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INTRODUCTION

Over the last decade, educators and entrepreneurs have created a new kind of charter school that prioritizes enrolling and serving a diverse array of students. These “diverse-by-design” schools use the charter school mechanism to not only counter the increased segregation among public schools, but also to intentionally bring those students together across race, ethnicity, class, and ability.

Since 2016, Teachers College has been leading a study of 46 such schools across several regions in California, Colorado, and New York. Working with over a dozen researchers across the country, we have used a combination of quantitative and qualitative data—including discipline and achievement data, interviews, focus groups, classroom observations, and surveys—to examine the practices and outcomes of these diverse-by-design charter schools.

What we have found is that in their results and in their approaches, diverse-by-design charter schools may hold promise for increasing integration between students of different racial, ethnic, and socioeconomic backgrounds. As much other research has demonstrated, promoting integrated schooling spaces may improve various behavioral, social, and academic outcomes for all students. If supported and cultivated appropriately, the direct impact that these diverse-by-design charter schools have on their students and families could, over time, have positive ripple effects that transform their surrounding communities and future generations.

To help policymakers, practitioners, philanthropists, and others optimize the impact and influence of these diverse-by-design charter schools, this paper will summarize some of the ways in which these schools are outperforming their local district schools. We will also illustrate some of the practices that these diverse-by-design schools engage in that may account for these results.

First and foremost, these schools are so far achieving their mission of serving a more diverse array of students than those schools in surrounding neighborhoods. By and large, they are helping those students learn at higher levels than they might otherwise have achieved if they had attended their local district school, especially in English language arts, and with far fewer chronic absences and suspensions. And in the few diverse-by-design schools that have been around long enough, their Black and Latinx students graduate at rates exceeding that of their peers in nearby district schools.

Although all diverse-by-design charter schools seek in some way to recruit and enroll an intentionally diverse array of students, they vary in what they do once students walk through their doors—or, during the pandemic, log onto their virtual classrooms. Some work hard to ensure that students interact and integrate with peers who are different from them in background, culture, or ability, and to build a deep sense of community and belonging through advisories, extra-curricular activities, and other means. Many of our sample schools have begun to replace exclusionary, punitive forms of discipline with alternative, inclusive disciplinary approaches such as restorative justice. And to connect their mission and their diverse student body with their curriculum and instruction, a subset of these schools are using culturally responsive pedagogy. Most are teaching students proactively about identity and bias; some are ensuring that diverse identities, perspectives, and backgrounds are represented in school texts and curriculum; and a few are providing or facilitating professional development on anti-bias teaching.

Together, these practices and outcomes make diverse-by-design charter schools worthy of further exploration and investment. Although they are still adjusting and refining their approaches, their early progress may point toward ways that our nation’s schools can better serve diverse groups of students by intentionally integrating them.
Diverse-by-design charter schools have emerged on the educational landscape. They seek to counter a pattern of increasing segregation that has persisted despite the rise of school choice, and despite research showing that integrated schools lead to better academic and social outcomes. In addition to enrolling students from more diverse backgrounds, to achieve their mission of greater integration, these diverse-by-design charter schools also work proactively to build community across myriad student and family cultures, counter racial disproportionality in student discipline, and ensure that their instruction and curriculum advance their academic and social goals of equity and inclusion.

**Public School Segregation and the Emergence of Charter Schools**

Over the last several decades, America’s public schools have grown more diverse but also more segregated—particularly in urban areas. For the first time in United States history, the majority of public school students are children of color, mostly driven by decreases in the number and percent of White students and increases in the share who are Latinx. Despite this increasing diversity, students rarely experience this. They are more often surrounded by others of their own race, ethnicity, and socioeconomic status. More than three-quarters of Black and Latinx students attend schools that are majority non-White, and nearly half attend “intensely segregated schools” with less than 10% White students. This often corresponds to a second form of segregation, as most Black and Latinx students attend schools with almost double the share of low-income students than do White and Asian students. Meanwhile, the typical White student attends a school where three-quarters of their peers are White.

In many urban areas, segregation in schools has increased, finds Wichita State University professor Chase Billingham: “As the levels of African American and Hispanic students have increased and as the share of White students has decreased in cities nationwide since 1990, White and non-White students have increasingly come to attend different schools, not just across neighboring districts in the same metropolitan areas, but across schools within the school districts of the nation’s central cities.”

In the last 25 years, public charter schools have emerged to offer families a greater variety of choices. In the 2000–2001 school year, only one percent of U.S. students were educated in charter schools, yet by 2016–2017, over six percent of students, or 3.1 million students, were educated in one of 6,900 charters. While many charter schools have been created to give low-income students and students of color a better educational option than their neighborhood district-run school, many of these schools—particularly in urban areas—tend to be even more segregated than the neighborhood district-run schools. Some research has shown that three-quarters of Black charter school students attend intensely segregated charter schools, twice as many as the share in traditional public schools, and half of Latinx charter school students attend racially isolated schools, where they are unlikely to encounter many students of other races. This segregation is further perpetuated and exacerbated by the word-of-mouth way that families often hear about charter school options, the tendency of families to choose schools whose communities resemble their own, and the pedagogical preferences of different parent populations.

This trend is even more troubling in the face of research that repeatedly shows that segregation has negative effects on students, and that integration can have a positive impact. Segregated schools may face greater student mobility and fewer proficient students, and high-poverty schools tend to have lower test score, completion rates, and college attendance rates, along with higher expulsion rates. For example, a 2005 Teachers College Record study using longitudinal data across a sample of high schools found that “the average socioeconomic level of students’ schools had as much impact on their achievement growth as their own socioeconomic status” and that “the effects of socioeconomic segregation can largely
be explained by its association with such school characteristics as academic climate and teacher expectations.”

Conversely, integrated schools can benefit all students who attend them, regardless of socioeconomic status (SES) or ethnicity. Diverse schools tend to have lower dropout rates, increased achievement and graduation rates, and positive relationships between groups of students. “Attending racially diverse schools is beneficial to all students and is associated with smaller test score gaps between students of different racial backgrounds, not because White student achievement declined, but rather that black and/or Hispanic student achievement increased,” say Amy Stuart Wells, Lauren Fox, and Diana Cordova-Cobo of Teachers College Columbia. Integrated schools have also been found to counter discriminatory attitudes amongst students and to lead to more tolerant adults.

