



MEMO

DATE: August 9, 2021
TO: Charter Authorizer
FROM: ADE Legal Services Staff
SUBJECT: Desegregation Analysis of Open Enrollment Charter Application – IDEA Public Schools Arkansas

I. INTRODUCTION

IDEA Public Schools Arkansas submitted an application for two open-enrollment public charter schools. One of the proposed charter schools would be located within the boundaries of the Pulaski County Special School District while the other campus would be located within the boundaries of the Little Rock School District. The proposed charter schools would open in 2023-2024 and provide instruction to students in grades kindergarten through two and grade six (K-2, 6) in their initial year and by 2026-2027 would serve students in grades kindergarten through nine (K-9). The proposed charter school would possess a student enrollment cap of 1,000 in its initial year, and by 2026-2027 the charter would have a student enrollment cap of 2,600 students. According to its application, the proposed charter school expects to draw students from the Little Rock School District, the North Little Rock School District, the Pulaski County Special School District, and the Jacksonville North Pulaski School District.

II. STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

Ark. Code Ann. § 6-23-106(a) requires the applicants for a charter school, the board of directors of the school district in which a proposed charter school would be located, and the charter authorizer to “carefully review the potential impact of an application for a charter school on the efforts of a public school district or public school districts to comply with court orders and statutory obligations to create and maintain a unitary system of desegregated public schools.” Ark. Code Ann. § 6-23-106(b) requires the charter authorizer to “attempt to measure the likely impact of a proposed public charter school on the efforts of public school districts to achieve and maintain a unitary system.” Ark. Code Ann. § 6-23-106(c) states that the authorizer “shall not approve any public charter school under this chapter or any other act or any combination of acts that hampers, delays, or in any manner negatively affects the desegregation efforts of a public school district or public school districts in this state.” This analysis is provided to inform the decision-making of the charter authorizer with regard to the effect, if any, of the proposed public charter school upon the desegregation efforts of a public school district.

III. INFORMATION SUBMITTED BY THE APPLICANT AND THE AFFECTED SCHOOL DISTRICTS

A desegregation analysis submitted by the charter school is included in its application at Question 35.

IV. ANALYSIS FROM THE DEPARTMENT

Enrollment, as accessed on August 9, 2021, for the traditional public school districts and the open-enrollment charter schools in Pulaski County are attached to the agenda.

“Desegregation” is the process by which a school district eliminates, to the extent practicable, the lingering negative effects or “vestiges” of prior *de jure* (caused by official action) racial discrimination. The ADE is aware of desegregation orders affecting LRSD, PCSSD, and the North Little Rock School District (NLRSD). *Little Rock School District, et al. v. Pulaski County Special School District, et al.*, Case No. 4:82-cv-00866-DPM (E.D. Ark.). The goal of a desegregation case with regard to assignment of students to schools is to “achieve a system of determining admission to the public schools on a non-racial basis.” *Pasadena City Board of Education v. Spangler*, 427 U.S. 424, 435 (1976) (quoting *Brown v. Board of Education*, 349 U.S. 294, 300-301 (1955)).

The Little Rock School District and the North Little Rock School District have both been declared unitary. The PCSSD has been declared unitary save for facilities. The JNPSD has also been declared unitary, but has ongoing facilities responsibilities.

Because IDEA Public Schools draws students from Pulaski County, Arkansas, the authorizer must ensure that any act it approves does not hamper, delay, or in any manner negatively affect the desegregation efforts of PCSSD or JNPSD. As the Supreme Court noted in *Missouri v. Jenkins*, 515 U.S. 70, 115 (1995):

[I]n order to find unconstitutional segregation, we require that plaintiffs “prove all of the essential elements of *de jure* segregation -- that is, stated simply, a current condition of segregation resulting from *intentional state action directed specifically* to the [allegedly segregated] schools.” *Keyes v. School Dist. No. 1*, 413 U.S. 189, 205-206 (1973) (emphasis added). “[T]he differentiating factor between *de jure* segregation and so-called *de facto* segregation . . . is purpose or *intent* to segregate.” *Id.*, at 208 (emphasis in original).

As noted above, PCSSD and JNPSD remain under federal court supervision with regard to facilities. Therefore, the authorizer should consider whether granting the application will negatively affect PCSSD or JNPSD’s efforts to achieve full unitary status.

ADE no desegregation-related opposition was received from any of the affected school districts.

V. CONCLUSION

As stated above, Arkansas law does not allow the authorizer to approve any public charter school that “hampers, delays, or in any manner negatively affects the desegregation efforts” of a public school district. Ark. Code Ann. § 6-23-106(c). The Supreme Court noted in *Missouri v. Jenkins*, 515 U.S. 70, 115 (1995):

[I]n order to find unconstitutional segregation, we require that plaintiffs “prove all of the essential elements of *de jure* segregation -- that is, stated simply, a current condition of segregation resulting from *intentional state action directed specifically* to the [allegedly segregated] schools.” *Keyes v. School Dist. No. 1*, 413 U.S. 189, 205-206 (1973) (emphasis added). “[T]he differentiating factor between *de jure* segregation and so-called *de facto* segregation . . . is purpose or *intent* to segregate.” *Id.*, at 208 (emphasis in original).

It is difficult to conclude, from data currently available, that approval of the charter school is motivated by an impermissible intent to segregate schools, or that approval would hamper, delay, or negatively affect the desegregation efforts of the affected school districts.