ProPublica, no press reports         No significant entries in ACP, ProPublica, no press reports         No significant entries in ACP, ProPublica, no press reports         No significant entries in ACP, ProPublica, no press reports         Welch & Light         Some desegregation activity detailed in Press Clippings for description of non-enforcement
$     \begin{array}{r}       17 \\       17 \\       17 \\       18 \\       18 \\       26 \\       34 \\       34 \\       34 \\       34 \\       34 \\       34 \\       34 \\       36 \\       36 \\       36 \\       36 \\       36 \\       36 \\       36 \\       39 \\$	St. Clair CountyPeoria CountyPeoria CountyMadison CountyLake CountyDelaware CountyDelaware CountySaginaw CountyCamden CountyUnion CountyPassaic CountyMercer CountyMercer CountyNew York CountyNiagara CountyNiagara CountyOnondaga CountyWestchester CountyStark CountyButler County	East Saint Louis         Peoria         Anderson         Gary         Muncie         Saginaw         Camden         Elizabeth         Paterson         Trenton         New York         Niagara Falls         Syracuse         Yonkers         Canton         Hamilton	Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated Untreated	<ul> <li>Listed as untreated in Welch &amp; Light. Only an ambiguous entry in ACP</li> <li>Only entry in ACP is a dismissal. No press accounts</li> <li>Only entry is from ACP (Parents for Quality Education with Integration v. State of Indiana) and does not appear to have ruled against Anderson school specifically and is also not until 1993: The Court of Appeals held that Eleventh Amendment permitted continuation of a desegregation suit against state defendants after a court-approved settlement between plaintiffs and local school defendants; if state had not taken affirmative steps to discharge its duty to dismantle the dual school system, it could be enjoined by federal court. The state was dismissed as a defendant in 1992. Therefore the actual desegregation plan effected Fort Wayne only.</li> <li>Control in Welch &amp; Light, and only entry in ACP was dismissed in 1964</li> <li>Only entry in ACP was late and not implemented. No press mentions</li> <li>Welch &amp; Light</li> <li>No significant entries in ACP, ProPublica, no press reports</li> <li>No significant entries in ACP, ProPublica, no press reports</li> <li>No significant entries in ACP, ProPublica, no press reports</li> <li>No significant entries in ACP, ProPublica, no press reports</li> <li>No significant entries in ACP, ProPublica, no press reports</li> <li>No significant entries in ACP, ProPublica, no press reports</li> <li>No significant entries in ACP, ProPublica, no press reports</li> <li>Welch &amp; Light</li> <li>Some desegregation activity detailed in Press Clippings, but no entries in ACP or ProPublica</li> <li>No significant entries in ACP, ProPublica. See Press Clippings for description of non-enforcement in Syracuse</li> <li>Welch &amp; Light</li> <li>No significant entries in ACP, ProPublica, no press reports</li> <li>Welch &amp; Light</li> <li>No significant entries in ACP, ProPublica, no press reports</li> <li>Welch &amp; Light</li> <li>No significant entries in ACP, ProPublica, no press reports</li> <li>Welch &amp; Light</li> <li>No significant entries in ACP, ProPubl</li></ul>
$     \begin{array}{r}       17 \\       17 \\       18 \\       18 \\       18 \\       26 \\       34 \\       34 \\       34 \\       34 \\       34 \\       34 \\       36 \\       36 \\       36 \\       36 \\       36 \\       39 \\$	St. Clair CountyPeoria CountyPeoria CountyMadison CountyMadison CountyLake CountyDelaware CountyDelaware CountySaginaw CountyCamden CountyUnion CountyPassaic CountyMercer CountyMercer CountyNew York CountyNiagara CountyNiagara CountyOnondaga CountyWestchester CountyStark CountyButler CountyLorain County	East Saint Louis         Peoria         Anderson         Gary         Muncie         Saginaw         Camden         Elizabeth         Paterson         Trenton         New York         Niagara Falls         Syracuse         Yonkers         Canton         Hamilton         Lorain	Untreated Untreated	Listed as untreated in Welch & Light. Only an ambiguous entry in ACP         Only entry in ACP is a dismissal. No press accounts         Only entry is from ACP (Parents for Quality Education with Integration v. State of Indiana) and does not appear to have ruled against Anderson school specifically and is also not until 1993: The Court of Appeals held that Eleventh Amendment permitted continuation of a desegregation suit against state defendants after a court-approved settlement between plaintiffs and local school defendants; if state had not taken affirmative steps to discharge its duty to dismantle the dual school system, it could be enjoined by federal court. The state was dismissed as a defendant in 1992. Therefore the actual desegregation plan effected Fort Wayne only.         Control in Welch & Light, and only entry in ACP was dismissed in 1964         Only entry in ACP was late and not implemented. No press mentions         Welch & Light         No significant entries in ACP, ProPublica, no press reports         No significant entries in ACP, ProPublica, no press reports         No significant entries in ACP, ProPublica, no press reports         No significant entries in ACP, ProPublica, no press reports         No significant entries in ACP, ProPublica, no press reports         No significant entries in ACP, ProPublica, no press reports         No significant entries in ACP, ProPublica, no press reports         No significant entries in ACP, ProPublica. See Press Clippings for description of non-enforcement in Syracuse         Welch & Light       No significant entries in ACP, ProPublica
