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The State of School Diversity in the United States

The rich diversity of America’s people is the strength of this nation. Despite research showing that school diversity benefits students, educators, and the community at large, progress toward increased racial and socio-economic diversity in schools has stalled in many communities.\(^1\) Research suggests that racially and socioeconomically isolated schools often have less access to the critical resources and funding needed to ensure that high-quality educational opportunities are provided for all students.\(^2\) This means that students from low-income backgrounds and students of color are less likely than higher income and white peers to have access to the learning experiences and opportunities that prepare them for college and career success.\(^3\) Isolation and its consequences have the potential to result in detrimental effects on the lives of individual students and may have lasting consequences for our democracy.\(^4\)

Scholars have argued that achievement gaps – a term used to describe differences in educational outcomes between students – can be explained at least in part by differences in opportunity driven by inequitable distribution of resources.\(^5\) Research suggests that the achievement gap is most pronounced when schools suffer from both racial and economic isolation of students of color and students from low-income backgrounds.\(^6\) Research also indicates that the lack of resources is the most significant driver of opportunity gaps.\(^7\) Further, some researchers have identified that the gap in test scores between Black and white students was largest in more racially isolated neighborhoods.\(^8\) Additional studies have found that a lack of school diversity can have profound effects on academic achievement and that racial isolation in schools is more predictive of achievement gaps than racial isolation in neighborhoods in the early school years.\(^9\) Taken together, this suggests that achievement gaps, opportunity gaps, and racial isolation in schools may be inextricably intertwined.\(^10\)

In contrast, research suggests that efforts to expand school racial and socioeconomic diversity can yield positive outcomes for students from all backgrounds. School diversity is associated with increased social mobility, civic engagement, academic success, empathy, and understanding.\(^11\) Efforts to increase diversity in schools may also be a cost-effective school improvement strategy that has the potential to improve students’ academic outcomes.\(^12\) For example, Black-white achievement gaps declined significantly during the 1970s and 1980s,\(^13\) which included the time period when schools were actively implementing and enforcing desegregation efforts prior to the 1980s. Further, well designed efforts to improve school diversity can also increase access to critical resources students need to succeed, such as experienced educators and advanced coursework. Some studies suggest that the progress toward school diversity, as well as student opportunity and potential, can be hindered by some school assignment, zoning, enrollment structures, and transportation policies that work in tandem with residential isolation.\(^14\)

In the explanatory statement accompanying P.L. 117-103, the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2022, Congress directed the U.S. Department of Education (Department) to examine and publicly release information on the racial and economic segregation within the United States’ K-12 education systems using data collected by the Department. The explanatory statement also directed the Department to provide technical assistance to school districts regarding the use of school improvement funds under Title I, Part A for transportation to support voluntary school integration efforts. Additionally, the explanatory statement accompanying P.L. 117-328, the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2023, directed the Department to continue the same technical assistance and capacity building support to states and school districts.

In response, this document provides a historical context of racial segregation and desegregation efforts, empirical research on longstanding resource inequity, and information on the value of expanding opportunities for local educational agencies (LEAs) to increase school diversity. This document also uses data collected by the Department to highlight the current state of school diversity, summarizes the ongoing
challenges, and discusses federal opportunities to support state and local efforts to foster diversity in schools and classrooms across the country.

I. Data and Research

The Effects of Brown v. Board of Education Decision

In 1954, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled in Brown v. Board of Education (“the Brown decision”) that segregating students by race, even if physical facilities and educational resources are equal, was unconstitutional. This decision was followed by the passage of a series of federal statutes that addressed and advanced the rights of students to equal education, including the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), and the Emergency School Aid Act, which each in their own ways supported and contributed to the desegregation of schools, including by providing supports and grants to retrain teachers and develop more culturally sustaining programs. More recently, the Supreme Court’s opinions in Parents Involved in Community Schools v. Seattle School District No. 1, 551 U.S. 701 (2007), emphasized the distinction between race-neutral and race-based means for increasing racial diversity in the K-12 context, with Justice Kennedy’s concurrence declaring that the former means are unlikely to “demand strict scrutiny to be found permissible.”