Moving Toward Integration: Diverse-by-Design Charter Schools

Increasingly, based on these findings and pressure from parent groups, policymakers and educators have begun to contemplate ways of fostering greater integration in schools. Some cities and districts have attempted to address economic segregation through school assignment categories: over the last decade, more school districts across the country have relied on income-based categories as part of their school assignment procedures, which accounted for roughly 8 percent of all public school students in 2016.

To counteract segregation found in the charter school sector, diverse-by-design charter schools have emerged in the last decade. These intentionally integrated public schools of choice—defined as those without a 70% majority of any race or ethnicity and with low-income students representing 30–70% of the student body—seek to achieve more equitable student outcomes as well as to foster greater equity, inclusion, and tolerance among students and communities. Nearly 200 intentionally diverse charter schools serving over 60,000 students have joined the Diverse Charter Schools Coalition since its founding in 2013. “The charter school movement is uniquely positioned to lead innovation in [school integration] and demonstrate both the feasibility and benefit of an integrated learning model—even in areas where public schools are constrained by residential segregation,” note Richard D. Kahlenberg and Halley Potter of The Century Foundation.

As befits their name and philosophy, these diverse-by-design charter schools are far from monolithic, with varying definitions of diversity, missions, and academic models developed to serve a range of communities, parent preferences, and student needs.
Fostering Integration Within Intentionally Diverse Charter Schools

Diverse-by-design charter school leaders have found that they cannot simply attempt to enroll a more diverse student body and assume equitable outcomes will follow. Integration is not that straightforward. It requires school leaders, teachers, and staff to attend in proactive and thoughtful ways to family and student engagement, to discipline, and to curriculum and instruction.

Given their mission of diversity and inclusiveness, these diverse-by-design schools find they must focus even more than other schools on creating a sense of community where all students feel safe and included. Research has shown that students’ engagement in school yields positive health outcomes in adulthood as well as gains in academic achievement. Diverse-by-design charter schools must work even harder than traditional schools to make a wide variety of students, families, and educators—who often come together from distant neighborhoods, racial groups, and socio-economic backgrounds—feel welcome and engaged.

Many of these schools also find they must consider approaches to discipline that reinforce that sense of belonging in an equitable way. Exclusionary discipline practices like in-school and out-of-school suspensions can threaten the sense that the school is an integrated, inclusive community and can undermine a student’s sense of belonging, by making membership in the classroom and school community conditional upon following rules that students and parents may find arbitrary and that are enforced inconsistently by the school. Nationally, exclusionary discipline is disproportionately applied to students of color, especially Black students, who make up about 15% of students enrolled in the U.S. public education system but account for 40% of students who received one or more out of school suspensions, according to the federal Civil Rights Data Collection. Racial disproportionality in school discipline is a well-documented problem, particularly among Black students, with serious implications for student achievement, cognitive and non-cognitive development among students, and long-term workforce outcomes.

One emerging alternative to these discipline practices is restorative justice, an approach that originated in indigenous cultures of the South Pacific and Americas, which emphasizes the offender’s accountability for the harm they caused, along with repairing affected parties’ hurt and restoring the offender to acceptance. Restorative justice focuses on nurturing healthy relationships, building processes to repair harm and conflict, and supporting learning environments characterized by justice and equity. The National Centre for Restorative Approaches in Youth Settings defines restorative justice as an approach to behavior “which puts repairing harm done to relationships and people over and above the need for assigning blame and dispensing punishment” and “shifts the emphasis from managing behavior to focusing on the building, nurturing and repairing of relationships.” Although many high-performing charter schools first embraced strict “no excuses” approaches to student discipline, many have begun experimenting with restorative justice approaches, including a number of diverse-by-design charter schools—but not all, as we will explore in later sections.

Finally, there is the business of teaching; diverse-by-design schools must consider how to ensure their instruction and curriculum reinforce their mission of integration and inclusiveness. To do this, many have turned to culturally responsive pedagogy, an approach to teaching that proactively addresses student identity and embeds anti-bias principles into student learning. Culturally relevant pedagogy challenges deficit narratives by centering and valuing the experiences and knowledge of diverse students. “Culturally relevant teachers utilize students’ culture as a vehicle for learning,” says Gloria Ladson-Billings, the scholar who has defined this approach. “In the classrooms of culturally relevant teachers, students are expected to ‘engage the world and others critically.’”

In these ways, diverse-by-design charter schools have responded to the increasing diversity and segregation of our public schools by bringing together intentionally diverse groups and attempting to educate them in welcoming, integrated communities, using culturally responsive techniques to teach them and restorative justice approaches to remedy conflict, so as to foster a sense of competence, inclusion, and belonging. Their hope is that these practices will lead to more equitable outcomes. So how are these schools doing against that goal, and what might we learn about how they are accomplishing those outcomes? This will be the focus of our next sections.
METHODOLOGY

This study used a mixed-methods (quantitative and qualitative) design to explore the outcomes and practices of 46 diverse-by-design charter schools. These schools were dispersed across five cities in three states: California (Los Angeles, San Diego, and the San Francisco Bay Area), Colorado (Denver), and New York (New York City).

All sample schools were located in metropolitan areas, and in districts serving students primarily from minority and low-income communities. We selected charter schools that met the following criteria:

- Schools that had been in operation for at least three years as of 2016–17,
- Schools that are members of the Diverse Charter Schools Coalition, and
- Schools with an explicit commitment to diversity and integration in their mission statements.

Some schools were part of charter school management organizations (CMOs) while others were independently run. Most of these schools were oversubscribed and used a lottery or similar process for student admission.

Geographic Data and Context

In our examination of academic and behavioral outcomes across all jurisdictions, we controlled for student demographics including race, free lunch eligibility, and grade level, as older students are more likely to be absent and experience discipline problems. However, there was significant variation across the state and district contexts in which these diverse-by-design charter schools operate, including available data, student demographics, education policies, and charter school landscape.