$     \begin{array}{r}       17 \\       17 \\       17 \\       18 \\       18 \\       26 \\       34 \\       34 \\       34 \\       34 \\       34 \\       34 \\       34 \\       36 \\       36 \\       36 \\       36 \\       36 \\       36 \\       39 \\$	St. Clair CountyPeoria CountyPeoria CountyMadison CountyMadison CountyLake CountyDelaware CountyDelaware CountySaginaw CountyCamden CountyUnion CountyPassaic CountyMercer CountyMercer CountyNew York CountyNiagara CountyNiagara CountyOnondaga CountyWestchester CountyStark CountyButler CountyLorain CountyClark County	East Saint Louis         Peoria         Anderson         Gary         Muncie         Saginaw         Camden         Elizabeth         Paterson         Trenton         New York         Niagara Falls         Syracuse         Yonkers         Canton         Hamilton         Lorain         Springfield	Untreated Untreated	Listed as untreated in Welch & Light. Only an ambiguous entry in ACP         Only entry in ACP is a dismissal. No press accounts         Only entry is from ACP (Parents for Quality Education with Integration v. State of Indiana) and does not appear to have ruled against Anderson school specifically and is also not until 1993: The Court of Appeals held that Eleventh Amendment permitted continuation of a desegregation suit against state defendants after a court- approved settlement between plaintiffs and local school defendants; if state had not taken affirmative steps to discharge its duty to dismantle the dual school system, it could be enjoined by federal court. The state was dismissed as a defendant in 1992. Therefore the actual desegregation plan effected Fort Wayne only.         Control in Welch & Light, and only entry in ACP was dismissed in 1964         Only entry in ACP was late and not implemented. No press mentions         Welch & Light         No significant entries in ACP, ProPublica, no press reports         No significant entries in ACP, ProPublica, no press reports         No significant entries in ACP, ProPublica, no press reports         No significant entries in ACP, ProPublica, no press reports         No significant entries in ACP, ProPublica, no press reports         No significant entries in ACP, ProPublica, no press reports         No significant entries in ACP, ProPublica, no press reports         Welch & Light         Some desegregation activity detailed in Press Clippings, but no entries in ACP or ProPublica         No significant entries in ACP, ProPublica, no press report
$     \begin{array}{r}       17 \\       17 \\       17 \\       18 \\       18 \\       26 \\       34 \\       34 \\       34 \\       34 \\       34 \\       34 \\       34 \\       36 \\       36 \\       36 \\       36 \\       36 \\       39 \\$	St. Clair CountyPeoria CountyPeoria CountyMadison CountyMadison CountyDelaware CountyDelaware CountySaginaw CountyCamden CountyUnion CountyPassaic CountyMercer CountyMercer CountyNiagara CountyNiagara CountyNiagara CountyStark CountyStark CountyLorain CountyLorain CountyMahoning County	East Saint Louis         Peoria         Anderson         Gary         Muncie         Saginaw         Camden         Elizabeth         Paterson         Trenton         New York         Niagara Falls         Syracuse         Yonkers         Canton         Hamilton         Lorain         Springfield         Youngstown	Untreated Untreated	Listed as untreated in Welch & Light. Only an ambiguous entry in ACP Only entry in ACP is a dismissal. No press accounts Only entry is from ACP (Parents for Quality Education with Integration v. State of Indiana) and does not appear to have ruled against Anderson school specifically and is also not until 1993: The Court of Appeals held that Eleventh Amendment permitted continuation of a desegregation suit against state defendants after a court- approved settlement between plaintiffs and local school defendants; if state had not taken affirmative steps to discharge its duty to dismantle the dual school system, it could be enjoined by federal court. The state was dismissed as a defendant in 1992. Therefore the actual desegregation plan effected Fort Wayne only. Control in Welch & Light, and only entry in ACP was dismissed in 1964 Only entry in ACP was late and not implemented. No press mentions Welch & Light No significant entries in ACP, ProPublica, no press reports No significant entries in ACP, ProPublica, no press reports Welch & Light Some desegregation activity detailed in Press Clippings, but no entries in ACP or ProPublica No significant entries in ACP, ProPublica. See Press Clippings for description of non-enforcement in Syracuse Welch & Light No significant entries in ACP, ProPublica, no press reports No significant entries in ACP, ProPublica, no press rep
$     \begin{array}{r}       17 \\       17 \\       17 \\       18 \\       18 \\       26 \\       34 \\       34 \\       34 \\       34 \\       34 \\       34 \\       34 \\       36 \\       36 \\       36 \\       36 \\       36 \\       36 \\       39 \\$	St. Clair CountyPeoria CountyPeoria CountyMadison CountyMadison CountyLake CountyDelaware CountySaginaw CountySaginaw CountyCamden CountyUnion CountyPassaic CountyMercer CountyMercer CountyNiagara CountyNiagara CountyOnondaga CountyWestchester CountyStark CountyButler CountyLorain CountyLorain CountyMahoning CountyErie County	East Saint Louis         Peoria         Anderson         Gary         Muncie         Saginaw         Camden         Elizabeth         Paterson         Trenton         New York         Niagara Falls         Syracuse         Yonkers         Canton         Hamilton         Lorain         Springfield         Youngstown         Erie	Untreated Untreated	Listed as untreated in Welch & Light. Only an ambiguous entry in ACP Only entry in ACP is a dismissal. No press accounts Only entry is from ACP (Parents for Quality Education with Integration v. State of Indiana) and does not appear to have ruled against Anderson school specifically and is also not until 1993: The Court of Appeals held that Eleventh Amendment permitted continuation of a desegregation suit against state defendants after a court- approved settlement between plaintiffs and local school defendants; if state had not taken affirmative steps to discharge its duty to dismantle the dual school system, it could be enjoined by federal court. The state was dismissed as a defendant in 1992. Therefore the actual desegregation plan effected Fort Wayne only. Control in Welch & Light, and only entry in ACP was dismissed in 1964 Only entry in ACP was late and not implemented. No press mentions Welch & Light No significant entries in ACP, ProPublica, no press reports No significant entries in ACP, ProPublica, no press reports Welch & Light No significant entries in ACP, ProPublica, no press reports No significant entries in ACP, P