Federal investments slowed in the mid-1970s. Congress passed the Education Amendments of 1972, which included a provision prohibiting funds appropriated for programs governed by the General Education Provisions Act (GEPA) (with the general exception of Impact Aid) from being used for the transportation of students and teachers. In 1974, Congress added to GEPA a prohibition on the use of federal education funds for transportation of students or teachers to overcome racial imbalance, or to carry out a plan of racial desegregation, in any school or school system. Additionally, during the mid-1970s, Congress began including similar prohibitions on the use of funds under the Department’s programs in the Department’s annual appropriations acts (“riders”), a practice that continued through P.L. 115-141, the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2018, but which Congress discontinued beginning with the Fiscal Year (FY) 2019 Appropriations Act.

The 1974 GEPA prohibition remained in effect until it was repealed by P.L. 116-260, the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2021. Congress then repealed the remaining 1972 prohibition in P.L. 117-328, the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2023. The repeal of the GEPA prohibition and the discontinuation of the annual appropriations riders have recently been noted by both House and Senate appropriations committees, which, through report language, have called on the Department to provide technical assistance to the field on the use of school improvement funds under Title I, Part A to pay for transportation to support voluntary school diversity efforts.

Research suggests there have been increasing trends of resegregation in schools, to the point where some schools are even more segregated than they were before being subject to a court-ordered desegregation plan. (See Figure 1.)
The chart above illustrates the time period before and after court oversight on school desegregation efforts. In the time period that the courts maintained oversight over desegregation efforts, segregation in schools declined significantly. When the courts terminated that oversight (beginning at the zero on the x axis), segregation in schools spiked to new highs. The y-axis of the chart demonstrates a measure of segregation. This measure ranges from 0 (schools have no segregation) and 1 (all schools are segregated).


Black students had more equitable access to the school resources and opportunities available to their white peers in the time period between the 1960s through the 1980s; including the years directly following the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the ESEA. Following the passage of the Civil Rights Act and the ESEA, some states changed their school funding formulas, which led to higher per pupil expenditures, smaller class sizes, and improved high school graduation for Black and Latino students. At the height of school desegregation efforts in the 1980s, among 13-year-olds, the achievement gap for Black students had decreased by more than half in reading and nearly half in math (see Figures 2 and 3), suggesting that these efforts may have been associated with improvements in educational outcomes.
Figure 2. Average Reading Scale Scores on the Long-Term Trend National Assessment of Educational Progress for 13-year-olds (1971-2020)


Figure 3 Average Math Scale Scores on the Long-Term Trend National Assessment of Educational Progress (1971-2020)
Some research shows that much of the gains in school diversity that occurred after the Brown decision were reversed by the 1990s. As a result, progress toward integration has significantly slowed for the last four decades, leaving many Black and Latino students racially isolated in schools with a higher likelihood of having fewer resources and opportunities that students need to be successful.

**Racial Isolation in U.S. Public Schools**

In the 1950s, before the Brown decision, white students made up 9 in 10 students enrolled in public schools. Enrollment data from the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) in 2022 indicate that white students now make up less than half (45 percent) of all students enrolled in public schools. While the overall school population has become more racially and ethnically diverse, some research suggests that, between 1991 and 2000, segregation between white students and Black students increased and, between 2000 and 2020, remained unchanged, and that socioeconomic isolation is likely to have increased between 1998 and 2020.

According to federal data, nearly one-third of students attend public schools in which the vast majority of enrolled students (75 percent or more) are students of color (Figure 4). Students of color disproportionately attend schools with a vast majority of students of color: 3 in 5 Black and Latino students and 2 in 5 American Indian/Alaska Native students attend schools where at least 75 percent of students are students of color (Figure 4), whereas about half of white students (46 percent) attend schools in which students of color make up less than 25 percent of the student population.