California

In California, more than 6 million students are enrolled in the state’s 10,000 public K–12 schools. Despite the state’s size, it provides its schools with below-average per-pupil funding despite a complex student population where about one-fifth are English language learners and one-fifth are poor, which has led to lackluster outcomes, particularly in urban areas (see below). What’s more, “California is the most segregated [state] for Latinos, where 58% attend intensely segregated schools, and the typical Latino student is in a school with only 15% White classmates,” note researchers at The Civil Rights Project.

Within the wider sample of 46 schools, we visited 26 to conduct a total of 101 interviews with administrative staff, school leaders, and teachers; 40 focus groups with educators; and site visits that included 61 classroom observations in 4th, 8th, and 11th grades. We also administered parent and teacher surveys in 21 of the schools with a response rate of 60% from teachers and 20% of parents.

In California, we were unable to obtain access to longitudinal student-level data and so relied on publicly available school-level information on demographics, proficiency, discipline, and graduation. To compare chronic absenteeism and discipline in diverse-by-design charter schools with other public schools in the state, we relied on school-level data from the California Department of Education and the Civil Rights Data Collection. It is also worth noting that California was the only state that had graduation data due to longevity of school operations, with some of its oldest diverse-by-design charter schools serving high school students.

Several diverse-by-design charter schools operate in the San Francisco Bay Area, south of the city in the suburban San Mateo and Santa Clara counties, as well as in the far South and East Bay areas. In 2016–2017, Santa Clara County was home to more than 280,000 students in 410 K–12 schools, more than a third of whom were eligible for free- or reduced-price lunch and 60,000 of whom were English language learners. Nearly 40% of students were Latinx, 30% were Asian, and 20% were White, while just 2% were Black. That year, San Mateo County enrolled nearly 100,000 students in 177 schools, also with about a third of students eligible for free- or reduced-price lunch and with 20,000 English language learners. Like Santa Clara County, nearly 40% of students were Latinx, but nearly 30% were White and only
15% were Asian, and here also just 2% were Black. Despite this overall diversity, many of the communities in San Mateo and Santa Clara counties are racially segregated. The racial achievement gap is as wide here as it is in many cities: 67% of White students and 59% of Asian and Pacific Islander students in San Mateo county met college readiness requirements in 2017 compared with just 39% of Latinx students; in Santa Clara county, 75% of Asian and Pacific Islander students and 67% of White students did so, compared with 34% of Latinx students there.

Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) is the nation’s second largest school district, serving nearly 600,000 K–12 students in around 1000 schools. The vast majority of LAUSD students are societal minorities; about three-quarters are Latinx, nearly 8% are Black, and 10% are White. Nearly 80% qualify for free- or reduced-price lunch. As in other cities, fewer than half of the students perform at grade level: in 2016–17, just 40% of LAUSD students met or exceeded the standard in English language arts (ELA) and not quite 30% did so in math.

The city’s public charter school enrollment is the highest in the country, with over 150,000 students, and includes 51 “affiliated” charter schools operated by LAUSD and 229 “independent” charter schools authorized by the LAUSD Board of Education but governed by outside organizations. Charter schools in LAUSD serve students with similar racial and ethnic demographics to non-charter schools in the district. In 2018–19, charter school students in LAUSD outperformed their non-charter counterparts, with 53% meeting or exceeding grade-level standards in ELA and 41% in math.

Just a little further south, San Diego Unified School District (SDUSD) serves more than 120,000 K–12 students. As in Los Angeles, the vast majority of SDUSD students are societal minorities, with about half of students identifying as Latinx, nearly a quarter White, and roughly 8% Black and the same proportion Asian or two or more races. In 2016–17, 56% of SDUSD students met or exceeded the standard in English language arts (ELA) and 46% did so in math.

SDUSD charter schools serve over 20,000 students. Charter schools serve higher percentages of Latinx (57.3%) and Black students (11.6%) and lower percentages of Asian (3.6%), Filipino (2.6%), and White (18%) students than the district overall. In 2018–19, charter school students in SDUSD underperformed their non-charter counterparts, with 49% meeting or exceeding grade-level standards in ELA and 36% in math.

Colorado

In Colorado, roughly 900,000 elementary and secondary age students were enrolled in Colorado’s 1,914 schools. Of the state’s 178 school districts, 146 are classified as rural yet serve only 15% of the state’s student population. The vast majority of students in Colorado attend urban school districts along the state’s Front Range. Around half of all students in Colorado are White, while roughly one-third are Latinx. Furthermore, the state has steadily increased funding for education in recent years, spending an average of $8,480 per pupil during the most recent school year. As of 2016, Colorado ranked behind only the District of Columbia and Arizona among all states for the highest percentage of students enrolled in charter schools, with roughly 12% of Colorado students attending a charter school.

Unlike in California, in Colorado we were able to mine rich student-level administrative data on student demographics and outcomes, including test scores, attendance, course taking, discipline, and graduation. We were also able to use attendance data for students who had applied to diverse-by-design charter schools (including those who were not admitted and attended other schools instead) to compare rates of chronic absenteeism.

Denver, the state’s largest city and capital, is home to over 90,000 public school students and more charter schools than any other city in the state. In Colorado, local school districts are charged with authorizing charter schools, and in 2017 Denver Public Schools (DPS) authorized 59 charter schools, or roughly one-quarter of all DPS schools. According to a 2017 district report, 85% of the students enrolled in charter schools were students of color compared to 72% in district-run schools. Similarly, 50% of students enrolled in Denver charter schools were categorized as English Language Learners compared to 35% in district-run schools. In 2015–16, students at charter schools slightly outpaced those in district-run schools on state tests, with 39% of charter students meeting or exceeding expectations in English Language Arts and 30% in Math, compared to 37% and 29% in district-run schools, respectively.
New York

In the state of New York, more than 2.5 million students attend over 4,700 K–12 public schools (including 349 charter schools), with about three times as many students statewide attending private religious or independent schools than public charter schools (but many of those choosing non-district options residing in New York City). About 43% of these students are White, 27% are Latinx, 17% are Black, and about 10% are Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander. Statewide, the number of White and Black students has been declining, while the number of Latinx and Asian students has been increasing, particularly outside of New York City.