**Figure 4. Percentage distribution of public elementary and secondary school students, by student's race/ethnicity and percentage of students of color enrolled in the school: Fall 2019**

Racial and economic isolation exists across the country in different types of school communities. Research shows that, even when Black and Latino families have higher incomes, they are more likely than white
families to live in neighborhoods with higher rates of poverty.33 Racial and economic isolation can be tied to a number of causes, including migration patterns, policy decisions like redlining that resulted in or contributed to neighborhood and community isolation, and parent school enrollment choices.34

Despite research showing the wide-ranging benefits associated with attending racially and socioeconomically integrated schools, isolation in schools continues. Students in socioeconomically diverse schools have higher test scores than students in schools with isolated poverty.35 For example, one study showed that students from low-income backgrounds who were enrolled in schools with lower poverty rates were two years ahead of students from low-income backgrounds enrolled in schools with high poverty rates.36 Research also suggests that racial integration can help reduce achievement gaps.37 This includes research that shows that students attending racially diverse schools have more success in math, science, reading, and language arts than students in racially isolated schools.38 Studies have found that school diversity can improve high school graduation rates for Black and Latino students. In fact, one study showed that, after courts released districts from court-ordered desegregation efforts, the rates at which Black and Latino students left high school before graduation increased in some cases.39

Diverse schools have long-term positive effects on the health of the country, economy, and democracy.40 These effects include providing students with the skills, tools, and the desire to navigate increasingly diverse environments as adults. This is especially important as 96 percent of employers say it is critical for employees to feel comfortable working with people from diverse cultural backgrounds.41 Even more, racially and socioeconomically diverse schools can blunt the rise in hate crimes the country is experiencing by giving students more opportunities to meaningfully interact with and learn from diverse groups of students.42 Integration will ultimately decrease bias and fear.43

Racial Isolation, Resource Inequity, and Opportunity Gaps

Racial isolation among students of color in schools is often paired with concentrated community poverty; that is, such racially isolated schools also serve disproportionate percentages of students living in poverty.44 More specifically, racially isolated schools with majority students of color are often schools with fewer resources than others to support student success.45 This is not true for white students in racially isolated schools. A recent study found that, as Black-white racial segregation increases, total school district revenue decreases in the average Black student’s district relative to the average white student’s district, even after accounting for poverty and other racial differences.46 While federal funds provide critical supports for educators and students, federal dollars have not offset these local inequities. For students, this often translates to fewer academic, extracurricular, and postsecondary opportunities.47 Moreover, racially isolated schools with majority students of color often have fewer of the resources they need to put students on a path toward success, including high-quality and experienced educators, access to advanced courses, and family engagement opportunities.48 Research suggests that the lack of these resources is associated with poorer academic outcomes.49 Desegregation efforts after the Brown decision improved outcomes for Black students, in part, through increased exposure to higher income schools.50

Inequitable school funding has challenged the United States for years, particularly because of the long history of using local property taxes to fund schools. In the most inequitable cases, wealthy neighborhoods can fund schools and high-quality programs, recruit more experienced educators, offer more advanced courses, maintain and provide educationally appropriate and equitable facilities, and better prepare students for college and career success while schools in low-income neighborhoods struggle to educate students with the most need.51 In states with inequitable funding formulas, schools serving more students of color or more students from low-income backgrounds have fewer dollars to support those students.52 For example, some research has shown that districts serving the highest percentage of Black, Latino, or Native American students receive $1,800 less per student than those with fewer students of color.53 However, when accounting for the funding required to address the needs of underserved students, this gap in funding grows
substantially. Some states have worked to address this challenge by creating more equitable school funding formulas.

**Demographic Changes in Neighborhoods**

Redlining and zoning policies also contribute to racially isolated schools and demographic changes in neighborhoods. When the U.S. Supreme Court ruled in 1917 that cities could not explicitly ban Black people from living in white communities, a number of cities replaced their existing policies with economic zoning policies that continue to lead to racially isolated communities a century later. For example, redlining is an illegal practice where lenders avoid providing loans to those living in certain communities because of the race of those living in those communities, and it was institutionalized by the federal government during the New Deal. Although there have been efforts to combat this practice, the effects are longstanding and have led to generational wealth gaps and racially isolated communities and schools that will take significant investments, interagency partnerships, and policy changes to overcome.

In general, most public school students attended their neighborhood schools prior to the expansion of school choice policies in the 1990s. Research suggests school choice policies have contributed to increased racial or economic isolation in schools. The expansion of school choice policies allowed for some families to opt into schools outside of their neighborhood boundaries. A recent study found that families in gentrifying neighborhoods were more likely not to send their children to neighborhood schools when there were other options. In this study, newly relocated families were more likely than longtime residents in gentrifying neighborhoods to send their children to a school other than their neighborhood school. And when newly relocated families did choose a school outside their neighborhood, they often chose a school that served more white students and fewer Black students than their assigned neighborhood schools. This movement of students away from their neighborhood schools contributed to further racial and economic isolation in neighborhood schools.