Educational inequity has been on the rise as enrollment demographics have shifted. Despite higher per-pupil spending than any other state, New York also has the second highest inequality in spending between wealthy and poor districts in the country and ranks 44th in the country by measure of the funding gap between the districts enrolling the most students of color and those enrolling the fewest. “A massive 51% of the state’s children qualify for free- or reduced-price lunch and 21% live below the poverty line, with many of these students living in concentrated poverty in districts where nearly every family is poor,” notes the New York Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. “Lack of resources creates proficiency challenges among our poorest students in our poorest school districts, most of whom are students of color, robbing them of their rights to a minimally adequate ‘sound basic education’ as well as the ability to participate meaningfully in the society at large.”

In New York, as in Colorado, we were able to rely upon rich student-level administrative data on student demographics and outcomes, including test scores, attendance, course taking, discipline, and graduation. As with Colorado, we also used student-level demographic and attendance data for applicants to diverse-by-design charter schools to compare chronic absenteeism of those who were admitted with those attending other schools. As in California, we used the Civil Rights Data Collection to explore school-level suspension rates.

New York City is the largest school district in the U.S. There are more than 1800 public schools with a total enrollment of over 1 million students. NYC public school students are extremely diverse: 74% qualify for free- or reduced-price lunch and about a third are Black and more than 40% are Latinx, with just 12% White and 13% Asian. City schools have a graduation rate of 75.9% but only 40% of students are proficient in math and 38% in English language arts (ELA).

The city’s charter school enrollment is also high with 111,805 students, ranking it as the second largest number of charter school students by district in the country and giving charters a 10% market share. Charter schools in NYC serve similar proportions of Black (51%), Latinx (40%), and low-income students (79%), but far fewer White (4%) students than traditional public schools. However, NYC charters tout higher test scores than traditional public schools; 63.2% demonstrated proficiency in math and 57.3% in ELA. In addition, NYC charter students living in poverty outperform their wealthier peers in traditional public schools in math and are on par with them in reading; likewise, Black and Latinx students in NYC charter schools outperform their peers in traditional schools in both reading and math.
In our review of data from the 46 established diverse-by-design charter schools that we included from across California, Colorado, and New York, we found that compared with nearby district schools, diverse-by-design charter schools:

- Enroll more racially and socioeconomically diverse student bodies,
- Have lower chronic absenteeism and suspension rates, particularly among students of color, and
- Have mixed academic outcomes but generally do better in English language arts and have better graduation rates for students of color.

More Diversity

In three out of the five jurisdictions we studied, diverse-by-design charter schools enrolled more diverse student bodies than comparison schools, as measured by the diversity index. This index used student race/ethnicity to illustrate the probability that any two students chosen at random from a school will be of a different race/ethnicity. Thus, higher diversity index values indicate more racial integration. Using this measure, the diverse-by-design charter schools we studied were more integrated than comparison schools.

Diversity Index for Sample and Comparison Schools, 2016/17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diversity Index</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>New York*</th>
<th>Colorado†</th>
<th>California‡</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sample DBD</td>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>Sample DBD</td>
<td>Comparison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity Index</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUDENT RACE/ETHNICITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latinx</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other†</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRPL</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Schools</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3,063</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,611</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The table reports mean percentage of respective variables for sample and comparison schools in each jurisdiction for 2016–17.

* Comparison schools are schools within a 5-mile radius of sample schools. Includes students in grades K–12. Enrollment share by subgroup equals more than 100 because of rounding error.

† Comparison schools are all schools attended by DBD lottery applicants not admitted to a DBD. Comparison schools include traditional public schools and charter schools.

‡ Includes American Indian and Alaska Native; Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander; Two or more races.

We also assessed whether the schools in our sample had 40–50% of enrolled students qualify for free- or reduced-price lunch, which was similar to the thresholds set by multiple schools in the sample (and in the middle of the 30–70% target range set by researchers), and if they had no racial majority group exceeding 50% of enrolled students. About half of all diverse-by-design charter school students qualified for free- or reduced-price lunch, which is lower than comparison schools. The greatest difference between diverse-by-design schools and comparison schools was in the share of White students, which was 13 percentage points higher in our sample; the shares of Black and Asian students were lower than comparison schools and roughly equivalent for Latinx students.
However, there was considerable variation across states, given the different demographic contexts in which these schools operate:

- In relation to comparison schools, New York’s diverse-by-design charter schools enrolled slightly greater shares of Black students, nearly three times the share of White students, and about half the share of Latinx and Asian students, as well as lower shares of students who qualify for free- or reduced-price lunch (74% vs 48%).
- Colorado’s diverse-by-design charter schools enrolled slightly greater shares of Black, Asian, and White students, and therefore lower Latinx student enrollment (56% versus 65% in comparison schools), and very similar levels of students eligible for free- or reduced-price lunch (70% vs 74%).

In California, just as in Colorado, Latinx students represent the largest subgroup of students, and in both states the share of Latinx students enrolled in diverse-by-design charter schools was 9 points lower. California’s diverse-by-design charter schools also enrolled much higher shares of White students (30% vs 16%)—driven mostly by schools in Los Angeles and the San Francisco Bay Area—and slightly lower shares of Asian and Black students than comparison schools. As in New York, diverse-by-design schools in California enrolled much lower shares of students who qualify for free- or reduced-price lunch than comparison schools (43% vs 63%).

**Stronger Attendance and Discipline Outcomes**

The diverse-by-design charter schools we studied generally have lower chronic absenteeism and lower suspension rates than comparison schools.

In all five jurisdictions, the chronic absenteeism rates were significantly lower for Latinx students, and significantly lower for Black students in four of the five jurisdictions. In some jurisdictions, some subgroups fare better than others, such as in Denver where Latinx students are less likely to be chronically absent than in comparison schools, and the same for Black students in Los Angeles’ diverse-by-design charter schools, and Black and Latinx students alike in New York City. In the San Francisco Bay Area and San Diego, all groups are less likely to be chronically absent, with the exception of Asian students in San Diego.

Overall suspension rates were lower among diverse-by-design charter schools in two out of the five jurisdictions (San Francisco Bay Area and Denver). But in several jurisdictions, particular subgroups had lower suspension rates that are noteworthy. Black students in Denver’s diverse-by-design charter schools are significantly less likely to be suspended (8.8 percentage points less than in comparison schools), and 2 percentage points less likely in San Diego. In the San Francisco Bay Area, White and Latinx students are 3 percentage points less likely to be suspended than in comparison schools. In New York, Latinx students in diverse-by-design charter schools had lower suspension rates than in the comparison schools, but Black students were more likely to be suspended.

**Black and Latinx DBD Students Less Likely to Be Chronically Absent**

Differences in Likelihood of Being Chronically Absent: DBD and Other Public Schools (percentage points)
Mixed Academic Outcomes

Diverse-by-design charter schools have a mixed effect on academic outcomes, but a generally positive impact in English language arts (ELA)—and among the high schools open long enough, higher graduation rates.

In four out of the five jurisdictions (in California and Colorado), students attending diverse-by-design charter schools had higher ELA scores than their peers in comparison schools. Subgroups’ experiences varied, however. The higher ELA proficiency was concentrated among White students in Los Angeles’ diverse-by-design charter schools, with little or no difference for Latinx students (and too few Black students in the sample to derive an estimate), while in San Diego, this higher proficiency was concentrated among Latinx students, with little or no difference for White and Black students.

The diverse-by-design schools in California are more mature than those in other states, and it shows in their outcomes. Across the state, diverse-by-design charter schools outperform comparison schools in reading by 11.3 percentage points in reading but are no different in math. California is also the only state that has diverse-by-design charter high schools that have been around long enough to graduate students, and their Black and Latinx students graduate at higher levels than their peers at comparison schools, but White students’ graduation rates are no different.

In Denver’s diverse-by-design schools, scores in ELA were higher but in math, scores were similar to those of comparison schools. Denver is the only jurisdiction where we were able to directly compare not just schools and similar students, but to compare actual scores of students who applied to and then attended diverse-by-design schools with the outcomes of peers who applied but did not attend. The students who actually get into and attend Denver’s diverse-by-design schools have higher reading scores compared to peers who applied, but were not admitted through the lottery; the effects are particularly high for Black and Asian students in ELA, with slightly lower math scores for Latinx students and no significant effects for White students in either subject.

Finally, in New York City, students attending diverse-by-design charter schools had lower ELA and math outcomes than their peers at comparison schools. There, Latinx students perform slightly better than their peers at comparison schools in ELA, but Black and White students perform at similar levels.

Lower Suspension Rates for Latinx and Black Students in Most Jurisdictions

Differences in Suspension Rates: DBD and Other Public Schools (percentage points)
Higher Graduation and ELA Proficiency Rates in DBD Schools in California
Differences in Outcomes between DBD and Other Public Schools, California (percentage points)

**BAY AREA**
- Graduation Rates: 16.1
- Math Proficiency: 7.8
- ELA Proficiency: 19.8

**SAN DIEGO**
- Graduation Rates: 15.2
- Math Proficiency: 1.0
- ELA Proficiency: 11.0

**LA**
- Graduation Rates: 4.9
- Math Proficiency: 8.7
- ELA Proficiency: 11.0

Higher ELA Scores for Black and Asian DBD Attendees in Denver
Differences in Test Scores between DBD Students and Other Public School Students, Denver (standard deviations)

**ASIAN**
- Math: -0.03
- ELA: .11

**LATINX**
- Math: -0.05
- ELA: .02

**BLACK**
- Math: -.08
- ELA: .12

**WHITE**
- Math: .06
- ELA: .09

**ALL STUDENTS**
- Math: -0.03
- ELA: .04
Creating a Sense of Community

As would perhaps be expected in a study of diverse-by-design charter schools, nearly all sample organizations (11 out of 12) had mission statements that specifically mention diversity. In interviews, most respondents defined diversity in terms of socioeconomic status, race, ethnicity, religion, gender, and sexuality. It was also common for interviewees to emphasize how diversity was an asset; a teacher at High Tech High Middle School in San Diego told us, “different backgrounds bring different strengths.”

Most also included family and community engagement front and center in their mission statements. They tended to describe the school community of students and faculty using terms like “sense of belonging” and “warm, joyful community.” Those that mentioned the external community often tied it to their curriculum in terms of community service and service-learning projects. Many schools also mentioned goals of producing “global citizens” and those who could make a positive impact in their community and world.

These schools often feel they must work harder to build community because of how long many families must commute to get to the school. As one teacher at High Tech High Elementary Explorer in San Diego, California explained, “No one really walks to school here. So, you have to do a huge amount to build the community which is automatically there in some schools where people aren’t having to drive for a long time in traffic to get to.” Importantly, study participants from nine out of the 12 organizations also mentioned that they were concerned not just with recruiting a diverse population but also retaining that population by actively creating a sense of community. “Unless we ensure that families feel like this is the place where they can be welcomed, and they can feel a sense of belonging, we won’t attract the students, and often not retain many students,” said an administrator at DSST: Byers Middle School. “If we get kids in the door, but they don’t feel like they belong, they don’t feel like they are valued here and they won’t stay with us.”

Several diverse-by-design schools reinforced community by building a school culture that kept community at the forefront. This sense of community was accomplished through morning meetings and school spirit activities as well as innovative mixing strategies within classrooms. All diverse-by-design sample schools used a variety of innovative mixing strategies such as advisory or mentor groups, mixing grades, skills and student backgrounds within groups and classrooms as a way to build community and a sense of belonging in school. These
groups provided a “home base” or feeling of “family” at school so that no one went “unnoticed.” All but one of the sample schools used mentoring/advisory groups to create “school families” for students. This was accomplished by keeping students and faculty together during the entire education school program—elementary or middle or high schools. “Every week the mentor groups have a community circle where they sat down together,” said an administrator at Summit Denali Middle School in Sunnyvale, California. “The intent is to have a space for kids to share, hear from each other, build empathy and build relationships with each other. When kids have strong relationships with each other, they build empathy.”