**Where Students are Most Likely to be Impacted**

The greatest driver of school segregation is between-district segregation. Two-thirds of school segregation is due to segregation between school districts, and one-third is due to segregation within school districts, according to some estimates. District boundaries can be drawn to exclude certain groups of students or protect the resources of other students. A 2022 Government Accountability Office report also found that district secession—where schools sever ties with an existing school district to form a new school district—has resulted in large shifts in the diversity of school districts. The report finds that, compared to districts that remained after such secessions, new school districts on average had roughly three times the share of white students and double the share of Asian students, while these new districts had a decreased share of Black and Latino students. Some research has found that the rate of district secessions has accelerated since 2000, with 73 districts having completed successful secessions, many of which left students of color and students from low-income backgrounds isolated. Few states have laws that provide guardrails for ensuring district secession does not result in racially and economically isolated schools. An analysis of state laws found 30 states have explicit secession policies, and just six of those states require consideration of the effects on racial and economic diversity.

Recent research from The Century Foundation has found that segregation between Black and white students is especially high in metropolitan areas. At the same time, compared to other locales (i.e., cities, suburbs, and towns), rural areas have the highest percentage of white public school enrollment (71 percent), whereas Latino students make up 13 percent of rural enrollment and Black students make up 9 percent of rural enrollment. Research also has found that white students, on average, attend schools with lower poverty rates than the schools that students of color attend, and segregated schools are much more prevalent in
the Northeast. At the height of desegregation efforts in the South, 44 percent of Black students in the South were in majority white schools. That number declined to 23 percent by 2011.72

Transportation

Transportation policy can hinder or expand access to high-quality learning opportunities. Some studies show students from more affluent backgrounds are more likely to travel further distances and benefit from unique school choice programs, including schools that are higher performing and offer specialized programs.73 Travel time and reliability, safety, and cost are all factors that families consider when they have the opportunity to choose a school.74 Therefore, efforts to improve school diversity may depend on accessible and reliable transportation. Expanding eligibility for transportation to and from school has the potential to increase opportunity for students who are otherwise limited to attending the neighborhood school due to proximity and accessibility. However, there are also instances where school diversity does not require significant increases in students’ travel time. Some research suggests that school boundaries are drawn to isolate high-poverty districts, causing two districts near one another to have substantially different demographics.75

Educator Diversity

After the Brown decision, more than 38,000 Black educators lost their jobs. They were dismissed, demoted, or forced to resign.76 As a result, the country suffered the great loss of many experienced, highly credentialed Black educators who worked in segregated Black schools.77 In addition to teachers, in many communities, Black school leaders were also dismissed to prevent Black educators and school leaders from having authority over white teachers and students.78 Today, Black teachers make up only 6 percent79 of the profession in public schools, yet Black people are 14 percent of the U.S. population and 15 percent of the K-12 public school student population.80

The benefits of educator diversity are clear.81 While all students can benefit from educator diversity, research has found that Black students are more likely to graduate from high school and enroll in college when they have at least one Black teacher in elementary school.82 Additional research has found that Black educators are more likely to identify Black students for gifted programs, less likely to suspend or expel Black students, and more likely to set high expectations for Black students.83 Finding effective ways to recruit, prepare, and retain diverse educators is therefore key to supporting better outcomes for students of color.

II. Federal Programs that Can Support State and Local Efforts to Increase School Diversity

Ultimately, zip codes and family income levels must not dictate the quality of education students receive. Therefore, the Department is encouraging states and districts to renew efforts to provide more equitable access to the important resources that make a difference in educational opportunity and outcomes—including high-quality and experienced educators, early childhood education, rigorous coursework, and equitable and adequate school funding.84 In some instances, this can be done through safe and accessible public transportation efforts that address the needs of students of all geographical, socioeconomic, racial, and ethnic backgrounds. Additionally, assessing and identifying strategies around school boundaries and feeder patterns can help to diversify student populations served at a given school.