They also built dedicated time into their weekly schedule for community building. Outside of the formal school day, several offered after-school programs and clubs that provided students with the opportunity to take on leadership roles and work with students with similar interests from different classes and grades.

The schools we studied also offered many opportunities for families to participate in the community. Some held sports, arts, and music nights for families with the goal of more deeply exploring their mission of equity and diversity. They also held book clubs and cooking classes featuring families’ diverse cultures. Several schools have also developed their own community traditions that families looked forward to every year.

Families and teachers confirmed that these practices were creating a strong sense of community. Almost all (98%) parents and teachers (97%) surveyed agreed that their school’s mission of supporting a diverse school community was embraced by families, teachers, and school administrators. Over 70% of families surveyed agreed that they trusted and felt connected to their child’s school and over 80% reported that the school often or sometimes provided opportunities for families to interact and form relationships with one another; a similar percentage of surveyed parents (85%) reported that their child’s school often or sometimes actively sought input from families when making decisions about school policies, practices, and programs. An overwhelming proportion of teachers (91%) surveyed agreed or strongly agreed that students from different backgrounds were encouraged to have a broad circle of friends at the school, and almost 90% of surveyed parents reported that their child always or sometimes socialized outside of school with students from different backgrounds.

Sense of Community Profiles: BUGS and DSST

**Brooklyn Urban Garden Charter School (BUGS):** This New York based independent charter middle school engages in project-based learning focused on environmental conservation that is connected with the local community. For example, a group of eighth graders studied food insecurity and nutrition by researching options in the area, making a map of where local residents could use food stamps to buy fresh vegetables, and distributing the map through local community organizations. Learning happens not only in the community but with the community. “It’s a really great learning experience for kids,” explained the principal. “Sometimes, the ‘ah-ha moment’ comes in when they’re presenting to community experts.”

The school partners with local organizations such as the Brooklyn Botanic Garden, Grow NYC and the Gowanus Canal to do sustainability projects as part of their field studies, which benefits both the school and the organizations. “Our goal is to use that theme as a way to engage adolescents in solving real-world problems, doing more hands-on learning with New York City as their living classroom,” explained the founding principal. “That will help improve their numeracy and literacy because they’ll be so excited to do these things connected to larger concepts that, over the years, it becomes more sophisticated for them.”

The school also uses advisory groups—a racially diverse mix of students that stay together their whole three years at BUGS—as a way to build community. As the founding principal explained, “it’s very structured community building that creates a social fabric across the school.” The advisory curriculum includes explicit units of study on diversity as well.

However, despite the use of these strategies, there can be challenges with community building as well. For example, the
principal mentioned that it was difficult to get some students to participate in their after-school program because they were unable to spend additional time at school due to family responsibilities. In addition, middle school parents were less likely to get involved than at the elementary level due to work schedules but also because they see their children as being more independent.

The principal also found that being available to greet families and students each morning at drop off provided an important opportunity for gathering information and building trust. They use this time to communicate with parents and students, saying that “it’s these small interactions that give me a window into the parent perspective and what they’re concerned about.” School leaders then use this information to help plan community events and hold focus groups to gather further information from parents about involvement.

DSST Public Schools: DSST Public Schools is a network of charter schools serving nearly 7,000 students in Denver and Aurora, Colorado. While the school model emphasizes science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM) curriculum, “we want to provide other opportunities for growth and development through arts and other channels to have [students] be prepared for college and beyond,” explained DSST’s Director of Schools.

In order to integrate its diverse student body, DSST holds regular community meetings and intentionally groups students in advisory classes. “The advisory itself is geared to bridge different friendships that students normally wouldn’t have in their typical homeroom traveling class,” described a teacher at DSST: Byers Middle School. “[Students] get to talk about things like bullying, sexuality, and topics that need a smaller space.”

Restorative Justice Approach to Discipline

As noted earlier, several diverse-by-design charter schools are moving away from exclusionary discipline approaches like suspensions and expulsions, which remove students from the school community for part of a day or more, and moving toward the use of restorative justice. Restorative justice centers around three main ideas:

- Repair: justice requires repairing the harm done by the discipline infraction
- Encounter: the best way to determine how to repair the specific harm is to have the parties decide together
- Transformation: working together to repair harm can cause fundamental changes in people, relationships, and communities

Restorative justice can help promote a sense of belonging for students. First, restorative justice promotes a belief that school culture is the responsibility of the collective. Second, an outcome of a successful restorative justice program is that it physically keeps students within the school community where they can continue to build relationships with students and teachers and continue to participate in the classroom “family.” As a teacher at The City School in Los Angeles noted, “The school is built on a community and it didn’t seem consistent to exclude people even after misconduct.”

Some of our sample schools had just begun restorative justice implementation, and had not undergone the professional development needed for full buy-in. In our review of codes of conduct, four independent charter schools and networks
were found to be “strong,” seven “hybrid” and one “weak” in their level of commitment to restorative justice; only the four “strong” implementers had updated their codes of conduct to remove mention of other discipline models. By shifting their codes of conduct, these schools had taken the important first step of communicating to their stakeholders that they were committed to the reform. For example, Community Roots stated in its code of conduct: “After a student violates a rule/expectation, students take ownership of their behavior, making amendments for any violation, and learning from the experience. We also seek the restoration of community trust and relationships.”

Codes of conduct that were clear and well-aligned with shifts in organizations’ policy helped to ensure equity in treatment of subgroups who are traditionally disproportionately represented in suspension data. “We have a restorative justice model with circles and a [social emotional learning] curriculum. We’ve really embedded the diversity learning throughout our course material,” said the Chief Academic Officer of one of the schools we visited. “In the second year [of restorative justice implementation], our middle school has had zero suspensions and it shows that when you take that mindset and just integrate it throughout, the change that is possible.”

Conversely, organizations with a hybrid or weak level of commitment to restorative justice implemented the reform in a piecemeal fashion, holding one-off professional development sessions or only implementing a portion of the reform—which meant these practices were implemented alongside more exclusionary discipline practices, causing a conflict that led some study participants to share with us that they were wary of restorative justice. Indeed, piecemeal or incomplete implementation can be problematic and can lead to inequitable outcomes. “Narrow models of [restorative justice] can overemphasize student participation in responsive circles and conferences, minimizing the importance of whole community participation,” say professors Anne Gregory and Katherine R. Evans in their analysis of restorative justice in education for the National Education Policy Center.

Unfortunately, the discipline outcomes we analyzed bore this out, with inequitable disciplinary outcomes in schools with a mixed disciplinary approach: while out-of-school suspension rates for White students were roughly equal between strong and hybrid schools, suspension rates of Black and Latinx students were higher in hybrid schools, regardless of disability status. For example, suspension rates for Black students without disabilities in hybrid schools were almost 1.5 times higher than in strong schools. These differences are even more striking among students with disabilities. While students with disabilities had slightly higher suspension rates in hybrid schools, the suspension rate of Black students with disabilities was almost twice as large as the rate in schools with a strong restorative justice implementation, and the suspension rate of Latinx students with disabilities was almost 1.5 times larger. This suggests that the level of commitment may be important predictor for racial disparities in suspension rates. “We still have a high rate of Black and Brown boys with discipline infractions,” noted an administrator at one of the schools we visited. “This school has a history in which whatever’s dealt with in the classroom stays there and never makes it out of the classroom. Therefore, we can’t really address anything school wide.”

Restorative Justice Profiles: HTH and Odyssey

High Tech High: High Tech High (HTH) opened its first campus in San Diego in 2000 and now runs a network of sixteen charter schools in San Diego. Participants credit the success of the school’s restorative justice program to having schoolwide language for behavior and discipline that is used and recognized by both students and staff. As noted by a former High Tech High Media Arts teacher who now directs the network’s Intern and Induction Programs, restorative justice has enabled staff to “uncover what’s at the root of [a student’s] problem and create logical consequences versus just these Band-Aids that are put on at the moment.”

Teachers have relied on each other to implement restorative practices. “We collaborate a lot as well in the social-emotional,” noted one teacher from High Tech High Elementary Explorer. “For example, if teachers get to our wits’ end and there’s a battle happening and I don’t want to go to this battle, I might go [to another teacher to say] ‘I need another ear. I just need someone to help me with this situation right now,’ and then, that’s a new, fresh set of eyes. It’s also helpful to have that collaboration time.”

Odyssey Charter Schools: Odyssey initially opened in 1999 in Pasadena, California, with a second campus (Odyssey South) opening in 2018, both of which will eventually serve students starting in transitional kindergarten through eighth grade.

Odyssey implemented restorative justice in an effort to reduce disproportionate discipline, after realizing that Black and Latino boys were sent out of the classroom and suspended more frequently than their peers. The school implemented a phased roll-out of restorative justice practices, starting with 4th–6th grade and then scaling up to the rest of the school. One member of the Odyssey school leadership team described the roll-out as a “soft sell” that allowed teachers to opt into trying restorative justice and help them “distinguish what should be teacher-managed behaviors and what should be office-managed behaviors.”

The focus of Odyssey’s restorative justice work has been building relationships between individual students and
also across the school community. In the words of another member of the school leadership team, this would help ensure that when students returned to the community after an infraction, “that there was a reentry and that they felt like they could also be included with other students, not just deal with that one student that they had an altercation with.”

Culturally Responsive Pedagogy

Diverse-by-design schools often embrace culturally responsive pedagogical approaches that proactively address identity and bias through their curriculum and professional development.

At 11 of 12 organizations in the sample, interviewees described the importance of understanding identity in instructing a diverse student population. All schools in the sample were engaged in explicit instruction around identity and bias with students. Of the nine organizations that served elementary age children, six emphasized the importance of teaching young children about elements of identity. As co-founder and co-director of the Community Roots network explained, exposing children to different identities is “the only way to interrupt and dismantle [stereotypes and bias].”

Some schools taught these issues primarily through advisory periods, while other schools prioritized embedding explorations of diverse identities throughout all content and curriculum. “One of the ways that I think about it a lot is that anti-bias education is not like, ‘It’s 2:30, let’s talk about racism,’ but it’s like how are we putting this lens on every part of our school day?” said another administrator from Community Roots. While many interviewees emphasized the importance of identity to their education programs, at least 2 of 12 organizations in the sample relegated instruction on issues of identity to advisory periods.

Several administrators and teachers emphasized an integrated anti-bias approach to learning, drawing from student experiences and challenging culturally dominant narratives. Five of the 12 organizations emphasized an anti-bias approach to education by providing all-school professional development related to anti-bias teaching, while another three organizations within the sample provided opportunities for staff members to seek professional development related to anti-bias training outside of the school or network rather than directly providing it.

Nearly all schools in the sample have made some efforts at representing diverse identities, perspectives, and backgrounds in school texts and curriculum. Ten of the 12 organizations mentioned explicit efforts to ensure that students’ identities were reflected in curricular materials, including diversity audits to investigate the extent to which authors, artists, and other figures studied reflected the identities of their students, which was sometimes done by central office staff but other times by teachers and even students. Brooklyn Urban Garden Charter School (BUGS) in New York City convened a group of all 5th–12th grade ELA teachers to vertically examine all texts used in order ensure that students would have exposure to diverse identities and backgrounds. The school’s founding principal described the group in charge of this process as “a culturally relevant curriculum working group that meets once a month to put more focus on materials and content … on how to better have our instructional materials represent
the students’ backgrounds.” At High Tech High Elementary Explorer in San Diego, California, a group of 4th grade students surveyed all classroom libraries for a diverse representation of authors. The students then organized a fundraiser to purchase books by authors from underrepresented groups for the classroom libraries with the least diversity. Parents were engaged in this process of fundraising, with the PTO helping to raise funds for these purchases.