The Department is committed to leveraging decades of experience and research to advance educational equity and excellence in P-12 education. The following are currently available or proposed federal resources to support states and districts in their efforts to ensure equal access to educational opportunity and increase
the racial and socio-economic diversity of their schools and classrooms to advance equitable access to high-quality education.

**Magnet Schools Assistance Program**

The Magnet Schools Assistance Program under Title IV, Part D of the ESEA provides grants to eligible LEAs or consortia of LEAs to establish and operate magnet schools under a required or voluntary desegregation plan. These grants assist in the desegregation of public schools by supporting the elimination, reduction, and prevention of minority group isolation in elementary and secondary schools with substantial numbers of minority group students. Magnet schools were created to support desegregation efforts by offering a special curriculum and program of study designed to better attract students from different racial backgrounds. With the *Emergency School Aid Act* of 1972, magnet schools expanded across the country as a popular desegregation method in the 1970s.  

**The Augustus F. Hawkins Centers of Excellence Grants**

Increasing the number of educators of color is a key strategy in the Administration’s equity agenda, as well as the Raise the Bar initiative, to improve educational opportunities and outcomes for students of color. Research shows that teachers of color benefit all students and can have a significant impact on students of color. Yet, only one in five public school teachers are people of color, compared to more than half of K-12 public school students who are people of color. Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs), Tribal Colleges and Universities (TCUs), and Minority-Serving Institutions (MSIs), which collectively prepare half of all teachers of color, are ideally positioned to help prepare a new generation of effective, diverse teachers, including teachers of color, for high-need schools. The Department held the first competition for the Augustus F. Hawkins Grant program in 2022, awarding 12 institutions of higher education with $8 million and granting awards to three more institutions with 2023 funds. The Hawkins grant supports HBCU, TCU, and MSI teacher preparation programs to increase the number of well-prepared teacher candidates including teacher candidates of color, in the field. As mentioned above, increasing educator diversity must go hand-in-hand with efforts to increase student diversity in schools. All students should have the opportunity to see themselves in their educators and that our educators reflect the growing diversity of the United States.

**Transportation and the ESEA**

In some cases, school diversity efforts can be enhanced through additional transportation options for students and families. Transportation is a permissible use of funds under the ESEA if it is authorized under specific programs. For that reason, it may be allowable in some circumstances to use certain ESEA funds (described below) to pay for the cost of supplemental transportation (i.e., the cost of transportation over and above what the district would pay to transport students to their neighborhood school) for students to attend schools outside their school attendance area for the purpose of increasing academic achievement through diversity, assuming the cost is reasonable and necessary to operate the program and is otherwise consistent with 2 C.F.R. Part 200.

Specifically, it may be allowable to use funds under Title I, Part A of the ESEA to pay for the additional cost of transporting students to a Title I school implementing a schoolwide program to increase academic achievement by providing access and opportunity for students, if doing so is consistent with the school’s needs assessment. Because transportation would be a necessary cost to support the schoolwide program, the LEA may use Title I, Part A funds to pay for the cost of supplemental transportation.
Similarly, an LEA may use school improvement funds under section 1003 of the ESEA for the supplemental cost of transporting students to a school identified for comprehensive, targeted, or additional targeted support and improvement in order to increase academic achievement through school diversity, if doing so is consistent with the school’s support and improvement plan. For example, if an LEA decides to use school diversity as a school improvement strategy (e.g., transforming a high school to a magnet school), the LEA may use school improvement funds to provide supplemental transportation to students across a geographically expansive district so that the school demographics better reflect the diversity of the geographic area.

It is generally not allowable, however, to use Title I, Part A or section 1003 funds to transport a student out of a Title I school, or a school identified for comprehensive, targeted, or additional targeted support and improvement, with limited exceptions described below.

Under ESEA section 1111(d)(1)(D), an LEA may, but is not required to, provide all students enrolled in a comprehensive support and improvement school with the option to transfer to another public school served by the LEA, prioritizing the lowest-achieving children from low-income families. An LEA that chooses to provide this option to families may use up to 5 percent of its Title I, Part A allocation to provide transportation to the students transferring out of comprehensive support and improvement schools. Further, a state may reserve up to 3 percent of its Title I, Part A funds to award funds to certain LEAs to provide direct student supports under section 1003A of the ESEA. An LEA that receives section 1003A funds may offer students enrolled in a comprehensive support and improvement school the opportunity to enroll in a school that is not identified for comprehensive support and improvement and use 1003A funds to provide the necessary transportation.

In addition, an LEA may be able to use its Title I, Part A funds to cover the supplemental costs of transporting students beyond their school attendance area to support district-wide diversity efforts in order to increase the academic achievement of low-achieving students if: (1) all of the schools in the LEA are Title I schools or (2) the LEA uses state and local funds to cover the costs of paying to transport students who live in a Title I school attendance area to non-Title I schools.

**Fostering Diverse Schools Program**

The Administration’s budget proposal for Fostering Diverse Schools program would address the well-documented, persistent negative effects of socioeconomic isolation by supporting voluntary efforts to increase school diversity in preschool through grade 12. The Administration requested $100 million for the program in its FY 2024 budget request. The program would make competitive awards to districts and states that have significant achievement gaps and socioeconomic isolation within or across districts and would require applicants to demonstrate strong student, family, educator, and community involvement in their plans. Program funds would support planning grants and, for applicants with well-designed plans, implementation grants to carry out activities in those plans, including, for example, a variety of school enrollment policies that promote diversity and opportunity in schools.

**Title IV, Part A**

Title IV, Part A funds may be used to increase student diversity in Title IV, Part A-funded programs by covering the supplemental cost of transportation. For example, an LEA may fund a science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM) program for students in district schools with Title IV, Part A funds, consistent with section 4107 of the ESEA (activities to support well rounded educational opportunities) and the LEA’s local needs assessment. The LEA may determine that increasing diversity in the STEM program
would improve the quality of the program and student academic achievement and use Title IV, Part A funds for student transportation to increase the diversity of students participating in the STEM program in individual schools.

To begin efforts to improve school diversity, the Department recently announced a first-time investment in the Fostering Diverse Schools Demonstration Grants program using funds reserved for technical assistance and capacity building under the Title IV, Part A program, which will support competitive grants to LEAs, consortia of LEAs, or one or more LEAs in partnership with a state educational agency (SEA) to provide students with access to a well-rounded education and improve school conditions for student learning by developing or implementing, and making publicly available as a resource for other LEAs and SEAs, comprehensive plans for increasing school socioeconomic diversity in preschool through grade 12.

**Conclusion**

All students benefit from attending racially and socioeconomically diverse schools. In addition to benefiting individual students, the academic, social, and emotional gains benefit the country. The Biden-Harris Administration remains committed to investing in programs and practices that will help all students succeed, including fostering greater access to educational opportunity and increasing school diversity.
Endnotes

15 Brown v. Bd. of Educ. of Topeka, Shawnee County, Kan., et al, 347 U.S. 483, 495 (1954) (“We conclude that in the field of public education the doctrine of ‘separate but equal’ has no place. Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal…We hold that the plaintiffs and others similarly situated … are…deprived of the equal protection of the laws guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment [of the U.S. Constitution].”)
16 P.L. 88-352, July 2, 1964; 78 Stat. 241
17 P.L. 89-10, April 11, 1965; 79 Stat. 27.
20 Parents Involved in Cmty. Sch. v. Seattle Sch. Dist. No. 1, 551 U.S. 701, 789 (2007) (Kennedy, J., concurring); see also id. at 745 (Roberts, C.J., joined by Scalia, Thomas, and Alito, JJ.) (plurality recognizing that “different considerations” are in play when a court evaluates actions seeking to “achie[ve] greater racial diversity” that are race neutral rather than based on “explicit racial classifications”).
21 P.L. 93-380, § 252, Aug. 21, 1974; 88 Stat.519
31 U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data (CCD), "State Nonfiscal Survey of Public Elementary and Secondary Education," 1995-96 through 2020-21 and 2021-22 Preliminary; and National Elementary and Secondary Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity Projection Model, through 2030. (This table was prepared July 2022.)


57 For example, the Biden-Harris Administration has an initiative to address redlining. See, https://www.justice.gov/opa/pr/justice-department-announces-new-initiative-combat-redlining


Although the Emergency School Aid Act was repealed in 1979, federal support for magnet schools as a tool for desegregation was resurrected in 1984 by the Education for Economic Security Act.