Finally, 9 of the 12 organizations used Project-Based Learning (PBL) in their classrooms and several schools within the sample used investigations of the surrounding community to engage their students. Schools that included work in their surrounding communities leveraged students’ interests in their surroundings, oftentimes with interdisciplinary projects that culminated in action or advocacy. For example, High Tech High in San Diego, California incorporated community building in their “project work” curriculum in age-appropriate ways. Younger students helped design playground and recess time and developed norms for behavior. Older students engaged in internships in the community and presented their work at the town courthouse for which community members were invited. They also sold their work in art galleries in the community and donated the proceeds to local organizations.

While we did not investigate causal links between these practices and the schools’ outcomes, one possible explanation for diverse-by-design charter schools’ higher English language arts scores rests on the fact that most students in our sample had in effect “double-ELA” most days—one period focused explicitly on ELA and a second session on social studies and social justice topics.

Culturally Responsive Pedagogy Profiles: Community Roots Charter School and Larchmont Charter School

Community Roots Charter School: Based in the Fort Greene neighborhood of New York City, Community Roots is an independent charter school with an elementary and a middle school campus. Amidst the rapidly changing demographics of Brooklyn, the school ensures a socioeconomically diverse student body by weighting its admissions lottery to guarantee 40% of incoming kindergarten spots to students from public housing immediately surrounding the school.

Community Roots’ mission to serve a diverse student body and community is the driving force of the school. From curriculum to community building, the school aims to disrupt segregation and “bring people together across lines of difference.” One of the founders and co-directors of Community Roots emphasizes the organization’s intent “to meet everyone’s needs and to not create a re-segregated environment in one building.”

In its curriculum, Community Roots focuses on teaching students about the many facets of human identity and how identity informs experience and perspective. From an early age, students tackle issues of discrimination and social justice. As one middle school teacher described to us, the school’s curriculum has evolved to “authentically incorporate multiple perspectives,” and that teachers strive to “create spaces for students to have tough conversations about power, privilege, skin color, and gender—even with kindergarteners.”
Multiple groups within the school are designated with promoting and integrating this anti-bias approach into every facet of the school. Starting in 2012, the school’s Diversity Working Group supports teachers in creating a developmentally appropriate anti-bias curriculum that integrates social justice throughout the school’s social studies units. Additionally, the Anti-Bias Collective leads professional development for staff, giving faculty a space to have conversations around identity, privilege, and power, while the school’s Inclusive Practices Group focuses on translating these conversations into the everyday work of teaching.

**Larchmont Charter School (LCS):** Larchmont Charter School is an independent charter school operator in Los Angeles serving students from transitional kindergarten through 12th grade across four campuses. LCS employs an inquiry-based academic model in order to foster creativity and academic excellence in its diverse student body. Describing the school’s mission to serve a diverse student population, one teacher from Larchmont’s Lafayette Park high school campus explained, “We talk a lot about equity versus equality… whether it’s learning styles or socioeconomic status, we really try to take everything into account.”

LCS’ academic program emphasizes social justice through advocacy, encouraging students to take an active approach to problem solving in their communities. At Larchmont’s Fairfax campus, fourth-grade students pick individual year-long advocacy projects and also vote for a class-wide project, such as raising funds for Alzheimer’s research through a talent show.

Teachers at LCS work hard to make sure their curriculum reflects the authentic diversity of Los Angeles and their students. As one high school teacher told us, English teachers at Larchmont’s high school campus review curriculum to make sure that it reflects “diversity along the lines of gender, sexual orientation, race, ethnicity, and the voices that students are exposed to,” emphasizing that it is important for students to “recognize someone who looks like them or who is like them.”
CONCLUSION

As American schools and society grapple with the best ways to achieve equitable outcomes in the face of increasing diversity, diverse-by-design charter schools are a noteworthy innovation to consider.

They have less segregation than other district and charter schools, not only by enrolling a more diverse array of students but also by fostering inclusive practices including community engagement, restorative justice, and culturally responsive pedagogy. In most locations, these integrated students are achieving behavioral and academic outcomes that are as good or better than those of their peers in nearby schools, particularly in attendance, discipline, and English language arts.

More research is needed to establish a stronger linkage between the practices and outcomes of these diverse-by-design charter schools, and to determine how other public and charter schools can best learn from their experiences and efforts.

As philanthropists, policymakers, practitioners, and parents work to increase equity in our nation’s schools and foster greater integration and inclusion, they should continue to support the efforts of diverse-by-design charter schools to intentionally enroll a diverse mix of students. As those students learn to work, play, and thrive together across difference, so may we all.
## APPENDIX: SCHOOLS WE VISITED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn Prospect Charter School: Clinton Hill Middle School</td>
<td>Brooklyn, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn Prospect Charter School: Downtown Brooklyn Elementary</td>
<td>Brooklyn, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn Prospect Charter School: High School</td>
<td>Brooklyn, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn Prospect Charter School: Windsor Terrace Middle School</td>
<td>Brooklyn, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn Urban Garden Charter School</td>
<td>Brooklyn, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens of the World Hollywood</td>
<td>Los Angeles, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens of the World Mar Vista</td>
<td>Los Angeles, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens of the World Silver Lake North (South)</td>
<td>Los Angeles, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Language Immersion</td>
<td>Los Angeles, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Roots Charter School: Elementary School</td>
<td>Brooklyn, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Roots Charter School: Middle School</td>
<td>Brooklyn, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSST: Byers Middle School</td>
<td>Denver, CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSST: Green Valley Ranch High School</td>
<td>Denver, CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSST: Stapleton High School</td>
<td>Denver, CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew Public Charter: Language Academy</td>
<td>Brooklyn, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Tech Elementary</td>
<td>San Diego, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Tech High Media Arts</td>
<td>San Diego, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Tech Middle</td>
<td>San Diego, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larchmont Charter at Hollygrove</td>
<td>Los Angeles, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larchmont Charter School at La Fayette Park Place</td>
<td>Los Angeles, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odyssey Charter School</td>
<td>Altadena, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summit Denali, Sunnyvale</td>
<td>Sunnyvale, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summit Everest, Redwood City</td>
<td>Redwood City, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The City Charter School</td>
<td>Los Angeles, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley Charter Elementary</td>
<td>Los Angeles, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley Charter Middle</td>
<td>Los Angeles, CA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>